

LYING FOR GOD: WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW AND WHEN THEY KNEW IT!

8TH EDITION – AUGUST 1, 2014

BY

KERRY B. WYNNE

**B.A., ENGLISH & HISTORY (1970 & 1972), PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE
M.A., EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, ANDREWS UNIVERSITY (1978)**

WILLIAM H. HOHMANN

B.A., THEOLOGY, AMBASSADOR COLLEGE (1976)

ROBERT K. SANDERS

FOUNDER OF TRUTH OR FABLES.COM

DUANE JOHNSON

INDEPENDENT BIBLICAL RESEARCHER AND AUTHOR

PART I – VERDICT: NO SABBATH IN GENESIS

PART II – ELLEN WHITE AND HER ENABLERS

COPYRIGHT 2014

PART I

VERDICT:

NO SABBATH IN GENESIS!

**A POINT-BY POINT REBUTTAL OF THE ADVENTIST DEFENSE LEAGUE'S PAPER
BY EDWIN M. COTTO, "THE SABBATH IN GENESIS."**

**ADDITIONAL REFUTATIONS TO OBJECTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST, BRIAN KNUDSON.**

BY

KERRY B. WYNNE

**B.A., ENGLISH & HISTORY (1970 & 1972), PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE
M.A., EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, ANDREWS UNIVERSITY (1978)**

**WILLIAM H. HOHMANN
B.A., THEOLOGY, AMBASSADOR COLLEGE (1976)**

**ROBERT K. SANDERS
FOUNDER OF TRUTH OR FABLES.COM**

**DUANE JOHNSON
INDEPENDENT BIBLICAL RESEARCHER AND AUTHOR**

You may contact the authors at the following e-mail address. In order to receive a reply you must read *LYING FOR GOD* from cover to cover, and the first line of your e-mail message must contain a statement to the effect that you have read it and still have additional questions. Due to time constraints and limited staff, we cannot answer questions that are already covered in the book. Also you have permission to distribute this publication in written or electronic form provided that the document is kept fully intact and proper credit is given to the authors. We request that you send copies of this book to 10 other people who fit our target audience. If you are a Hebrew language scholar with special training in the Ancient Hebrew form of the language, we would like to talk to you:

LyingForGod@Yahoo.Com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I – VERDICT: NO SABBATH IN GENESIS!

BEGINS ON PAGE 4

PART II – ELLEN G. WHITE AND HER ENABLERS

PAGE	CHAPTER AND TITLE
116	ONE – THE UNMASKING OF ELLEN WHITE – PART I
122	TWO – THE UNMASKING OF ELLEN WHITE – PART II
146	THREE – ELLEN WHITE BOTCHES ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
156	FOUR – ELLEN WHITE AND WHY CHRISTIANS OBSERVE SUNDAY
169	FIVE – WHAT ADVENTIST LEADERS NEW ABOUT SABBATH IMPOSSIBILITIES
179	SIX – MORE BARRIERS TO ELLEN WHITE'S SABBATH THEORIES
187	SEVEN – WHAT ADVENTIST LEADERS KNEW ABOUT DANIEL'S PROPHECIES
209	EIGHT – TIME-LINE: THE <u>REAL</u> HISTORY OF ADVENTISM
261	NINE – MORE ON ELLEN WHITE AND THE SUPERNATURAL
279	TEN – THE VISIONS CREATED HOW MUCH MONEY?
281	ELEVEN – ELLEN MAKES BILLIONS FOR THE CHURCH WITH HER UN-BIBLICAL TITHING DOCTRINE
286	TWELVE – CHURCH CORRUPTION DURING THE 1970'S
294	THIRTEEN – DOES RELIGION HAVE TO MAKE SENSE? (HOHMANN)
302	APPENDIX I – SABBATH NOT A LAW FOR CHRISTIANS
318	APPENDIX II – J. N. ANDREWS ON THE DIDACHE
320	APPENDIX III - TERTULLIAN: WAS HE SABBATARIAN OR ANTI-SABBATARIAN?
324	APPENDIX IV - D. M. CANRIGHT ON THE SUPREMACY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH
332	APPENDIX V - THE 10 COMMANDMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT (SANDERS)
334	APPENDIX VI – CHRISTIANS WORKING ON SABBATHS: UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES (HOHMANN)
340	APPENDIX VII - ELLEN WHITE'S QUININE TEACHINGS KILL MISSIONARIES
341	APPENDIX VIII - CANRIGHT: NO HEATHEN WEEKLY WORSHIP OR REST DAYS
353	APPENDIX IX - THE ADVENTIST SABBATH PARADOX: WILLIAM MILLER/SAMUEL SNOW CALENDAR CALCULATIONS
355	APPENDIX X - THE ADVENTIST SABBATH PARADOX - JERICHO CAMPAIGN: 7 DAYS WITHOUT A SABBATH!
358	APPENDIX XI – FROM SABBATH TO SATURDAY BY JOHN D. KEYSER (EXCERPTS)

PART I

VERDICT: NO SABBATH IN GENESIS!

From The Land Of Goshen To The Mountain Of The Moon

The Hebrews left Egypt on a Thursday night and marched and camped for a total of 38 days before they kept their first Sabbath, treating all the previous days of their journey the same in regard to travel and work. One week before observing the first Sabbath ever kept by anyone, they marched 20 kilometers from their camp by the Red Sea to the edge of the Wilderness of Sin, trampling on the 7th day of their week, arriving around 5 pm on the 31st day of their journey late that “Saturday” afternoon. That evening, God introduced the Manna Obedience Test to Israel, instructing them to gather daily an amount sufficient for their needs for one day, and that on the sixth day they were to gather a double portion in order to provide them with manna on the Sabbath, seeing as there would be none provided on that day. Critical thinking elicits the fact that you cannot keep the Sabbath holy without a preparation day before it. All the work has to be completed before sundown on the 6th day.

At this point in the Exodus journey, the Sabbath represented nothing more than the second of two obedience tests. It was not until a few weeks later when, at Mt. Sinai, the Sabbath was incorporated into the treaty between God and Israel known as the 10 Commandments. Like the ordinance of circumcision and the Jewish dietary laws, the institution of the Sabbath was designed to set the Hebrews apart from every other society on Earth, forming a protective social barrier that would severely restrict their interaction with the Heathen. Regarding these cultic Jewish rituals, a scholar once observed that people who do not eat together seldom become friends. If the Sabbath were a Creation ordinance with truly moral qualities, God would not have led His children out of Egypt without provision for keeping it every step of the way. Once, because of their sins, God seems to have threatened to take Israel’s Sabbaths away.

Hosea 2:11 (NIV) - "I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days—all her appointed feasts.

There is some evidence that this text may merely represent a prophecy of what would become of Israel’s sabbath system as a result of their disobedience, rather than an actual statement that God would specially intervene to take away their sabbaths. During their various captivities, Israel undoubtedly experienced disruptions of their Sabbath-keeping. In either case, the adoption of the fixed calendar by their conquering nations made it impossible to keep the Sabbath as is was specified in the Law of Moses. In effect, they were forced to keep “Saturday” rather than the “Sabbath.” All of this Sabbath chaos illustrates the fact that the Sabbath is characteristically ceremonial rather than moral. For example, if Israel was committing adultery and fornication “too much,” God would not suspend the parts of the Law of Moses that forbid these sins. Not even God Himself can set aside or suspend moral laws because such laws are based on the natural laws of cause and effect.

Before the Hebrews left Egypt, the instructions God gave them regarding the keeping of the Passover Feast suggest that no Sabbath existed at that time. This feast was to last seven days, so whether a fixed or lunar calendar is used for our calculations, one of those days would have to have been a Sabbath-- if there had been a Sabbath in existence at that time. The preparation of food was allowed on all of the seven days of the Passover feast. By contrast , cooking on the Sabbath was forbidden. For the Sabbath, the cooking must be done on the Preparation Day, or the sixth day of the week. If there was no sixth day of preparation, there could be no seventh-day Sabbath because food would have to be prepared for the people on it. While permission to prepare food on the Sabbath may have been granted in connection with some of the Jewish feast celebrations that God added later, the only national feast week God had given them up to the time of the Exodus was the Passover.

As our study unfolds it will become painfully clear that Exodus 16 provides water-tight proof—not merely evidence--that no Sabbath existed before the giving of the Manna. We do not use the term, proof, loosely. What this fact means is that any

argument for the existence of the Sabbath prior to the Exodus must be remarkably clear, or it is hardly worth discussing. Also, any pro-Sabbatarian arguments must be able to stand on their own with evidence gathered only from Genesis 1 through Exodus 16. In view of the absolutes of Exodus 16, Sabbatarians should not expect to be taken seriously if their approach involves taking references to the Sabbath from beyond the account of the Exodus journey and stuffing them back into Genesis 2. In order for them to provide meaningful support for their agenda, they must demonstrate clear Sabbath content in Genesis 2.

All it takes is a brief survey of Genesis through Exodus 16 to see that there is nothing of this sort available to Sabbatarians. At the same time, there is only a limited amount of evidence available to anti-Sabbatarians, such as the four of us, to actually prove that there is no Sabbath content in Genesis. This evidence is found in part in that Moses used special literary devices to limit the blessing, hallowing, and sanctifying (the setting aside) of that day to that ONE day ALONE. We will explain these indicators and how they work subsequently. Meanwhile, let us turn our attention back to the Exodus journey. God introduced the Sabbath to Israel as something new. The people acted as if it were something new— a stiff-necked and stubborn people testing the boundaries. Some individuals gathered firewood on that first Sabbath. They did so publicly. If the Sabbath had existed prior to Exodus 16, these offenders would have been stoned. The stubborn nature of the Hebrew people strongly suggests that if there were Sabbaths before Exodus 16, some of them would have tested God by breaking the Sabbath every chance they got; yet there is no record that God ever rebuked them for Sabbath-breaking prior to Exodus 16. Here is what the Law of Moses has to say about Sabbath-breaking:

Num 15:32 - 36 (NIV) ³²While the Israelites were in the desert, a man was found gathering wood on the Sabbath day. ³³Those who found him gathering wood brought him to Moses and Aaron and the whole assembly, ³⁴and they kept him in custody, because it was not clear what should be done to him. ³⁵Then the LORD said to Moses, “The man must die. The whole assembly must stone him outside the camp.” ³⁶So the assembly took him outside the camp and stoned him to death, as the LORD commanded Moses.

Think how bad the Exodus journey would make God look if the Sabbath had originated at Creation! Was He not powerful enough to control the events of the Exodus to provide for Sabbath-keeping, including, in each case, a Preparation Day? What kind of example would He have set for His people? Do God’s children only have to keep the Sabbath when it is convenient? Clearly, there was no Sabbath to break until day 38 of the Exodus. Sabbatarian apologist, Brendan Knudson, suggests the possibility that if there was Sabbath-breaking involved under God’s direction-- “The ox is in the ditch” principle excusing God for leading His people to trample on it. Our position is that God had enough power to halt all the forces of Evil and Nature to enable them to keep the Sabbath if there had been a Sabbath to keep, and that as a cognate requirement, He would have also given them preparation days to assure that they could keep their Exodus Sabbaths without preparing food or gathering firewood upon it. People get hungry on Sabbath whether food was prepared the day before or not.

Everything we know about God’s character screams out that He would not lead His people to break an eternally binding moral law. This fact explains several mysterious things that honest-at-heart, thinking Sabbatarians have secretly pondered. Why is there no mention of the Sabbath in Genesis? Why did God give Abraham a surgical procedure (circumcision) as a “seal” for his descendants instead of the Sabbath, which was never even mentioned? Why was Sabbath-keeping not included in a list of basic laws that God gave to Noah around the time of the Great Flood? Why did St. Paul instruct the early church not to require Sabbath-keeping of the new Gentile converts (Colossians 2:14-17)? And why did St. Paul not list Sabbath-breaking in any of the several lists of sins he discussed in his writings? In Galatians St. Paul discusses the Christian’s freedom from the “LAW,” and it is clear he is discussing moral, rather than ceremonial, laws because the example he cited was adultery. Yet in the same breath he explained that the Christian is not subject to the LAW, he gave a list of 15 sins that he said would keep a person from entering Heaven. Robert K. Sanders observes that in Romans 1:28-32 he listed 16 sins that were not mentioned in Galatians 5 and that he listed still more sins in Ephesians 4:25-32-- and that in all of these lists there is not a single mention of Sabbath-breaking. With all the sins that Paul’s writings mention-- which included sins of motive and omission in addition to the sins of commission that are the focus of the Decalogue-- it is difficult to imagine how an objective Bible student could think that the 10 Commandments were intended to represent a complete guide to morality or that the Sabbath-keeping should be transferred from Judaism to Christianity. Apparently God didn’t think so either because he gave additional moral laws to Moses after He wrote the 10 Commandments in stone, including prohibitions against fornication (a very different sin from adultery in Hebrew thought) and homosexual relationships.

CAN YOU KEEP THE SABBATH AT THE NORTH POLE?

Imagine you are trying to keep the Jewish Sabbath above the Arctic Circle! The Arctic night "Sabbath" eventually arrives. Suddenly you are not allowed to light a fire in your dwelling place because the sun went down but didn't come back up. Your heater goes out. You honor God's "law" by not re-lighting it. The next morning you are found frozen to death, and you go down in history as a noble Christian Jewish Sabbath-keeper who would rather die than break the Jewish Sabbath. Perhaps you miraculously survive the Polar Winter "Sabbath without a fire. You can't work for the oil company that hired you until the sun comes up (making it "Saturday" morning) and goes back down again, creating a Saturday night. Eventually, however, the sun does come back up, stays up for a day, and goes back down. The Arctic stretch of extended non-Sabbath is finally over. You can go to work now. Sabbath-keeping is conventional for a while, but eventually the sun comes up and won't go down! Now you have to contend with the extended Arctic stretch of non-Sabbath time. Because the sun won't go down, Sabbath won't "start" on Friday night. You have to go to work every day because the Sabbath won't start since there is no sundown on Friday night.

Actually, there are more variations of this Arctic Sabbath nonsense. In the Arctic fall, if the Sun fails to set on a Friday night, you have "endless" work days. If the Sun fails to set on a Saturday night in the Arctic fall, you have an "endless" Sabbath. We will leave it up to your imagination to figure out what happens in the Arctic spring depending on which day the sun rises for the first time of the season. Please review the dual requirements of the Sabbath commandment. Both requirements apply to Jews. Christians who keep the Jewish Sabbath seem to forget the six-day requirement since it works against the ill-conceived idea that Adam and Eve qualified to rest on the 7th day of Creation along with God. God had worked for six days prior, but Adam and Eve had existed only about one day:

Exodus 20:8 (NIV): "Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. 9 Six days you shall labor and do all your work, 10 but the seventh day is a sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns. 11 For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.

If you manage to die of over-work during this stretch of non-Sabbath time, you go down in history as the Sabbath-keeping Christian who would rather die than break the Jewish Sabbath. Is it illogical to think that God would impose a moral law on His earthlings that could not be kept anywhere in the solar system. The sins of fornication and adultery can be committed on Planet Earth or in a space ship on its way to Mars, but the Sabbath can't be kept anywhere but in a climate like Palestine in the Mid-East. The Adventist prophetess, Ellen G. White, "solves" this problem by mandating that people should not live in parts of the Earth where the Sabbath cannot be kept. Try presenting the Gospel to a Polar-living Eskimo while at the same time telling him that he has to move to a different part of the world in order to keep "God's Law."

"In the countries where there is no sunset for months and again no sunrise for months the period of time will be calculated by the records kept. But God has a world large enough and proper and right for the human beings He has created to inhabit it without finding homes in those lands so objectionable in very many, many ways" (Ellen G. White, Letter #167, 23 March, 1900).

For the above reference, follow this link: www.gospeloutreach.net/chap09.html

God gave the Sabbath to Israel only. The Nation of Israel is located in a mild climate where the sun does rise and set every 24 hours for the entire year and where the temperatures are moderate enough to get through a cold winter night simply by piling on the blankets.

If you lived in the Arctic Circle as so many people do now, would you be condemned to Hell and receive the Mark of the Beast because you COULD NOT keep the Sabbath right no matter how hard you tried? Would God have to give you a special dispensation to break His law so you wouldn't end up with the Mark of the Beast?

On top of all this, Sabbath-keepers at the North Pole cannot keep the Sabbath according to a fixed calendar or the lunar calendar. During the Arctic winter, the moon's position remains very close to the sun after it goes down. Here is what happens according to astronomer, Laura Spitler:

While the Moon does rise during the summer at the North Pole, since the Sun is always up, you generally can't see it, so I'll focus on the movement of the Moon during the winter.

The daily movement from Earth's rotation causes the Moon to circle once around the sky. If you spent the entire day staring at it, you'd have to turn around exactly once. This movement is also the same that the Sun makes during the summer . . .

The second movement caused by the Moon's orbit around the Earth is analogous to the movement of the Sun over the course of a year only it repeats over the course of a lunar month. Near the new Moon phase, the Moon is near the Sun and therefore never rises during the winter. As the Moon approaches full, it will start to pop up above the horizon. Eventually near the full Moon phase it will be high enough in the sky to stay up all day and circle like the Sun. . . The elevation of the circle will rise as the Moon becomes completely full and then start to decrease until it begins to dip below the horizon. Eventually the Moon will stop rising at all as it gets close enough to the new phase. The cycle then repeats.

Follow this link to the above reference: <http://curious.astro.cornell.edu/question.php?number=777>

It appears that even our lunar Sabbath brethren can't keep the Sabbath "right" above the Arctic Circle. Will they go to Hell because they can't keep it right? Does God have to give them a special dispensation that would go something like, "Well, my lunar Sabbath-keepers have such a good heart and they really want to do what's right, but in this case they can't. I'm going to let them into Heaven anyway."

WHERE DO YOU DRAW THE SABBATH-KEEPING LINE?

There is no greater lunacy about the Sabbath than what happened to the Seventh-day Adventists of the South Pacific Islands of Western Samoa and Tokelau in 2011. On midnight on December 29, 2011, a world agreement moved the International Date Line from the American side to the Australian side for the purpose of benefiting tourism. These islands never experienced December 30th because an instant jump was made from December 29th to December 31st at 10:00 GMT. The seventh day of the week got turned into the day that was formerly Sunday. The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists considered the matter and decided that the Adventist churches on Samoa and Tokelau were to keep the same day they had always kept, ignoring the change of the International Date Line. As a result, Adventist Sabbath-keepers on these islands began keeping Sunday with the other Christians. These other island Christians, by keeping their new "Sunday," are expected, according to the statements of Ellen White, to receive the Mark of the Beast if they don't start worshiping on the right day. These other Christians moved their "Sunday" to the new "Sunday," which was the former 7th day "Sabbath," but because they are still thinking of it as "Sunday," they are probably doomed, according to the typical viewpoint espoused by Adventism, to end up in Hell. Now, they are worshiping on what used to be the 7th day Sabbath, which would have rescued them from Hell. But, alas, the INTENT of these other Island Christians is observe the first day of the week. Their motives are, therefore, wrong, but the motives of the Adventists are pure because they are trying to keep the actual 7th day of the week. It seems that by special dispensation of the General Conference, the Adventists, who now are keeping Sunday will be protected against receiving the dreaded Mark of the Beast. Now, if the non-Adventist Christians on these islands would become Seventh-day Adventists, they could get a special dispensation from the General Conference president to keep the "wrong" day, and both Adventists and non-Adventist Christians could be saved.

The ability of the General Conference to change Sunday into Saturday by dispensation appears to give it powers that rival the ecclesiastical authority falsely credited to the pope by the Catholic Church. For the whole story, see the article in *Adventist Today*, "Samoa, the International Dateline Shift, and the Seventh-day Sabbath," which appeared in the publication in 2013 at the following link. **Note that the author of the *Adventist Today* article does not discuss the Mark of the Beast problem. The authors of *VERDICT* are solely responsible for taking the Mark of the Beast logic to its furthest logical extent:**

<http://www.atoday.org/article/1937/opinion/hanson-andy/2013/samoa-the-international-dateline-shift-and-theseventh-day-sabbath>

Hanson summarizes a variety of opinions submitted by various Sabbath-keeping theologians, but the one that fixes the problem the best is the lunar Sabbath approach. As we will explain shortly, the lunar calendar was by Israel in favor of a fixed calendar at some time after the building of the second temple but before the birth of Christ. Therefore, the Jews had been keeping the 7th day of an arbitrary fixed week even before the time of Jesus. However, if the following author is correct, it is possible that the arbitrarily chosen day that the Jews were keeping at the time of Christ may have been changed a second time by Constantine. Some authorities find that some Jewish sects were keeping the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar during the time of Christ. Please note that you are about to read a Seventh-day Adventist's point-of-view. We object to his assertion that "the Sabbath is introduced in the biblical book of Genesis." We quote him according to his written statement:

The Samoa Dateline Dilemma shows that one cannot use the International Date Line in determining the Sabbath. In fact, the Old Testament Sabbath does not use the modern Gregorian Calendar: The calendar used by Moses was based upon the phases of the Moon, not a continuous weekly cycle.

The Old Testament calendar starts every month on New Moon Day, and the Sabbaths are always in the same place: The 8th, 15th, 22nd, and 29th of the month. This is why the feast days in Leviticus 23 have a Sabbath on the 15th of the month, and why the words "New Moon" and "Sabbath" often occur together in Scripture.

The Moon is the clock which orbits the round Earth and provides the reference for Biblical time. If this reference is ignored, then an arbitrary man-made marker (such as the International Date Line) has to be substituted.

The Sabbath is introduced in the Biblical book of Genesis. Note that does not say "count every seven days", but rather [Genesis 1.14](#): And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for SEASONS, and for days, and years.

“The word for SEASONS is Strong’s #4150, ‘religious festivals’. Notice that [Genesis 1:14](#) says that the "religious festivals" are designated by the "lights in...heaven". [Psalm 104:19](#) identifies the light as the Moon.

The Sabbaths and Feast Days are linked by the Fourth Commandment as recorded in two different Bible books: The Fourth Commandment in Exodus 20 clearly references the seventh day Sabbath based on Creation; The Fourth Commandment in Deuteronomy 5 clearly references the seventh day Sabbath based on the deliverance from Egypt, which occurred on the evening of the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread.

Note that the Sabbath commandment in [Deuteronomy 5:12-15](#) does not mention Creation, but rather the Exodus from Egypt, which happened on the 15th, at night. To repeat, the seventh-day Sabbaths are always in the same place: The 8th, 15th, 22nd, and 29th of the month, and they use the same calendar as the Feast Days—the Lunar Calendar. The format of the Biblical Month:

Note: Moon phases are approximate, and are shown for the Northern Hemisphere; If you're south of the Equator, they are reversed.

The reason most Jews today keep Saturday is the same exact reason that most Christians keep Sunday—because of Constantine's calendar change, and the persecutions by which he enforced these changes. Prior to this, in 46-45 BC, Julius Caesar (the Julian Calendar) had separated the months and weeks from the Moon and made a continuous eight day cycle, but he did not enforce it on other nations living within the Empire.

In AD 321, Constantine created a compromise calendar. He blended the Hebrew idea of a seven day week with the Julian concept of a continuous weekly cycle, and added the veneration of the "sun god" from Mithraism to create the Roman calendar used today. He enforced his calendar upon the entire Roman Empire with military power.

Because of these changes which were being enforced by persecutions across the Roman Empire, the Jewish Sanhedrin met for the last time around AD 350, and modified their calendar to the form used by most Jews today, in which the Sabbath is on Saturday. Other Feast Days are determined using a form of the Lunar calendar.

Constantine's calendar was modified slightly by Pope Gregory into the calendar used today. However, the true Calendar ordained at Creation, according to [Genesis 1:14](#) and [Psalms 81:3](#), is based on the phases of the Moon. Therefore, neither Saturday nor Sunday is the Old Testament Sabbath, and the International Date Line is not involved at all.

This situation in Samoa is a tiny foreshadowing of what is coming. If the proposed New World Calendar is adopted, and the 364-day perpetual year is implemented, then the extra "blank" day (called "World Day Holiday") will disrupt any continuous seven-day cycle. At that point, the whole world will face a situation where the day that "should have been" Saturday or Sunday will fall on a different day.

<http://sda-samoa-dateline-sabbath.info/>

NOTE: According to Hanson, this on-line source for this information no longer exists.

Adventism And The Lunar Sabbath Issue

We do not take a position for or against the lunar Sabbath theory, but since the idea is creating so much controversy within Adventism at this very moment, we would be irresponsible not cover this topic for our readers. We will try to show you the arguments pro and con. Our task is made difficult because of the obvious biases of those who write in favor or against the concept. It is our intention as researchers to find truth and to follow it at all costs. The cost to us seems to be that the idea of a lunar Sabbath appears to be so far-fetched that it is almost too much for even our anti-Sabbatarian supports to swallow. At its very best we can only make educated guesses about what happened in ancient times. However, some theories are more respectable than others. Most readers do not know some important things about the Seventh-day Adventist Church and the lunar calendar Sabbath controversy:

1. William Miller learned about the lunar calendar from the Karaite Jews who were teaching him Hebrew. He applied the lunar calendar to help him solve some biblical time problems. It worked, and he was able to resolve those problems and arrive at the "correct" date Christ would return.
2. The Advent Movement adopted his prophetic charts, which were based on the lunar calendar, but in doing so they accepted an AD 31 date for the crucifixion—a date which differs from the AD 33 date accepted by most Christian scholars and which is supported better by historical and astronomical data. See Appendix IX for an analysis of the Adventist Sabbath "Paradox."
3. The lunar Sabbath issue has been looked at three times by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Each time the committees were disbanded and the records of the committee proceedings destroyed. The most significant lunar Sabbath research paper, submitted to the General Conference back in the 1930's, has disappeared without a trace. The committee established in 1995 to study the question of the lunar Sabbath was scuttled when, so we are told, three of the delegates, theologians from the Church's seminary at Andrews University, became convinced that the lunar Sabbath was correct and that the Church should adopt the practice.
4. Seventh-day Adventists would naturally have a bias against the lunar Sabbath for at least two reasons:

- A. The concept that one day of the week is intrinsically holy is dependent on the idea that such a day represent an exact seven-day multiple of the seventh-day of Creation. If the Jews kept the Sabbath according to a lunar calendar, the Sabbath day would have wandered, rather than having been fixed, making it next to impossible, if not impossible, to keep track of that exact seven-day multiple.
 - B. It makes the question of who changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday irrelevant. You can't "change" a moving target. The lunar Sabbath concept would make it impossible that the papacy could or anyone else could have "changed" it.
5. William Miller probably new that the position of the Karaite Jews was that a number of factors, including calendar issues, make it impossible to know which day of the current "fixed" week was really the 7th day and that Jews have known for a very long time that they were keeping an arbitrarily chosen 7th day as their Sabbath. The earliest leaders of Adventism might have known that the current 7th day has only one chance in seven of being an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation.

SCHOLARLY OBJECTIONS TO THE LUNAR SABBATH THEORY

Nehemia Gordon, a prominent advocate for Karaite Judaism and the webmaster for the Karaite Corner, listed the following objections to the lunar Sabbath theory in a recent podcast. His position is that the Jews never observed the lunar Sabbath. (Later we quote from an entry on the Karaite Corner's website the current position of Karaite Judaism that Jews have known for a very long time that the day they accept as their 7th day was arbitrarily chosen and may or may not be an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation.) Gordon is a former president of a Jewish university, and his opinion is worthy of respect because of his presumed knowledge of the Hebrew language and the history of Judaism:

- 1. People who espouse this concept tend to have gotten their idea from skeptical scholars from the past who believe that the Hebrews borrowed the Sabbath idea from the pagan nations around them. The pagan "sabbath" was lunar-based. Currently (2014), even most skeptical scholars have abandoned this theory of the origin of the Sabbath concept.
- 2. You can go anywhere in the world and find that the Jews in every country where they are found worship on the same seventh day. Furthermore, this has been true for over 2,000 years. None of these Jews seem to know anything about a wandering Sabbath that is based on the lunar month.
- 3. The only scriptural evidence of something Sabbath-related that "moved" was the Sabbatical Year, which had to be adjusted frequently to adjust their year to correlate properly with the seasons.
- 4. Although the Jews eventually adopted pagan names for the days of the seven-day week, this fact did not mean that the Jews abandoned a supposed lunar week with Hebrew names for a fixed week with those pagan names. Furthermore, the theory that the wandering Sabbath had to be moved to "fixed" Saturday because the pagan name for the fixed 7th day, Saturday, was related to the word from any language for "sabbath." Rather, Saturday was named in honor of the pagan god, Saturn.

In addition to these objections of Nehemia Gordon, other biblical scholars report that they have studied the Scriptures and have not found any evidence that God instructed Israel to observe the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar. Researchers report that they find exceptions to the rules of the so-called lunar Sabbath principles that disprove the entire theory. The work of scholars who oppose the lunar Sabbath are widely available on the Internet and appear to us to have some validity.

SUPPORT FOR THE LUNAR SABBATH THEORY

The best way to see the very best that the lunar Sabbath community has to offer is to study Appendix XI, excerpts from John D. Keyser's paper entitled, "From Sabbath to Saturday." Whether his research proves that the lunar Sabbath concept is true or not, he appears to make a respectable case for it. He utilizes resources we have not seen elsewhere. Together with a study of Appendixes IX, X, and XI, our readers should walk away with less reluctance than ever to reject the idea categorically.

Let us evaluate the objections of Nehemia Gordon. First, the issue of whether the Hebrews borrowed the Sabbath concept from the pagans or it came from direct, divine revelation is a serious issue, but it tells us nothing about how the Jews practiced that belief, wherever that belief might have come from. (Hopefully all of us believe the Sabbath concept came directly from God on Mt. Sinai during the Exodus.)

Second, the fact that Jews everywhere have kept the same fixed 7th day for a very long time—perhaps for a couple thousand years—tells us nothing about whether the ancient Hebrews observed the lunar Sabbath prior to the building of the second temple hundreds of years before the birth of Christ. The primary claim of lunar Sabbatharians is that the Jews kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar prior to the building of the second temple, although they cite evidence that some of the Jewish sects were observing the lunar Sabbath at the time of Christ and that some Christians and some Jews kept the lunar Sabbath for a few hundred years after the death of Christ. (We will look at the evidence for these additional claims later.)

Third, there is some evidence that Israel kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar, and some very tenacious lunar Sabbath researchers have uncovered it. As you will learn later, world civilizations did not have any notion of a fixed calendar until around the time of the building of the second temple. Just as the idea of a lunar calendar with extra days at the end of the month is incomprehensible to us today, so the idea of a fixed calendar would have been unfathomable to the civilizations of the world back then. **It appears that in these ancient times the concept of a week existed, but not that of a fixed week.** The week was based on the four phases of the moon, which were approximately seven days in length. It would be unreasonable to expect God or any Old Testament writer to specify that the Sabbath had to be kept according to a lunar calendar because there was no other way in existence to keep track of time.

While we will give you more documentation in regard to the extra days of the lunar months later, the only reasonable explanation for the biblical account of the **Battle of Jericho** involves the use of the lunar calendar. Recall that the Israelites were instructed to march around the city for seven days in a row. It is unlikely that God would have instructed the Hebrews to break the Sabbath, and one of those seven days would have to have been a Sabbath day if Israel had been using a fixed week at that time to determine their Sabbaths. See Appendix X for a full explanation. Please do not skip reading this appendix.

The ancient civilizations contemporary to the time of the Israel's Exodus from Egypt marked time by lunar months. We also know that their smallest "absolute" unit of time for periods of time less than a solar year was the lunar month. They had no concern for numbers of days within a lunar month. Universal to virtually all ancient societies contemporary with Exodus Era Israel was that the number of days between the lunar months were of no consequence or concern. These civilizations were focused on the absolute reference point represented by the appearance of the new moon. (The reference point was always an absolute, fixed event, but this is not at all the same thing as saying that the time between the reference points were absolutely the same length.)

Furthermore, we know that in between the new moons they kept track of time by seven-day weeks that were correlated to the four phases of the moon. Finally, we know that their focus on the new moon as the absolute reference of time-keeping resulted in a total lack of concern for the number of days between those absolute reference points. This is one more prime example of the danger of studying the Bible without an understanding of the culture and the language which produced the biblical record. It is a very naive biblical scholar who would demand that Moses explain that his time references were lunar at a time when the entire world had no concept of fixed calendars.

Many of the cuneiform writings discuss a day of cessation from work at the end of each phase and suggest that the extra days between the last new moon and the first new moon were spent resting, rather than working. This information, which has been widely available for a very long time to scholars, raises serious questions about the usual Sabbatarian explanation for the

existence of the pervasive heathen concept of a seven-day week and a day of rest at the week's end. Sabbatarians claim that this heathen familiarity with a kind of sabbath principle is due to the retention (with corruption) of the memory of a seven-day fixed week and a Sabbath ordinance that all people were supposed to keep since Creation. Unfortunately there are better explanations for this phenomenon—the universal association between seven-day periods of time and the four phases of the moon. Since there was no Sabbath ordinance in Genesis, other explanations demand to be found.

The Hebrew word for Sabbath is closely related and derived from a word that means “propitiation.” When God ceased His creative work on the 7th day of Creation, He did not ask to be propitiated, and there is nothing in the story of Adam and Eve to suggest that any such propitiation if for no other reason than sin had not entered the world yet. The fact that in these ancient languages the sabbath concept was equated with the need to appease the gods is a major linguistic barrier to the idea the Sabbath originated at Creation.

The work of D. A. Carson and his team of distinguished biblical scholars published *From Sabbath to Lord's Day* in 1982. This landmark study of the Sabbath-Sunday Question provided the world with a break-through understanding of the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 that definitively proved that Moses worded his language carefully to make it impossible for his Hebrew readers to see a Sabbath commandment in Genesis 2. Their studies also proved to the point of over-kill that Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping for biblical reasons and that all the known conspiracy-apostasy theories to explain this abandonment are contrary to facts of history that have been known for nearly 2,000 years.

The lunar connection explains the development of the Heathen concept of a seven day week and a day of rest at the end of the week better than any other theories, since we now know for certain that there was no Sabbath in Genesis.

The *Encyclopedia Biblica* (The MacMillan Company, 1899, p. 4180) says that the Hebrew word for Sabbath, or *sabbathon*, conveys the propitiation or appeasement of divine anger:

It is the opinion of [Professor Jastrow] that the idea of propitiation or appeasement of divine anger, and it is . . . the opinion of [Professor Jastrow] that the Hebrew Sabbath (i.e. Creation Sabbath) was originally a *Sabbathon* – i.e. a day of propitiation and appeasement; marked by atoning rites . . . it was celebrated at intervals of seven days, CORRESPONDING WITH CHANGES IN THE MOON'S PHASES, and was identical in character with the four days in each month, i.e. 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th! (page 4,180). Cited in *From Sabbath to Saturday* by John D. Keyser.)

The *Encyclopedia Biblica* also notes that the word translated “rest” in Genesis 2:1-2, indicates that the 7th day of Creation was a day that divided something and has nothing to do with resting. **For our immediate purposes, note that the word indicates a division of the month—not days.** (We hasten to point out, as discussed elsewhere, that to us it seems to divide the seven days of Creation into two categories —the days that God created and the day that he did not create.) However, since Jastrow is an expert in Ancient Hebrew linguistics, we may find ourselves having to defer to his interpretation-- one that represents still another serious argument against a Creation Sabbath from Hebrew linguistics. On page 4,173 we read:

The word, “Sabbath” is a feminine form/word. The ROOT (of Sabbath) has NOTHING to do with resting in the sense of enjoying repose; in transitive forms and applications, it means: “to sever,” “to put an end to” — “to come to an end.” In a transitive sense – “the divider” – indicates the Sabbath as dividing the month. It certainly cannot be translated “The Day of Rest.”

Lunar Sabbath Researcher, John D. Keyser, has studied the “heathen” Sabbath in depth, and he presents numerous examples of it in his remarkable book, *From Sabbath to Saturday*. These are some examples he discovered:

Assyria

Discovered by Assyriologist, George Smith in 1869 among the cuneiform tablets in the British Museum and summarized here by Hutton Webster:

. . . a curious religious calendar of the Assyrians, in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days or “Sabbaths,” are marked out as days on which no work should be undertaken.”

It appears to be a transcript of a much more ancient Babylonia original, possibly belonging to the age of Hammurabi, which has been made by order of Ashurbanipal and placed in his royal library at Nineveh. The calendar, which is complete for the thirteenth or intercalary month, called Elul II, and for Markheshwan, the eighth month of the Babylonia year, takes up thirty days in succession and indicates the deity to which each day is sacred and what sacrifices or precautionary measures are necessary for each day.

All the days are styled “favourable,” an expression which must indicate a pious hope not a fact, since the words *ud-khul-gal* or *umu limnu* (“the devil day”) are particularly applied to the seventh, fourteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days . . . With regard to the reasons which dictate the choice of the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days, two views have been entertained. It has been held, in the first place, that the “evil days” were selected as CORRESPONDING TO THE MOON’S SUCCESSIVE CHANGES; hence the seventh day marks the close of the earliest form of the seven-day week, A WEEK BOUND UP WITH THE LUNAR PHASES.

(Hutton Webster, *Rest Days: a Study in Early Law and Morality*, New York: The MacMillan Company. 1916, p. 223-224.)

It seems like the utilization of the lunar calendar appears to have produced some extra rest days between the months:

Assurbanipal in the seventh century promulgated a calendar with a definite scheme of a seven-day week, a regulation of the month by which all men were to rest on days 7, 14, 19, 21, 28. The old menology of Nisan made the TWO DAYS OF THE DARK OF THE MOON, 29, 30, rest days, so that each lunar month had 9 rest days, on which neither the sick could be cured nor a man in difficulty consult a prophet, none might travel, and fasting was enforced.

Babylon

Keyser cites Hutton Webster, a contributor to *Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality*, pp. 228-229, regarding the fact that the Babylonian “Epic of Creation,” includes a discussion of lunar weeks that end in a Sabbath rest day. Keyser says:

“Finally,” writes Webster, “in the fifth tablet of the Babylonian ‘Epic of Creation,’ a work which in its original form is traced to the close of the third millennium B.C., it is told how the god Marduk, having created and set in order the heavenly bodies, then placed the moon in the sky to make known the days and DIVIDE THE MONTH WITH HER PHASES.” “Although this interesting production, in its present mutilated state,” elicits Webster, “mentions only the seventh and fourteenth days, we are entitled to believe that the original text also referred to the twenty-first and twenty-eighth days of the month.”

Keyser’s research suggests that the seven-day week synchronized to the four phases of the moon was virtually universal in the ancient world that surrounded Israel. He cites the work of *Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible* (Charles Scribner Sons, New York, 1892-1902), the article, “On Sabbath: Babylonian,” it appears that the document referenced by Hastings is the same one referenced by Webster above:

Almost all scholars today agree that the primal seven-day calendar, as used among the very ancient Semites (including the Babylonians and Hebrews), was based upon the moon. Furthermore, this unique weekly cycle was observed in tandem with the lunar phases. An example of the early week, based upon the phases of the moon, is described in the *Fifth Tablet of the Semitic Story of Creation*. Note that the moon is said to “make known the days” and its horns “the seasons,” creating the Sabbath on the 7th and 14th days of the month. Quoting the tablet’s translation, he finds:

[The moon] He caused to shine, ruling the night: He set him then as a creature of the Night, **to make known the days.**

Monthly unfailing, He provided him with a tiara.

At the beginning of the month then,

Appearing in the land,

The horns shine forth to make known the seasons.

MORE ABOUT THOSE EXTRA DAYS!

With the ancient lunar-solar calendar, the first sighting of the new moon started the first day of the first week of the new month. The ancients viewed the monthly cycle of the moon as the absolute marker for any period of time less than one solar year, and they cared nothing about the number of days in between the markers represented by the appearance of each new moon. But what about the extra days between the new moon months? They never seem to add up to seven.

If you look back at our example of a lunar month and analyze it, you can't help being puzzled by the fact that the new moon seems both to end the month and to begin it. The orbit of the moon around the Earth varies by up to several days. Therefore, there are almost always (it seems) these extra days left over at the end of each lunar month. As "moderns" accustomed to a fixed calendar and having never known anything else, our first reaction to the lunar concept of marking time is that these extra days "mess up" the weekly cycle. This perception is the result of normal cultural bias, but one that is dangerous when it comes to translating one language into another. We will explain momentarily that the Hebrews simply discarded these days and either rested or worked on them. Their absolute standard was the appearance of each new moon. The records left by these societies strongly suggest that they simply rested on these extra days. Recall from the previous section that Assurbanipal's calendar of the 7th century BCE had a total of nine rest days, a few of them represented by the extra days in between the months.

Elsewhere in *VERDICT*, we cite the work of Benner, a noted Hebrew language scholar. Benner says that the Hebrew language is impossible to translate accurately without an advanced understanding of the culture that produced it. The culture in which the early Israelites and their ancestors found themselves was overwhelmingly enmeshed in the concept of the lunar calendar and the lunar week. The trouble we have comprehending the variable day lunar month is the result of our Western idea, forged into our minds by our fixed calendar cultural experience. Since a fixed calendar has been used by civilizations roughly since the time of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires, the weeks "butt up" against each other consecutively. However, by either method of reckoning time, a week is always seven days.

The fact that the ancients likely rested on these extra days is supported by the obsession they appear to have had on fertility subjects and celebrated with fertility rites. They did not fail to notice that the number of days it takes the moon to go around the Earth is roughly equal to the number of days in a woman's reproductive cycle. Notice the research of Janet and Stewart Farrar in their book, *The Witches' Goddess* (Phoenix Publishing, pp. 24-25, & p. 106):

The modern use of seven day weeks also stems from the ancient lunar calendar. The first of every lunar month was marked as the first day of a new week and a Sabbath was celebrated every seventh day to mark the 4 quarters of the moon. The last week was followed by the days of the dark moon when the goddess was held to be menstruating and so an extended Sabbath was observed until the waxing crescent moon reappeared and the new month began.

The Jewish Encyclopedia addresses the problem of the extra days between the lunar months with this explanation in Volume 10, p. 482, the article, "Week:"

The idea of the week, as a subdivision of the month [was found] . . . in Babylonia, where each lunar month was divided into four parts, CORRESPONDING TO THE FOUR PHASES OF THE MOON. The first week of each month began with the new moon, so that, as the lunar month was one or two days more than four periods of seven days, these additional days were not reckoned at all. Every seventh day (*sabbatum*)

was regarded as an unlucky day. This method of reckoning time spread westward through Syria and Palestine, and WAS ADOPTED BY THE ISRAELITES, probably after they settled in Palestine.

Another well-respected encyclopedia supports this view as well. *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia* was an English translation of a German encyclopedia that had been published first in 1805, and the American version was released between 1908 and 1914, according to its *Wikipedia* entry:

“The Israelites . . . made the Sabbath the feasts of a living and holy God. The work of man became symbolic of the work of God, and human rest of divine rest, so that the Sabbaths became preeminently days of rest. Since, moreover, the LUNAR MONTH had 29 or 30 days, the normal lapse of time between Sabbaths was six days, although sometimes seven or eight; and six working days were accordingly assigned to the creation, which was to furnish a prototype for human life. The connection of the Sabbath with lunar phases, however, was [later] discarded by the Israelites”
(*The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, pages 135-136.)

TOWARDS A NEW THEORY OF SABBATH ORIGINS

Thanks to advanced studies in Hebrew linguistics we now know that there is no possibility that the Sabbath ordinance was imposed on God’s people until the time of the Exodus. We also know that Heathen societies that predated Exodus Era Israel had a “sabbath” concept based on the four phases of the moon and fertility themes. The next logical step requires the obvious conclusion, and that is that the sabbath of propitiation and fertility associations that was so prevalent in the societies that predated ancient Israel could not have developed as the result of some kind of “dim memory” of the “original Sabbath” in the Garden of Eden. No such thing ever existed! Additionally, some historians see evidence that this lunar-fertility sabbath was part of the Egyptian culture when the Hebrews were their captives.

The next logical step is to conclude that the evidence available to us suggests that when God gave Israel its sabbath system, His thinking was that He would take a useful but purely heathen concept, redeem it, wash it clean of its fertility and superstitious connotations, and present it to Israel in the glorious and holy form in which came down to them from Mt. Sinai-- The Mountain of the Moon. It would appear that while it was washed of its Heathen connotations, its association with the four phases of the Moon was retained. After all, in Genesis, Chapter One, God stated that the sun and moon were given to the human race to determine “sacred times.” The lunar connection with the Sabbath, then, did not need to be cleansed as it reflected His provision for time-keeping for all peoples for all time from the beginning of time. The earliest societies on Earth had retained the memory of the lunar method of time reckoning that God had given to the world in the very beginning. And this memory was not a “dim” one either. With each appearance of the Moon, all the people on the Earth recognized the existence of God’s long-lasting timepiece.

This theory of how the Jewish Sabbath came into existence is so much in keeping with God’s history of communicating spiritual truths to Israel through cultural concepts with which they were already familiar. For example, God modeled the Ten Commandments after the formula for the treaties that Israel’s neighbors made with one another. It was the custom of the time to draft these agreements so that a list of required actions by the people of a conquered nation had a ceremonial requirement placed right in the middle. The ceremony that the people were required to enact at regular intervals was designed to help the conquered people to remember the one who had the power to require them fulfill their obligations, as well as to remember his actual requirements. Consider the fact that Jehovah did not choose to ban slavery for Israel. The practice of slavery was universal at the time. The way the Heathen practiced it created extreme human suffering. God’s regulations for slavery within Israel was just, humane, and designed to give the worker-slave hope were for the future at the end of his seven-year indenture. Similarly, He chose to control—not to erase—certain inequalities between the role of men and women in society. The Law of Moses provided, for example, that women could own property, and they enjoyed many protections and privileges while the women of Israel’s neighbors were frequently treated as having less value than livestock. Jehovah seems to have chosen to work within the culture of the day whether in regard to the Sabbath, slavery, or women’s rights. Even female slaves had a

status of honor and protection unheard of in the Heathen world. In the New Testament, Jesus redeemed the concept of baptism-- always a symbol of spiritual renewal-- from heathen cultic sources.

It is impossible to divorce the Sabbath from its lunar foundations. Recall once more that Jehovah gave these treaty-like Ten Commandments from the top of the Mountain of the Moon (Sin = Semitic for Moon) which sat on the edge of the Wilderness of the Moon. Furthermore, He thundered these requirements to the Hebrews on the same day as the pagan High Sabbath of the lunar month. The Sabbaths before and after the giving of the 10 Commandments from Mt. Sinai correlated with the designated sabbaths of the lunar month.

Was it just a coincidence that God chose the High Sabbath of the pagan lunar month to present the terms of His treaty with the ceremonial Sabbath requirement placed in the middle with His Hebrew people? It would seem that if we were to humbly attempt to think about the way God would view this question, we would reason that if He were concerned about the linkage between the Holy Sabbath of the Hebrews and the pagan Sabbaths of their neighbors, He would have avoided giving the terms of His treaty with Israel on that day. Because ALL the countries around Israel kept time by the phases of the moon, all sabbaths, whether sacred or pagan, would have been observed on exactly the same day in that part of the world.

The lunar month and the lunar-based seven-day week was simply the way things worked at that time in the history of the world. Back then the concept of a fixed calendar would likely have been as incomprehensible to them as their lunar calendar is to us. To demand that Moses record the fact that Israel was using a lunar calendar at the time of the Exodus is as unreasonable as demanding that Robert Hemingway explain that in the age he wrote in, there were things called cars that drove on things called roads. He would simply put a car in his story if it was a necessary part of his story-telling, and his readers would already know what a car was.

DID JESUS KEEP THE “RIGHT” DAY?

The Karaite Jews concede that the current seventh day is arbitrarily assigned, yet they accept it for their day of worship. Even during the time of Jesus there were serious controversies over the Jewish Calendar. New content from the *Dead Sea Scrolls* verifies the existence of these controversies.

Evidence we will present later indicates that most civilizations were forced to adopt some kind of a fixed calendar scheme around the time the Jews were in Assyrian and Babylonian captivity. It is difficult to imagine that there would not have been calendar trouble in Israel in the time period between the Babylonian Captivity and the birth of Christ. The Karaite Jews still oppose Rabbinical (Mainstream) Judaism both over calendar issues and the fact that mainstream Judaism accepts the traditions of the Talmud and Mishnah as authoritative for formulating their religious beliefs. Historians debate whether the predecessors of the Karaites go back to the end of the Second Temple period (70 CE), or whether Karaism represents a novel emergence of similar views. Karaites have always maintained that, while there are some similarities to the Sadducees, there are also differences, and that the ancestors of the Karaites were another group called Benei Şedeq during the Second Temple period. (*Wikipedia* article, “Karaite Judaism.”)

Jesus did not keep the “right” day if the right day is defined as being an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation Week. There is not one text in the Torah or the Old Testament that teaches that the Sabbath must be kept as an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation. The only requirement of the Law of Moses is that the people must work for six days and rest on the 7th. The Sabbath concept was modeled after the seven days of Creation, but no absolute reference point for determining the first day of the six days of work is provided. The fact that Jesus gave His tacit approval to an **arbitrarily chosen 7th day** poses serious problems for any Sabbath-keeping Christian sect that teaches that there is a specific 24-hour period of time within each week that is intrinsically holy. There is some evidence that some of the sects of Judaism were keeping the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar during the time of Christ, including the Nazarenes. Jesus may have been a Nazarene. While it may very well be that Jesus kept a fixed Sabbath, we cannot be entire certain that this is the case. Please review Appendix XI, for additional information regarding this evidence. Our readers should not skip reading this appendix because the evidence is interesting to say the least.

Jesus didn't say anything about the lunar Sabbath, nor did He reveal which day that was an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation Week. The fact that Jesus did neither of these things underscores the fact that no day of the week possesses intrinsic sacredness. It also suggests that He knew the Sabbath would cease to be relevant to His followers after His death on the cross. If there was a problem, it wasn't worth fixing.

THEORY: WHY ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS ABANDONED THE LUNAR CALENDAR

King Hezekiah And The Sundial

Why did world civilizations abandon their lunar calendars for fixed calendars? The solar year does not exactly total up to any exact number of days. The story you are about to hear is as strange as anything you have ever heard, but the historical and astronomical evidence for its truth is as remarkable as the story is bizarre.

As the contributor cited by *Adventist Today's* Hanson explained, Genesis 1:14-16 spells out the concept that God gave the sun and moon to be the markers of time for the human race. God specifically mentioned that these markers were designed for keeping track of sacred days. This concept is especially clear in the New International Version. We will start where the contributor quoted by Hanson left off:

Genesis 1:14-16 (NIV) - ¹⁴ And God said, "Let there be lights in the vault of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark sacred times, and days and years, ¹⁵ and let them be lights in the vault of the sky to give light on the earth." And it was so. ¹⁶ God made two great lights—the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars.

It was a disruption of world lunar calendars by a series of catastrophic events that took place somewhat before the building of the second temple in 586 BC (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Temple) that made the use of the lunar calendar impractical for world civilizations, including Israel. The disruption of these world lunar calendars, as mentioned elsewhere, strongly correlated through a study of the calendar, historical, and astronomical records of the major world civilizations of the age. Furthermore, there is a remarkable correlation between the records of these disruptive world events with the biblical record of the turning back of the sundial by 10 degrees as a sign requested by King Hezekiah. This event is recorded in both Isaiah 38:8 and II Kings 20. Historian, Edwin Thiele, places the reign of King Hezekiah between 715 and 786 BCE. See:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hezekiah>

Also, in Joshua 10 we have the story of how God prevented the sun from going down until a battle was won. Both events took place after the lunar-based Sabbath was given to Israel from high atop the Mountain of the Moon—Mt. Sinai. Ancient civilizations used the lunar calendar until the disruptive events that seem to have taken place between 600 and 800 BCE.

As we review Velikovsky's research, you will recognize that these dates lend credibility to his theory that it was a major astronomical event that altered the length of the lunar month. Prior to these strange events, the lunar calendars of world civilizations had 12 months of 30 days each which added up to a solar year that was about 360 days. After the miracle of the sun dial retreating 10 degrees, the solar year mysteriously grew from about 360 days to about 365.25 days, and world civilizations were forced to add extra days to their lunar calendars to get them to sync with the expanded length of the solar year. These disruptive events recorded in the histories of ancient civilizations included crazy weather patterns, earthquakes, and other catastrophes. This is true of the calendars and histories of the Mayans in South America, the Chinese, and the civilizations of the Middle East. It is no stretch of the imagination to see the reality of the biblical teaching that the Earth is "growing old like a garment." Today scientists believe they have proof that the magnetic field of the Earth has reversed polarity several times in the past, and some scientists, including Albert Einstein, have believed that a major disruptive event caused the continents of the world to drift many thousands of miles within the space of less than one or two days. To dismiss Velikovsky's

astronomical explanation as the explanation for the world abandonment of the lunar calendar tends to diminish the reality of two biblical miracles. The miracles of a lengthened day and the sun dial going backwards ten degrees would have to have natural consequences. For more information on Einstein and the Polar Shift Hypothesis, follow this link:

See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pole_shift_hypothesis

It is critically important to understand the reality of this part of ancient calendar and astronomical history. Therefore, we quote at length from a position paper posted by the Sabbath-keeping Bethel Church of God of Eugene, Oregon:

<http://www.bethelcog.org/church/church-of-god-articles/can-we-rely-on-the-hebrew-calender>

With respect to the calendar, the book of Genesis implies a 360-day year at the time of the Flood (*Dictionary of the Bible*, by James Hastings, s.v. "Time"). Comparing Genesis 7:11, 24 with Genesis 8:4 we see months of thirty days—a five-month period with 150 days. Checking Deuteronomy 34:8 with Numbers 20:29 we see a thirty-day month during the time of Moses—at about 1500 BC. According to Immanuel **Velikovsky** in his work, *Worlds in Collision*, we find the following information: The old Babylonian year consisted of 360 days—twelve months of thirty days each. Scholars knew this even before the cuneiform script was understood. The Assyrian year contained 360 days; a decade was made up of 3,600 days. Assyrian documents reveal a thirty-day month from new moon to new moon. Anciently, the Persian year also had 360 days of twelve months containing thirty days each. The Egyptian year was 360 days in length. Later, it was changed to 365 days. The *Book of Sothis* states the added five days were introduced at a later time. The Eber Papyrus lists a year of twelve months with thirty days each. During the Eighteenth Dynasty the new moon festival was observed at periods of thirty days. After the fall of the Middle Kingdom, the Hyksos introduced a solar year of 360 days according to a gloss on a manuscript of Timaeus. The Mayan year originally consisted of 360 days, but five days were later added, as well as another day every fourth year. In South America, in ancient times, the year consisted of 360 days with twelve months. The same was true in China—360 days with twelve months. When five days were added to the Chinese year they included another one-quarter day. Plutarch wrote that when Rome was first founded during the time of Romulus, the Roman year was 360 days. Various Latin authors record the month as being thirty days in length. What this means is that there is ample historical evidence to demonstrate that before the introduction of a 365¼ day year the length of the year was 360 days. The ancient texts of India during the Veda period state the year was 360 days in comments found throughout the Brahmanas. Nowhere is intercalation mentioned. Nor is an extra five or six days associated with a solar year. The Hindu year was made up of twelve months of thirty days each. With their astronomical skills it is astonishing why the Brahmans failed to realize that 360 days was 5¼ days short. All the historical computations found in Hindu history used a 360-day year with months of thirty days each. What is quite apparent is that throughout the world we find a calendar of 360 days that was later changed at about the seventh century BC when five days were added to the year (Velikovsky, 124, 331-341). Did God change the seasons as Daniel stated? (Dan. 2:21).

About the seventh or eighth centuries BC five additional days were added to the length of the year. From about this time the Hindu year, for example, was lengthened to 365¼ days even though the original length of the year was still used. From the fifteenth century down to the eighth century BC, the length of the year was consistently the same due to the orbit of the Earth and revolutions of the moon. It was the same thirty-day month, and the length of the year itself did not vary more than a few hours. What happened to change this? Some sort of catastrophe occurred that altered both the orbit and axis of the Earth and moon as well as the length of the year. Repeated disturbances changed the orbit of the Earth from 360 days to 365 and ¼ days in length and the length of the month from thirty days to 29½ days (Velikovsky, 338, 332, 342).

What is required to bring about the kind of changes that took place in the eighth century BC? For one thing the axis of the Earth must be altered from the perpendicular into a tilt. This would affect the seasons. The 23½ degree tilt of the axis is now responsible for the seasons—spring following winter and fall following summer because the axis is tilted either toward or away from the sun. A perpendicular axis prevents seasonal changes, which appears to be the case from the opening chapters of Genesis. Fossil remains prove that at one time the climate was the same worldwide. Should there be another change in the axis the seasons would be more intense and their order would be altered. The orbits of both the Earth and moon must be modified in order to change the times. According to Velikovsky, there is a vast amount of information available from peoples all over the globe to demonstrate what took place in the eighth century BC. During a century of disturbances, which involved two catastrophes, the moon receded into an orbit of 29¼ days as an average and has remained so ever since. Also, the Earth orbit was changed so that 5¼ days were added. Written traditions by many of the ancient peoples recount the disorder of the seasons and connect it directly with the motion of the planets (Velikovsky, 345, 120-121).

What took place in the middle of the eighth century BC, is that the calendar previously accurate became unusable. Lunar and solar movements changed repeatedly from 747 to 687 BC, and calendar adjustments had to be made, Velikovsky tells us. Adjustments were soon outdated and had to be readjusted. Clay tables found at the royal library in Nineveh record astronomical observations made prior to the time our present system was established. One tablet places the vernal equinox as the sixth of Nisan, and another places it at the fifteenth. This difference cannot be explained by modern scholars. These Assyrian astronomers were very accurate and precise in their work and would not have erred by a period of nine days. The astronomical tablets at Nineveh reveal three systems of planets. Single planets were closely observed and tracked in three dissimilar schedules. The movements of the moon itself were found to have two different systems. The last one to be observed corresponds to our present solar order. In one of the systems observed, the solstitial and equinoctial locations on the ecliptic are found six degrees too far to the east. Tablet 272 records that the distances from one new moon to another on the Chaldean ecliptic average three degrees, fourteen minutes too great. Thus, during a lunar month the moon traveled farther in relationship to the fixed stars than the present order shows. The astronomical tables at Nineveh reveal that the world order repeatedly changed during a single century. Included in these tables is the fact that the apparent path of the sun, as it traversed the heavens, led Babylonian astronomers to differentiate three orbits for the sun (Velikovsky, 349-350).

For information on Velikovsky, follow this link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Velikovsky

There is no record that the Hebrews ever had to add extra days to their calendar before 600 to 700 BCE. In fact there is no record of any ancient contemporary civilization adding extra days to its lunar calendar before these strange astronomical events happened. The Sabbatarian writers from the Bethel Church of God also conclude from their research that there may have been some convulsive global activities during the Great Flood and/or the Exodus that may have contributed to solar system events that created minor disparities between the lunar and solar calendars even before the major disruptive events that occurred later. Here is another interesting observation the authors credit to Velikovsky:

Velikovsky is not the only one who contends that the original new year in the Bible fell on the tenth day of the seventh month, the same day as the Day of Atonement. See Leviticus 25:9. It was later transferred to the first of Tishri — the first day of the seventh month. If this is true, on the Jewish calendar as well as the Babylonian calendar, there is an equinoctial displacement of nine days. When scholars examine the Assyrian astronomical records, they regard them as enigmatic mistakes. Yet, what needs to be asked is how could these astronomers who were responsible for the earlier records be so careless as to uphold a 360-day year, an error that in only six years would lead to a whole month's divergence? Certainly these astronomers of the royal observatories would

not have announced to the king wrong dates when anyone can observe when the moon is new. Furthermore, their records on the clay tablets required mathematical calculation. What should be obvious is that during the reign of Assurbanipal, the movements of the planets, the precession of the equinoxes, and recurring return of the eclipses had been recorded and recalculated. As changes in the heavens took place, new tablets were placed in the royal archives along with the older records (Velikovsky, 350).

The Greek philosopher Thales is credited with discovering how many days were in a year. From his time (640-546 BC) the Greeks knew the year consisted of 365 days. Since he was born in the seventh century BC, is it possible he learned the new length of the year? It was about this time that the year was firmly fixed at its present length. A contemporary of Thales was Solon. He is credited with discovering that the length of the lunar month was less than thirty days. Yet, for the purpose of computation, as well as respect for the earlier length, the 360-day year was maintained for some period of time (Velikovsky, 338). If the year was 365 days then as it is now, it is odd that the discovery of the 365-day year should have occurred as late as the seventh century BC. There were many more much older kingdoms which certainly would have discovered this earlier. Why would the calculation of the length of a year, which is a reasonably simple matter to understand, be discovered by Thales, while the calculation of the eclipses, which is quite difficult to forecast, had been discovered centuries before? The same conclusion can be reached regarding Solon's discovery of the length of the lunar month because we can see that an adjustment of a new calendar system was taking place! (Velikovsky, 356-357). In Peru, the king issued orders that astronomical observations be made. The result was a calendar change in the length of the year from 360 days to 365¼. The same was true with the Toltecs. Their history records how the sages and astrologers were gathered together in order to recalculate the length of the year which had been recognized as inaccurate. The Talmud relates how King Hezekiah made a calendar change. He is said to have intercalated the calendar in order to delay the Passover. While this conclusion may be erroneous, it is recognized that the Passover was held the second month for ritual reasons. See 2 Chronicles 30. Whatever changes became fixed at that time is not known, but it is apparent calendar computation had become difficult (Velikovsky, 352). Even the Romans made corrections in their calendar near the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century BC. Numa, the second king of Rome and a contemporary of King Hezekiah, made corrections in the inequality of the calendar which required further corrections later (ibid, 356).

The same writers cite the following additional support for the observation that calendar adjustments were taking place on a global basis after these disruptive global events:

What can be seen in all this is that in the years following 687 BC there were calendar reforms taking place all over the Earth. The calendar was in a state of chaos between 747-687 BC, the length of both the month and the year constantly changing. We have our present calendar today because the new order has not been altered (Velikovsky, 358-359).

Note that Velikovsky's research does not appear to mention that the week may have had its position altered again much later by Constantine as suggested by Hanson. It is widely believed that Judaism officially divorced the Sabbath from the lunar calendar connection around 700 AD by a committee of powerful Jewish rabbis in a dispersed community of Jews that had remained in Babylon since the days of the Babylonian Captivity. The article on Karaite Judaism in *Wikipedia* gives this explanation of what happened. Anan Ben David (CE 715-795 or 811?) arose as a major proponent of the Karaite sect when the Jews from another sect began teaching doctrines that were highly offensive to him:

Isma'īl al-'Ukbari believed he was the prophet Elijah, and hated 'Anan; and Mishawayh al-'Ukbari, who was a disciple of Isma'īl al-'Ukbari and the founder of the Mishawites, taught his followers to use a purely solar calendar of 364 days and 30 day months, insisted that all the Holy Days and fast days should always occur on fixed days in the week, rather than on fixed days of the months, and said that Shabbat should be kept from sunrise on Saturday to sunrise on Sunday. Such

beliefs were anathema to Ananites and Karaites and their practitioners were excoriated by the Karaites.

The Karaite View Of The Sabbath

Karaite Judaism is interesting to the Sabbath-Sunday question primarily because of its knowledgeable position that calendar issues and other factors make it impossible to know which day of our current week is the “real” seventh day. The history of the Hebrew calendars is complicated indeed. For example, Steve Rudd, an apologetics researcher with Bible.CA and the author of the article, “Solved: Divided Kingdom Chronology,” explains that the Kingdom of Judah began its new year with the month of September-October, whereas Israel’s new year began with the month of April. Also adding to the confusion, during much of the history of the Hebrews, they used a lunar calendar for feast days and a “business” calendar for the solar year of approximately 365 days in length. The fact that the Hebrews used different calendars of different kinds may partially explain why the Karaites have no problem with keeping the weekly Sabbath on a arbitrarily chosen seventh day themselves. It is less clear why they had, and still have, no interest in keeping the weekly Sabbath according to the lunar calendar. Instead, they were focused on the importance of observing Jewish feasts and holy days according to the lunar calendar. They seem to have fought against Judaism’s change to a fixed calendar on that basis only. Documentation of their fight to maintain the use of the lunar calendar is very clear in regard to the events that took place within Judaism during the late 700’s CE.

Despite the seemingly formidable evidence lunar Sabbatarian, John D. Keyser, has found in support of the lunar Sabbath concept, the fact that the Karaite Jews have no interest in keeping the weekly Sabbath according to it may represent the single most powerful indirect evidence against the idea that Israel ever kept the Sabbath according to the phases of the Moon. There are possible explanations for this paradox, however, including the fact that the primary focus of Karaite Judaism has not been on the lunar calendar but rather on the principle that the Torah, which came directly from God, is to be the Jew’s only guide to Faith—that the Talmud and Mishnah, books of Jewish tradition, are not inspired as mainstream, Rabbinical Judaism, claims.

When it comes to the role played by their predecessor groups— the dissident sects that sprang up at some time after the building of the second temple-- the issues that drove them are less clear. They sprang up to oppose mainstream, rabbinical Judaism on a variety of issues that almost certainly included disputes over the Jewish calendar. The Babylonian Captivity began in 597 BCE, and by this time the Assyrians and Babylonians had adopted fixed calendars. It would have been natural for both the Assyrians and the Babylonians to try to impose their national calendars on all of their citizens, including their Jewish subjects. It is possible, and even likely, that these dissident sects that later evolved into the Karaites may have opposed a possible change from observance of the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar to observing it according to the fixed calendar of their captors. However, we have only indirect evidence that this is likely so in that a variety of historical sources indicate that (1) The Jews kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar before the building of the second temple. (2) Excerpts from The Dead Sea Scrolls documents the fact that some Jewish sects were keeping the lunar Sabbath at the time of Christ. (3) The writings of the early fathers of the Christian church document the fact that some Christians and Jews kept the lunar Sabbath for hundreds of years after the death of Christ. (See Appendix XI, excerpts from John D. Keyser’s paper, “From Sabbath to Saturday.”)

The Karaite position on the observance of the weekly Sabbath might suggest that today’s lunar Sabbatarians cannot find any real support for their unique beliefs from Karaite Judaism. Instead, an examination of the facts pulls the rug out from under the foundation of Sabbatarian doctrine-- the untenable concept that the current seventh day of our week is an exact seven-day interval of the seventh day of Creation.

The predecessors of the Karaites were called by various names:

Karaism has been around since God gave his laws to the Jewish people. At first those who followed YHWH's laws were merely called "Righteous" and it was only in the 9th century CE that they came to be called Karaites. The question of why God's followers are today called Karaites is really a question of the origin of the other sects. At first there was no reason to label the righteous as a separate sect because there was only the one sect which consisted of the whole Jewish people. Throughout history a variety of sects appeared and it was only to distinguish the righteous from these other groups which caused them in different periods to take on such names as Sadducees, Boethusians, Ananites, and Karaites.

The first reference in the history of Israel to more than one sect takes place some 200 years after the close of the Biblical period, in the first century BCE. Various sources tell us of two opposing sects, the Sadducees (Zadokites) and the Pharisees. The Sadducees followed the Torah as it was written while the Pharisees believed in a second "Oral" Torah which they added to the real one. The Second Temple period saw the rise of several more sects among them another group which only followed the written Torah called the Boethusians and a sect which added several books to the Bible called the Essenes (a.k.a. the "Dead Sea Sect").

<http://www.karaite-korner.org/history.shtml>

The Karaites are first mentioned in written sources in the late eighth century. They themselves claim to be descendants of dissident sects of the First Temple period, and the rabbinical tradition traces them back to opposition trends of the Second Temple period.

http://www.myjewishlearning.com/history/Ancient_and_Medieval_History/632-1650/Islamic_World/Karaites.shtml?p=1

Historians have argued over whether Karaism has a direct connection to anti-Rabbinic sects and views, such as those of the Sadducees, dating back to the end of the Second Temple period (70 CE), or whether Karaism represents a novel emergence of similar views. Karaites have always maintained that, while there are some similarities to the Sadducees, there are also differences, and that the ancestors of the Karaites were another group called Benei Şedeq during the Second Temple period.[4]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karaite_Judaism

Here is the current position statement of the Karaite Corner, a website that articulates the beliefs of Karaite Jews in the U.S., and whose webmaster is Nehemia Gordon, on the calendar problem as it relates to keeping the weekly Sabbath. This subject should be of special interest to Seventh-day Adventists because of William Miller's connection with Karaite Judaism through his Hebrew teachers. Adventism evolved out of the Millerite Movement. William Miller and Ellen White corresponded with each other. She said that God showed her that William Miller rejected the Sabbath because he had a "mental block" to it, implying that it was a honest but mistaken rejection of the truth on his part. What we know about William Miller's understanding of Karaite Judaism, the lunar calendar, and the arbitrary assignment of the fixed calendar's 7th day suggests that he rejected Adventism because he knew that even the Jews did not know which day was really the 7th day. Here is the official position of the Karaite Jews on these issues:

[Does Shabbath Have to Be on a Saturday?](#)

One of the questions which I am constantly asked by former gentiles making their way into Karaism is whether Shabbath must be on a Saturday. The idea that it must be on Saturday comes from two questionable assumptions: (1) That Saturday is the actual "anniversary" of the day within the seven day week on which Yehowah rested from creating the universe, and (2) That the Shabbath has to be the same day as this anniversary. If either one of these assumptions is incorrect, then

Shabbath does not have to be on a Saturday. While there is no outright proof that the first assumption is not correct, there is also no outright proof that it is. Through all the trials and tribulations that humanity has experienced over the past 5,000 years, we have no proof whatsoever that our current Saturday is the actual seven-day "anniversary" of the original Shabbath of Creation. Likewise, the Rabbinical year (5768 as of this writing) is only a guesstimate rather than a cold, hard fact. (More likely than not, the current year is not what the Rabbinical calendar says it is.) To illustrate this point, I borrow a quote from the character Morpheus in the movie *The Matrix*, who, explaining his post-apocalyptic world, says, "You believe it's the year 1999 when in fact it's closer to 2199. I can't tell you exactly what year it is, because we honestly don't know." As for the second assumption, this too comes from the flawed Rabbinical concept that the essence of the Shabbath is the celebration of the seventh-day "anniversary" of Yehowah's rest-after-creation. In fact, the essence of the Shabbath is not the seventh day, but the rest. As usual, the Rabbis have switched the focus of this crucial holiday away from its humanistic and social justice aspects, and placed it on the symbolic and ritualistic aspects. From a Karaite point of view, we do not celebrate the Shabbath because it is some esoteric and mystical anniversary of an original Shabbath, we celebrate it so that we can rest, so that our dependents can rest, and so that our animals can rest. This is the essence of the Shabbath. Shabbath, and indeed the entire Torah, is about serving Elohim through serving our fellow man. Thus, theoretically speaking, it does not matter what day the Shabbath falls on; it only matters that on every seventh day, the entire society is allowed a day of rest, physical and spiritual rejuvenation, and holiness. Do I therefore recommend that you start celebrating Shabbath on Tuesday, or Wednesday, or Sunday? No, I do not. I personally celebrate the Shabbath on Saturday, and will continue to do so. This is the day that the people of Israel have currently chosen for the Shabbath, and the Shabbath must be a national rather than an individual effort. But let us not harbor the illusion that the day the nation has chosen is the exact same day on which Elohim rested, or that it even needs to be. What is important and central to the idea of the Shabbath is that on every seventh day, all people and animals get a chance to rest. - See more at:

<http://karaiteinsights.com/article/shabbat.html#sthash.Su6lnLC.dpuf>

General Internet reference: <http://karaiteinsights.com/article/shabbat.html>

Another Possible Theory About The Sabbath Days Of Colossians 2:14-17

Even Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholar, the late Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, conceded that Colossians 2:14-17 targets the weekly Sabbath, and it was his absurdly Judaizing work-around of Colossians 2:14-17 that finally opened the eyes of the Evangelical world to the impossibilities of Sabbatarianism. A few thinking Seventh-day Adventist theologians also took note of the implications of Bacchiocchi's theory's and left Adventism, including the (then) controversial independent SDA theologian, Dr. Robert Brinsmead. Our research on the lunar Sabbath theory might possibly provide still another leg of support that Dr. Bacchiocchi's assessment that the sabbath in the third position represents the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. If the lunar Sabbath theory is correct, we would have another reason to see that the Jews viewed the sabbath system as an integrated whole, all synchronized to the new moons. However, there are other reasons for determining that the sabbath in the third position represents the weekly Sabbath. If the third sabbath is not a reference to the weekly Sabbath, his sentence structure would make no sense, as you would have "annual, monthly, annual," or "annual, monthly, monthly."

Note that the Greek word in the third position in Colossians 2:14-17 is "sabbaton." Here is the Strong's definition of the word:

Title: Strong's Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries

Edition: Third

Copyright: Electronic Edition STEP Files Copyright © 2003, QuickVerse, a division of Findex.com, Inc.

G4521

σάββατον sabbaton *sab'-bat-on*

Of Hebrew origin [[H7676](#)]; the *Sabbath* (that is, *Shabbath*), or day of weekly *repose* from secular avocations (also the observance or institution itself); by extension a *se'nnight*, that is, the interval between two Sabbaths; likewise the plural in all the above applications:— sabbath (day), week.

Galatians 4:8-11

GALATIANS 4:8-11 (NIV) - Formerly, when you did not know God, you were slaves to those who by nature are not gods. But now that you know God-or rather are known by God-how is it that you are turning back to those weak and miserable principles? Do you wish to be enslaved by them all over again? ¹⁰ You are observing special days and months and seasons and years! I fear for you, that somehow I have wasted my efforts on you.

Sabbatarian apologists claim that the special days Paul was referring to here were the sacred days of the pagan calendar. Unfortunately, the focus of the book of Galatians is on the baleful influence of the Judaizers—Christian Jews who wanted all Christians to keep the Law of Moses and the rabbinical traditions. Several verses later, Paul even names the Judaizers as the culprits he is referring to. Review the following principles and you will see that Paul's three anti-Sabbatarian passages are consistent: (1) The Sabbath was not referenced to the 7th day of Creation, but rather to the principle of work six days and rest the 7th. (2) All three sabbath types were an integrated and inseparable set of sacred days in Jewish thought. (3) Even Seventh-day Adventist Sabbatarianism concedes that the annual and monthly sabbaths were done away with by Christ's death on the Cross. (4) One type of Sabbath cannot exist without the others, so St. Paul said in Colossians 2:14-17 that all three types of Sabbaths became obsolete shadows when the Reality that cast those shadows died on the Cross. (5) If, indeed, the lunar Sabbath concept is true, we would have an additional reason to see all sabbaths as an inseparable set.

Romans 14:5-6

Romans 14:5-6 (NIV) - One person considers one day more sacred than another; another considers every day alike. Each of them should be fully convinced in their own mind. 6 Whoever regards one day as special does so to the Lord. Whoever eats meat does so to the Lord, for they give thanks to God; and whoever abstains does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God.

Sabbatarian apologists claim that the days referred to in this passage are merely references to the ceremonial Jewish feast days. They use circular reasoning, assuming that since the Sabbath is an unquestionable truth, Paul could not possibly be referring to the weekly Sabbath days in this passage. Unfortunately, this statement is about as clear as it can be said. Only a Sabbatarian bias forces someone to try to explain it away in such a manner.

Once the sabbath set became obsolete shadows at the Cross, there was no principle or absolute reference point that could be used to make any day of the year intrinsically sacred. As you will discover as you look deeper into the Sabbath-Sunday Question, you will see that Christians came to observe Sunday out of arbitrary convenience— not because Sunday was sacred. As we have said before, informed Jews never based their weekly Sabbaths on an absolute reference point because they couldn't.

Paul is correct. With no absolute reference point to use to calculate a sacred day, no day possesses any sacredness in and of itself. To the Christian, all days are equal. Any day is a good day to worship God. Observe Sunday if you wish as an arbitrary day that Christians have chosen or worship on Saturday, but understand that if you chose to worship on Saturday, you are doing so not because it falls on a new moon or because it is an exact seven-day interval of the 7th day of Creation Week. Christians, therefore, are obligated to respect Paul's admonition not to impose their own idea about sacred days on other believers because there are no longer ANY sacred days. We cannot imagine St. Paul telling the new Gentile converts that they would receive the Mark of the Beast and go to Hell if they did not join the Jewish Christians in keeping the Jewish Sabbath. The Jews departed from the intent of the Law of Moses by capitulating to worship on the day that Babylonian rabbis

had arbitrarily chosen to be labeled the 7th day. Christians violate God's special revelation through St. Paul that Christians are not to impose the Jewish Sabbath on others. They can keep it themselves without sinning because any day is a good day to worship God, but they ignore God's specific instructions when they seek to impose it on others.

DO THEN JEWS BELIEVE GENTILES SHOULD KEEP THE SABBATH?

Again, we turn to the Karaite Jews for light on this perspective. Keep in mind that this opinion is that of Jewish scholars and can be used only so far to throw light on how Christians should think about this subject. Note that the foundation of this opinion is the concept that there is only one chance in seven that the seventh-day is an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation:

Do the Other Nations Have to Keep The Shabbath? **First of all, it is clear from what I have written above, that even if the other nations do have to keep the Shabbath, it does not necessarily have to be on a Saturday.** Each society may choose its own day, and as long as all the members of that society are allowed to rest on that day, then that society is, in effect, keeping the Shabbath. But now the question arises, "Do they have to?" The answer to this question actually raises a much more general question: "Do the nations other than Israel have to keep the Torah at all? If so, what parts of it must they keep?" To answer that the other nations do not have to keep the Torah at all is clearly flawed, since no thinking person can imagine that other nations should be permitted to commit murder, theft and adultery. On the other hand, to answer that the other nations must keep the entire Torah is equally flawed, since, for instance, what relevance would keeping the detailed laws of Passover have to another nation, inasmuch as Passover specifically celebrates the freeing of Israel from Egypt? The answer, in my opinion, lies somewhere in-between. The laws of the Torah are meant for Israel, but Israel, in keeping them, is in turn meant to set an example for the rest of the nations. In other words, that which is mentioned in Deuteronomy 4:6 is supposed to happen: "So keep them and do them because this is your wisdom and your understanding in the eyes of the nations, who will hear all these laws and say, 'This is certainly a wise and understanding nation, this great nation.'" 5 After coming to this conclusion, other nations will naturally want to emulate many of our laws. When they do, Israel's role in the world is actualized. (For a further explanation of this idea, I recommend reading my book, *The Torah and the Marketplace of Ideas*.) Therefore, to return to the specific question of the Shabbath, my answer is as follows: The other nations are not explicitly required to keep the Shabbath, but as Israel's influence in the world grows, other nations, seeing the beauty and wisdom of the Shabbath, will choose to integrate the idea into their own societies. Indeed, this is exactly what has happened, as both Christian and Muslim societies do keep a form of the Shabbath, and just about all societies around the modern world have the concept of a day off from work, whereas this was not the case 2,000 years ago.

<http://www.karaiteinsights.com/article/shabbat.html#sthash.TbCJFadJ.dpuf>

Sabbatarians protest that some of the rabbis taught that the Sabbath was universal, and it is true that some have. Only a few select rabbis are chosen to have extensive training in the Ancient Hebrew version of the Hebrew language in which the Torah was "originally" written; so it is not surprising that a rabbi who did not receive this special training would write in ignorance. (We will have more to say about this fact later.) That this universal view is held by some rabbis has been substantiated by a paper sent to us by Brendan Knudson, "**Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath**," by **Robert M. Johnson**, available from Andrews University Library. One example Johnson cites is found in the *Book of Jubilees* 2:30-33, which describes an angel telling Moses, "We kept Sabbath in the heavens before it was made known to any flesh to keep Sabbath thereon on the earth." Note that the rabbinical author of the *Book of Jubilees* advocates for the universality of the Sabbath from a non-biblical perspective. As Robert K. Sanders observes, the angels had no part in Creation, so there would be no point in them keeping the Sabbath. When angels are assisting mankind through the week, they are doing "good" on the Sabbath, and thus they would not be

resting. Furthermore, as Sanders observes, “The Father and Jesus work on the Sabbath. A non-biblical starting point seems to lead to a non-biblical conclusion.” (Similarly, Duane Johnson observes that Seventh-day Adventist scholars, while using questionable support for the Sabbath from other sources, demonstrate literary bias when they attempt to squeeze out a Sabbatarian-friendly reading of quotes from the early fathers of the church. Unfortunately, most of these passages, when taken in proper context, were strongly anti-Sabbatarian. Johnson cites such works as *The Didache* and *The Epistle of St. Barnabas* as examples of the writings of the early fathers who strongly opposed Sabbath-keeping. Now, reflect on Robert K. Sander's observation that a non-biblical starting point leads to non-biblical conclusions:

John 5:16 - 18 (NIV) ¹⁶So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him. ¹⁷Jesus said to them, “**My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working.**”

The rabbinical author of *The Book of Jubilees*, quoted by Robert M. Johnson, continues:

And the Creator of all things blessed it, but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath, but Israel alone.

Notice the theological difficulties posed by a Sabbath that existed before the creation of Planet Earth. The Sabbath was given to Israel. The Sabbath was given to the Jews in part to help them remember that God created this world —not the Universe. It was also given to them to help them not forget that God had led them out of Egyptian slavery. Jewish scholars seem to vary in their methods of Bible study just the way Christians scholars do. We would ask the question, if any Jewish rabbi studied the Exodus story with a native understanding of Ancient Hebrew, how could he possibly arrive at the conclusion that the Sabbath had universal jurisdiction?

God never sent a messenger to a Heathen city or nation to condemn it for Sabbath-breaking, but He did for violating fundamental moral laws. On the other hand, God rebuked Israel when it broke the Sabbath after it was given to them as an ordinance— additional evidence that the Sabbath was for Israel alone. No other nations had any meaningful knowledge of the True God or of the Sabbath He provided for the Jews. Robert K. Sanders provides three texts to support this position:

Psalm 147:19 - 20 (NIV) ¹⁹ He has revealed his word to Jacob, his laws and decrees to Israel. ²⁰He has done this for no other nation; *they do not know his laws*. Praise the LORD.

The Sinaitic Sabbath covenant was not made with the Fathers such as Adam, Noah, Isaac, and Abraham.

Deut. 5:2 -3 (NIV) ²The LORD our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. ³*It was not with our fathers that the LORD made this covenant*, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today.

If the Israelites did not know about the Sabbath then certainly the Gentile nations did not know about it:

Neh. 9:13, 14 (NIV) ¹³“*You came down on Mount Sinai*; you spoke to them from heaven. You gave them regulations and laws that are just and right, and decrees and commands that are good. ¹⁴*You made known to them your holy Sabbath* and gave them commands, decrees and laws through your servant Moses.

Duane Johnson adds the following texts in support of the fact that the Law of Moses with its Sabbath commandment was unique to Israel:

Deut 4:5 - 7 (KJV) ⁵Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. ⁶Keep therefore and do *them*; for this *is* your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation *is* a wise and understanding people. ⁷For what nation *is there so great*, who *hath* God *so* nigh unto them, as the LORD our God *is* in all *things that* we call upon him *for*?

Deuteronomy 4:5-7 - Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is

there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for?

Sabbatarians claim that since the Sabbath is part of the 10 Commandments, doing away with it would be like doing away with all LAW. The reference to the Law in James 2:8-11 is to all 613 laws of Moses—not simply the 10 Commandments:

James 2:8 - 11 (NIV) 8 If you really keep the royal law found in Scripture, “Love your neighbor as yourself,” you are doing right. 9 But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as lawbreakers. 10 For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it. 11 For he who said, “Do not commit adultery,” also said, “Do not murder.” If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker.

Note contextually how James uses the “law” here, referring to the “whole” law, and how that covenant law worked when it came to breaking any one point of that whole law. One was guilty of the entirety should they break any one point of that law. William Hohmann observes that James used the Old Covenant Law as an example to illustrate how the New Covenant “Royal Law of Liberty” works when it comes to our relationship with other people. If we show favoritism for one, and despise another, failing to show proper love even for one other human being, we are guilty of transgressing that Royal Christian law of Liberty, having shown partiality in our love and treatment of others.

Before going any further we need to take a good look at what the LAW really is. The heresy of Sabbatarianism develops in part when there is a serious misunderstanding of what Bible writers meant when they discussed the topic of the Law. There is no doubt that God gave His human begins laws from the very beginning, but He only gave the Decalogue with its Sabbath commandment to the Jews. Robert K. Sanders clarifies what God’s law really is in the next section.

THE LAW OF THE SPIRIT

by Robert K. Sanders

We observe that most Sabbatarians have no knowledge of this law. They have been indoctrinated into the law of the flesh, known as the Old Covenant in the New Testament. They have been led to believe that they must keep the Ten Commandments or they will lose their salvation. Jesus taught the Jews the spiritual aspects of the Law, that if they lust after a woman they had adultery in their hearts. The Jews under the Law did not have the Law of the Spirit within their hearts. They hated the Gentiles as well as their fellow Jews.

At the time of Noah before the flood God said that His ***Spirit would not always “contend with man.”*** The Holy Spirit put a basic understanding of moral law into the consciences of every human being. God said in Genesis 6 that the thoughts of man were evil continually. Mankind rejected God’s moral laws. God declared Noah to be a righteous man, and only he and his family were saved from the flood.

King David understood the concept of the Law of the Spirit. After he committed adultery with Bathsheba and killed her husband, he wrote:

Psalm 51: 10-11 (NIV) - Create in me a pure heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me. Do not cast me from your presence or take your Holy Spirit from me.

God tells Jeremiah that He was going to make a new covenant with Israel that would not be like the one He made with them when he delivered them from Egypt:

Jeremiah 31:31 (NIV) -The Lord said, “I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts.”

The Jews were devoid of the spirit of God as they were an idolatrous, rebellious people which are the reasons God gave them the Old Covenant law so that they would know what sin was.

Paul explains that God writes His law on the hearts of Christians. The ministry that brings death was written on stone and was fading away, and the ministry of the spirit is more glorious. What was written on stone and "fading away"? The Ten Commandments with the Sabbath!

2 Cor. 3:3 (NIV) ³You show that you are a letter from Christ, the result of our ministry, *written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.*

2 Cor. 3:7 - 8 (NIV) ⁷Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on *stone*, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, *fading though it was,* ⁸*will not the ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious?*

Paul writes that the Gentiles that "do not have the law" still have the requirements of the law written on their hearts. The Gentiles as well as the Jews who follow the Spirit written in their hearts will be eternally saved when God judges the world through Jesus Christ (Verse 16):

Rom. 2:14 - 16 (NIV) ¹⁴(Indeed, when *Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law*, they are a law for themselves, *even though they do not have the law,* ¹⁵since they show that *the requirements of the law are written on their hearts*, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts now accusing, now even defending them.) ¹⁶*This will take place on the day when God will judge men's secrets through Jesus Christ, as my gospel declares.*

Rom 2:7 (NIV) – ⁷To those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honor and immortality, he will give eternal life.

Heb. 8:10 (NIV) - ¹⁰This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel.

God has been speaking to each person who comes into the world through their consciences from Adam to Moses and from Moses till the end of the world (See St. John, Chapter One). The various moral codes of the world seem to agree to a remarkable extent. As C. S. Lewis once pointed out, there are few if any societies on Earth where lying, cheating, and stealing are looked upon with admiration and approval. Similarly, as Lewis observed, these societies have disagreed about how many wives a man could have, but few, if any, have believed that a man could take any woman he wanted for a wife.

The writer of Hebrews references Jer. 31:31 to illustrate that a new covenant was part of God's plan for the future of his people:

Jer. 31:31 (NIV) - The days are coming," declares the Lord, "when I will make a new covenant with the people of Israel and with the people of Judah.

Here is the text from Hebrews:

Heb. 8:13 (NIV) - ¹³By calling this covenant "new," he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.

King David did not need any written laws to tell him it was wrong to commit adultery with Bathsheba and kill her husband. The real laws of God seem to explain themselves: Don't do anything to others that you would not want them to do to you. If a person steals someone from someone else, that person may fight the thief to get his things back, and in the process one or both of them may die. Kerry Wynne knows a particular atheist very well. He observes that he despises dishonesty and has a sharp conscience when it comes to business dealings. Recently he thought someone had stolen several hundred dollars from him. He had no trouble seeing that what happened to him was intrinsically "wrong." Wynne observes that if those who do not even profess to believe in a Higher Power have a good sense of right and wrong forged into their minds, it should not be difficult to understand how Christians, who are under control of the Holy Spirit, would have the REAL "Law of God" emblazoned deeply in their souls—the Law of the Spirit—and would have an innate understanding of God's LAW that would greatly transcend a mere list of "do's" and "don'ts" that govern sins of commission to encompass an understanding of sins of omission and motive.

Kerry Wynne tells of a remarkable incident that took place between a Seventh-day Adventist missionary and a Head Hunter in Borneo during the 1970's. This head hunter's village was feuding with another village, and a war between them seemed

likely. The missionary was working to try to prevent the fight. In a discussion with one of the cannibal warriors, the missionary asked him if he planned to eat the people he killed in battle. The warrior got a solemn look on his face, put his hand over his heart, and said, "No, master. I could never do that. Something in here (At this point he thumped the area over his heart.) tells me that would be very wrong. No, I will not eat them." Even the Heathen know when they are doing evil. The LAW is, indeed, written on their hearts.

Wynne also relates an interesting discussion he had with a Christian who questioned whether there was any direct commandment in the Bible against a man having more than one wife. A careful analysis of Scripture proves that there is not. The Bible is full of examples of polygamy, and although King David had many wives there is no record that God ever rebuked him for this practice. In fact, God said that David was a "man after His own heart." Wynne asked his believing friend whether or not he would wish to share a woman that he was crazy about with several other men. The friend evaded the question. Then Wynne pointed out that surely he would not wish to do so if he was deeply in love with her and then suggested that if he were a woman who was deeply in love with her husband, she would not want to share him with several other women. If we follow the command of Jesus to love others like we love ourselves, it is a "no brainer" that we would not want to do anything to someone else that we would not want that person to do to us. There is no question that the Law of the Spirit is vastly superior to the Ten Commandments, the entire Law of Moses, or even the lists of sins that St. Paul gave us.

Wynne also observes that Romans 7 demonstrates that when Paul said Christians are not under the LAW, he meant, in a very real sense, that they were no longer under any written codification of LAW whether it be ceremonial or moral, when it came to the process by which salvation works. Notice that the example he gives in this particular discussion of the Law is the sin of adultery. The claim that Paul only targeted the ceremonial LAW is refuted by this fact. At the same time there is no license to sin because the standard of the Law of the Spirit is much higher. Following the direct and unrelenting influence of the Holy Spirit leads the sinner away from all the sins that Sabbatarian legalist is "worried about," and more. The LAW that Jesus confirmed, that we are to love God supremely and others as ourselves, is comprehensive and enables us to decide every moral issue that confronts us. He gave this "law" to Israel in the Old Testament, and He confirmed it in the New Testament.

There should be almost no moral issue that can't be resolved to the best of a believer's conscience with the combination of the Law of the Spirit and the comprehensive principle that Jesus gave us that we are to love God supremely and others as ourselves. Let's say, for example, that you are a fetus in your mother's womb, but the man who fathered you does not care about her and has no interest in being a parent to you. Do you want to be butchered and aborted without a chance to see the light of day just because your father is a no-good? Do you, then, simply because your father was a no-good, not care to ever see flowers and trees, hear the song of a bird, or behold the glories of a star-studded sky at night? Of course not! You want to see the light of day. Your mother, then, really knows what to do. If your situations were reversed, what would she do? Also, notice Jesus Himself "replaced" the 7th Commandment against adultery with something far more comprehensive. He said that not only must a man not commit the act of adultery itself, but that he must not even look at a woman with lust in his heart. Surely the Law of the Spirit is a principle that is not difficult to grasp.

IMPOSSIBLE BARRIER: THE SABBATH A MEMORIAL TO THE ESCAPE FROM EGYPTIAN SLAVERY

Genesis chapter 2 does not instruct Mankind to do anything Sabbath related. There is no command to follow God's example of rest in the future or even at the moment. Moses' account of the events of the 7th day of Creation is the story of what God did. The account of these events doesn't even suggest that Adam and Eve joined Him in the ceasing of His of activity. We don't have any evidence that God took seven days to create Planet Earth because He wished to establish a seven-day week for the human race, although such is certainly possible, but not plausible. In the first chapter of Genesis, God gave the Sun and Moon to help people keep track of sacred days. All we really know is that God wanted a seven-day week for Israel and that at Creation He gave the moon (and the sun) to Mankind to provide a reference for its holy days. When God gave them

the Sabbath ordinance at Mt. Sinai, the Mountain of the Moon, He provided that the new moons would provide the point of reference for Israel's Sabbaths, other holy days, and the sacred feasts. As we will explain later the Ancient Hebrew form of the Hebrew language did not develop until after the time of King David. There is almost no chance that the nomadic Children of Israel could maintain an accurate reference to one single day over a period of over a thousand years.

Furthermore, Moses, the assumed author of Genesis, used specific Hebrew linguistic devices to clarify that these special attributes—the blessing and sanctification (setting aside of it)—gave this one, single day a significance that He wanted all the human family to remember over a time period that would have no boundaries. Both the blessing and the sanctification of the 7th day might well have taken place at that time, but in either case, whenever these attributes were applied, they were bestowed upon this one day in the history of Planet Earth. It was the MEMORY of the blessing and setting aside of this one day, together with the self-evident eternal rest of God from creating Planet Earth, that was to be remembered forever.

When we get to Exodus 20, Moses used several linguistic indicators to clarify that the Sabbath ordinance was only MODELED after Creation week's pattern of Divine work and "rest." However, in Leviticus God told them that He gave them the Sabbath to help them remember that it was He who brought them out of Egyptian slavery. Do today's Sabbath-keepers break the Sabbath when they fail to think about how God rescued them from Egyptian slavery? No Christian has ever been rescued from slavery in Egypt by the miraculous power of God, so Christians do not meet an important qualification for those who are commanded to keep it. Note this passage from Deuteronomy:

(NIV) - Deuteronomy 5:12-15 - "Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the Lord your God has commanded you. ¹³Six days you shall labor and do all your work, ¹⁴but the seventh day is a sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns, so that your male and female servants may rest, as you do. ¹⁵Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the Lord your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the Lord your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.

Sabbath keeping for Christians fails the logic test. Israel was commanded to keep it as a memorial; a reminder it was their God who made heaven and earth and who rested on that seventh day, of which the sabbath was a shadow of where they could rest from their labors and remember also that they and or their ancestors who were slaves in Egypt worked without rest. Israel collectively often "forgot" all this – having abandoned God and His commands for them, having turned time and again to idolatry. Christians are not ancient Israelites, devoid of God's Spirit. True Christians, in possession of God's Holy Spirit, are not going to forget who their God is, and as such, do not need the memorial of a sabbath as a reminder not to forget God. The Christian has entered into God's rest through faith, a rest that is permanent as contrasted to the weekly sabbath rest which was temporary and merely a shadow of God's rest. (See: Psalms 95; Hebrews 4; Colossians 2:16-17)

IMPOSSIBLE BARRIER: CIRCUMCISION

A former Adventist researcher who has chosen to remain anonymous has found proof in the work of Seventh-day Adventist theologians Maxwell and Damsteegt that Seventh-day Adventists have known since no later than 1992 that the Jews have typically understood that observance of the ordinance of circumcision was a requirement for keeping the Sabbath. This unnamed former Adventist scholar, whose work we found posted at a website which examines the Sabbatarian views of the now defunct Worldwide Church of God, focuses on the research of these SDA biblical scholars, Mervyn Maxwell, and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992.

So, if the Christians were worshiping on Sunday, why wasn't there an outcry in the Jewish church in Jerusalem? It was a church that most likely continued to meet on Saturday at the synagogue for several decades to hear the scriptures read. The reason they did not cry out in protest is because Jews believed then, and still believe now, that the Sabbath was given only to Jews. They NEVER

expected Gentiles (which made up most of the early church) to keep the Sabbath. Notice the following passages:

“The children of Noah...were given seven Laws only, the observance of the Sabbath not being among them” (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., p. 23], as quoted in C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 75).

The Noachian laws are also listed in Midrash Genesis Rabbah 16:6 (Soncino ed., p. 131), Sanhedrin 56 a, b; and Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah 1:2(5) (Soncino ed. pp. 26-7) (ibid., p. 74). Gentiles could be considered righteous if they observed these laws, which did not include the Sabbath. Nor did they include restrictions about pork. Rabbi Judah could say that there was a time for the “sons of Jacob when unclean beasts were still permitted to them” (Hullin 7:6, as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p.74. The rabbis did not think that the Sabbath had been given to Gentiles: “Why does it say, ‘The Lord hath given you’ (Ex. 16:29)? To you hath he given it [the Sabbath], but not to the heathen. It is in virtue of this that the Sages stated [Sanh. 56b] that if some of the heathen observed the Sabbath, then not only do they not receive any reward [but they are even considered to be transgressing]” (Midrash Exodus Rabbah 25:11 [Soncino ed., p. 314], as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 74).

"A non-Jew who observes the Sabbath whilst he is uncircumcised incurs liability for the punishment of death. Why? Because non-Jews were not commanded concerning it.... The Sabbath is a reunion between Israel and God, as it is said, 'It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel' (Ex. 31:17); therefore any non-Jew who, being uncircumcised, thrusts himself between them incurs the penalty of death.... The Gentiles have not been commanded to observe the Sabbath" (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., pp. 23-4], as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 75).

The Jews understood that the Sabbath commandment was given only to Israel. The Jews traditionally thought in terms of two different sets of laws– the Noachian laws– which they believed were given to everyone, and the TORAH laws that they believed were given only to Israel at the time of the Exodus.

It is important to keep in mind that the concept of Noachian law is NOT a biblical concept and is to a large extent Jewish tradition. Only a couple of the seven laws are found in the Old Testament Scriptures accepted by Jews as the Canon. The remainder are found only in literature understood by the Jews to be a non-canonical and interpretive version of the Books of Moses. Please study these quotations from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* carefully:

The Seven Laws.

Laws which were supposed by the Rabbis to have been binding upon mankind at large even before the revelation at Sinai, and which are still binding upon non-Jews. The term ‘Noachian’ indicates the universality of these ordinances, since the whole human race was supposed to be descended from the three sons of Noah, who alone survived the Flood. Although only those laws which are found in the earlier chapters of the Pentateuch, before the record of the revelation at Sinai, should, it would seem, be binding upon all mankind, yet the Rabbis discarded some and, by hermeneutic rules or in accordance with some tradition (see Judah ha-Levi, “Cuzari,” iii. 73), introduced others which are not found there. Basing their views on the passage in Gen. II.16, they declared that the following six commandments were enjoined upon Adam: (1) not to worship idols; (2) not to blaspheme the name of God; (3) to establish courts of justice; (4) not to kill; (5) not to commit adultery;

and (6) not to rob (Gen. R. xvi. 9, xxiv. 5; Cant. R. i. 16; comp. Seder Olam Rabbah, ed. Ratner, ch. v. and notes, Wilna, 1897; Maimonides, “Yad,” Melakim, ix. 1). A seventh commandment was added after the Flood—not to eat flesh that had been cut from a living animal (Gen. ix. 4). Thus, the Talmud frequently speaks of “the seven laws of the sons of Noah,” which were regarded as obligatory upon all mankind, in contradistinction to those that were binding upon Israelites only (Tosef., Ab. Zarah, ix. 4; Sanh. 56a *et seq.*).

He who observed the seven Noachian laws was regarded as a domiciled alien (Ab. Zarah 64b; see Proselyte), as one of the pious of the Gentiles, and was assured of a portion in the world to come (Tosef., Sanh. xiii. 1; Sanh. 105a; comp. ib. 91b; “Yad,” l.c. viii. 11).

Here is a more extensive quote from the ***Jewish Encyclopedia*** which supports the concept that the Jews are very serious about their belief that the Sabbath was given to Israel alone. This passage is particularly interesting because it has a direct bearing on the Sabbath question for Christians as viewed by the Jews (***Jewish Encyclopedia***, article, “Gentile,” section “Gentiles May Not Be Taught the Torah”):

Resh Laish (d. 278) said, “A Gentile observing the Sabbath deserves death” (Sanh. 58b). This refers to a Gentile who accepted the seven laws of the Noachidæ, inasmuch as “the Sabbath is a sign between God and Israel alone,” and it was probably directed against the Christian Jews, who disregarded the Mosaic laws and yet at that time kept up the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. Rabbina, who lived about 150 years after the Christians had changed the day of rest to Sunday, could not quite understand the principle underlying Resh Laish's law, and, commenting upon it, added: “not even on Mondays [is the Gentile allowed to rest]”; intimating that the mandate given to the Noachidæ that “day and night shall not cease” (=“have no rest”) should be taken in a literal sense (Gen. viii. 22)—probably to discourage general idleness (ib. Rashi), or for the more plausible reason advanced by Maimonides, who says: “The principle is, one is not permitted to make innovations in religion or to create new commandments. He has the privilege to become a true proselyte by accepting the whole Law” (“Yad,” Melakim, x. 9). R. Emden [An unrenderable Hebrew symbol follows the word “Emden,” ed. note] In a remarkable apology for Christianity contained in his appendix to *Seder Olam* (pp. 32b-34b, Hamburg, 1752), gives it as his opinion that the original intention of Jesus, and especially of Paul, was to convert only the Gentiles to the seven moral laws of Noah and to let the Jews follow the Mosaic law—which explains the apparent contradictions in the New Testament regarding the laws of Moses and the Sabbath.

In his classic “*A Digest of the Sabbath Question*,” former SDA theologian, Robert D. Brinsmead observed:

The Book of Jubilees (a Jewish pseudepigraphal work of the second century BC) says that “the Creator of all things... did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone” (“The Book of Jubilees,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R.H. Charles, vol. 2, *Pseudepigrapha* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913], p. 15).

This same anonymous researcher also quotes biblical scholar, James Charlesworth, in support of his point that the Jews have always viewed the Sabbath as being given only to the Jews:

Further evidence of the antiquity of this rabbinic understanding comes from the second-century BC book of Jubilees:

“The Creator of all blessed it, but he did not sanctify any people or nations to keep the Sabbath thereon with the sole exception of Israel. He granted to them alone that they might eat and drink and keep the Sabbath thereon upon the earth” (Jubilees 2:31, James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, [New York: Doubleday, 1985], vol. 2, p. 58).

As noted by Michael Morrison, who writes about the former Sabbatarian views of the Worldwide Church of God, it was the fact that the Jews understood that the Sabbath was only for the Jews that combined with the decision of the Council of Jerusalem not to require the new Gentile converts to be circumcised that prevented any controversy over the official discontinuance of the ordinances of circumcision and the Sabbath at that time. See: <http://www.gci.org/law/sabbath/history1>???

Summarizing the research of SDA researchers, Maxwell and Damsteegt, and biblical scholar, Charlesworth, our anonymous former SDA scholar comments on their work as follows:

Based on these quotes above, we can see from the Jewish writings, and from the Adventist documents that the Gentiles were never expected to keep the Sabbath. This was the understanding of the Jews, to whom the Sabbath was given, and whom Christ never corrected on this matter. So, this begs the question, Why do Adventist's and others keep the Sabbath rather than the Lords day, which according to the writings of early Christians, was kept during the time of the Apostles?

Note: Unfortunately the link to this quote no longer works, so source identification at the time the 7th Edition was published is impossible.

We will spend a considerable amount of time examining the circumcision-Sabbath connection because the concept is so critically important to the Sabbath question. A proper understanding of this principle helps us understand what St. Paul was thinking when he wrote about the law, circumcision, and the Sabbath. Paul was a Jewish lawyer, and he would have thought about these things the same way as other Jewish lawyers. Apologists for Adventism point out that the mixed multitude was commanded to keep the Sabbath during the Exodus when the Manna was also given to the Hebrews, and that a very large number of the people were not circumcised at the time. This excuse works for about two weeks. At the time the Sabbath appears to have been merely an obedience test—like the Manna Obedience Test. However, When the LAW was given to them a short time later at Mt. Sinai, circumcision became a covenantal agreement between each individual Hebrew and God and the nation of Israel as a whole. The specifications of this treaty required circumcision in order to keep the Mosaic Law. Thereafter, Old Testament writers made note of how this concept was incorporated into universal practice in Israel.

We are much more interested in the entire concept as it developed through Jewish history because above everything else, we need to understand what St. Paul and the other apostles were thinking when they brought circumcision into discussions about the Law.

Israel viewed the Law of Moses as one integrated and inseparable body of 613 equally important “covenant” points of law. You break one of these 613 laws, and you have violated the covenant. The Decalogue was only a part of the Law of Moses, and it was strikingly incomplete. Take the Seventh Commandment that addresses the sin of adultery. Because of the very nature of Hebrew linguistics and culture, this commandment of the Decalogue, to our surprise, does not forbid sexual relationships between a man and a woman who are not married. By the very definition of the word, *adultery*, two unmarried persons cannot possibly commit the sin of adultery. Any attempt to say that adultery covers all sexual sins ignores the facts of Hebrew linguistics and culture. In English, fornication is the definition of a sexual relationship between a man and a woman who are not married. Even more striking is that the Decalogue portion of the Law of Moses does not address homosexual behavior or human sexual relations with animals. Rabbinical law draws a sharp difference between adultery and fornication, supporting this fact.

Evidence of the interpretive restrictions imposed by the existence of the separate definitions of these English words is that God chose to cover these additional areas of sexual sins—fornication, homosexuality, and bestiality—outside of the Decalogue “section” of the Law of Moses. The Jews believed that all 613 of these laws were equally important. Thus, when St. Paul says that circumcision is a token of bondage to the *entire* law, we are confronted with the principle that without the requirement for circumcision, there is no requirement for keeping the Sabbath because it is one of the most important components of the Law of Moses. Keep in mind that the abrogation of the Decalogue at the cross did not cause natural law and/or the Law of the Spirit to cease:

Galatians 5:3 (NIV) - Again I declare to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obligated to obey the whole law.

The Torah, we must remember, contains the Sabbath commandment and is included in the 613 laws of Moses. There is sufficient evidence that Gentile men who chose to locate within a Jewish community had to be circumcised if they wanted his family to be able to participate in any of the ordinances that God had given to Israel. Before the Law of Moses was given at Mt. Sinai, God required the foreigner who wished to participate in the Passover to be circumcised:

Exodus 12:48 (NIV) - “An alien living among you who wants to celebrate the LORD’s Passover must have all the males in his household circumcised; then he may take part like one born in the land. No uncircumcised male may eat of it.”

In the Old Testament we see that Gentiles were only required to keep the Sabbath if they chose to unite with a Jewish community mentioned as we see in this passage from Isaiah 56– a text which Sabbatarians like to use to demonstrate the perpetuity of the Sabbath. This conclusion begs the logical conclusion regarding the perpetuity of sacrifices:

Isa 56:4 - 7 (NIV) ⁴For this is what the LORD says: “To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me and hold fast to my covenant— ⁵to them I will give within my temple and its walls a memorial and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off. ⁶And foreigners who bind themselves to the LORD to serve him, to love the name of the LORD, and to worship him, all who keep the Sabbath without desecrating it and who hold fast to my covenant— ⁷these I will bring to my holy mountain and give them joy in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house will be called a house of prayer for all nations.”

In our study of the problems of Sabbatarianism, our interest is as much in how the Israelites viewed the concept of the Law and its relationship to the Sabbath as we are in the actual teachings of the Scripture regarding it. What we do know is that by the time of Jesus, the keeping of the Torah– the Law of Moses– was thought of to be for Jews only, and Gentiles were not welcome to participate in its ordinances unless they were circumcised.

The Council of Jerusalem made the decision not to impose circumcision on the Gentile converts, thus settling the Sabbath question forever. Dr. Bacchiocchi teaches that the exemption (contrary to the law) for circumcision was for the Gentiles only and was still required for the Jewish Christians. (See Bacchiocchi’s essay, “**How Did Sabbath Keeping Begin,**” in the section titled, ‘*Attachment to the Law.*’) If the issue involved here is truly a moral one, God could therefore not make a distinction between what Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians were required to do! What kind of theological nonsense is this in regard to the Gospel in which God and his Christian followers do not even differentiate between male and female, the free and the slave? We are at a total loss to see why Dr. Bacchiocchi would suggest such an idea. Dr. Bacchiocchi’s willingness to split the requirement for Sabbath-keeping between the Jew and the Gentile is a desperate attempt on his part to extricate himself from the illogical web into which he has fallen.

The biblical understanding of circumcision as taught in Scripture and Jewish rabbinical writings is close to absolute proof that Sabbath-keeping ended at the cross and was officially put to rest at the Council of Jerusalem.

As we mentioned earlier, Jewish thought regarding Gentiles and the Sabbath is based on the Jewish belief that the Sabbath was not given to Adam and Eve at the Creation. Understanding the linguistics of their own Hebrew language, they clearly perceived that Moses worded his account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in such a way as to make certain they could not possibly read a Sabbath commandment into what he wrote.

These concepts about what the Bible really teaches about the question of Sabbath-keeping for Christians from a combination of Jewish traditional theology and the Bible:

1. The Jews knew the Sabbath didn't begin at Creation.
2. The Jews believed the Sabbath was given to Israel and Israel alone.
3. The Jews, who are known to be excellent historians, knew that Christians abandoned the Sabbath almost immediately, and the most extreme of the rabbis in the early Christian era taught that Christians and others who kept the Sabbath should be put to death. (See page 33 for the comments of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*.)
4. Similarly, the gateway to keeping the TORAH, even for an Israelite, was circumcision. Circumcision represents the bondage of an Israelite to the Torah.
5. The Sabbath was not part of Noachian Law, which was a non-biblical concept held by Rabbinical Judaism.

6. God sent his prophets to rebuke many Gentile nations, but there is no record in the Bible that God ever rebuked them for Sabbath-breaking.

7. Jesus viewed both the Sabbath and circumcision to be ceremonial in nature. He did not condemn the Jews for breaking the Sabbath to circumcise a child on the 8th day following his birth according to the laws of Moses:

John 7:21-23 (NIV) - Jesus said to them, “I did one miracle, and you are all astonished. ²²Yet, because Moses gave you circumcision (though actually it did not come from Moses, but from the patriarchs), you circumcise a child on the Sabbath. ²³ Now if a child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the Law of Moses may not be broken, why are you angry with me for healing the whole man on the Sabbath?”

8. The Weekly Sabbath is listed in Leviticus 23 as one of many ceremonial ordinances.

Note that the Jews knew which ordinance superseded the other when contests between circumcision and the Sabbath arose. Jesus recognized that the Law of Moses incorporated this hierarchy between the two ordinances. At the Council of Jerusalem, the Apostle Peter, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was able to persuade the other Early Church leaders to avoid saddling the new Gentile converts with a burden that neither they nor their Jewish fathers were able to bear. Once the decision was made not to require the Gentile converts to be circumcised, the Sabbath question was settled forever. There was no chance (without ignoring the legalities of that covenant law) for the Sabbath question to surface again without first reviving the question over Christians undergoing circumcision. This understanding helps us to see why the requirement to keep the Jewish Sabbath was never indicated in any Scripture that post-dated this historic council.

The link between circumcision, the TORAH, and the Sabbath is clear.

Acts 15:4 - Acts 15:5 (NIV) - And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. ⁵But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.

Both Christians and Jews understood that TORAH law was designed to keep Jews and Gentiles *separate*. The TORAH, with the Sabbath and its dietary laws, had to come to an end before the Gospel could include the Gentiles. While it may not matter what day Christians choose to worship God, choosing to retain the Sabbath as a day of rest is like rebuilding the same wall of separation that cost God so much to tear down. Here is how Paul talks about this concept in Ephesians Chapter 2:

(NIV)Therefore, remember that formerly you who are Gentiles by birth and called “uncircumcised” by those who call themselves “the circumcision” (that done in the body by the hands of men)—¹²remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world. ¹³But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far away have been brought near through the blood of Christ. ¹⁴For He himself is our peace, who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility, ¹⁵by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, ¹⁶and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. ¹⁷He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. ¹⁸For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit. ¹⁹Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God’s people and members of God’s household, ²⁰built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone. ²¹In Him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord. ²²And in Him you too are being built together to become a dwelling in which God lives by His Spirit.

Jews and Christians can now eat together and worship together. The barrier erected by the Jewish ordinances of the Sabbath, the Jewish dietary laws, and circumcision have been destroyed by what happened at the cross.

The Jews, according to the rabbinical writings down through history, have believed the Sabbath was given to them at the Exodus as a sign to differentiate them from all the other peoples of the world. In fact the very words of God Himself explain why He gave the Sabbath to Israel:

Deuteronomy 5:12-15 - “Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the LORD your God has commanded you. ¹³Six days you shall labor and do all your work, ¹⁴but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor the alien within your gates, so that your manservant and maidservant may rest, as you do. ¹⁵Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.”
(N IV-Deuteronomy 5:12-15)

Israel was the only nation ever brought out of Egyptian slavery by God. The Sabbath part of the 10 Commandments would differentiate the Nation of Israel from all the other peoples of the world who were required only to keep the moral requirements of the Noachian laws.

Furthermore, Rabbinical Judaism taught that the Gentiles would be eternally saved if they kept the basic moral laws given to mankind in the Book of Genesis.

As mentioned elsewhere, the concept of Noachian Law is not part of the Jewish Canon's teachings. In other words, the idea cannot be found in the Old Testament as we know it and which both Jews and Christians accept as the inspired Word of God. We present the concept not as true doctrine, but as a way to understand how Jews thought about the subject of The Law.

The rabbinical writings make it very clear that the Sabbath is intended for no one else but Israel, and this concept is very well documented in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. It is no surprise that the Jews would view the Sabbath this way, since they read the books of Moses in their own language. The meaning indicators in Genesis 2 that are invisible to us are perfectly clear to rabbinical scholars who have had special training in the ancient form of the Hebrew language. They have recognized, “from the beginning,” that Moses contraindicated a Sabbath commandment at the time of Creation. In his classic “*A Digest of the Sabbath Question*,” Robert D. Brinsmead says:

The Book of Jubilees (a Jewish pseudepigraphal work of the second century BC) says that “the Creator of all things... did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone” (“The Book of Jubilees,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R.H. Charles, vol. 2, *Pseudepigrapha* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913], p. 15).

Jewish tradition taught that the “**Noachian Laws**” were given to every person on Earth around the time of the Great Flood. As we mention elsewhere, there is only Scriptural support for three of the seven laws. The key point, however, is that the Sabbath was not a part of the Noachian laws. Therefore, the Jews believe that the Gentiles who keep the Noachian laws will be saved without having kept the Sabbath, and there is no indication in the rabbinical records that the Jews ever officially believed otherwise. **God never sent an Israelite prophet to rebuke a heathen nation or city for Sabbath-breaking, but He did so for disregarding the basic principles of REAL morality– in particular violence and sexual evils.**

The logic of set theory demands that one cannot use a trait that is characteristic of all the members of the set to create a subset. **C. S. Lewis** once said that nonsense is nonsense even when you are talking about God. One of the reasons God explained for giving the Sabbath to Israel was to create a sign that would differentiate them from all the other nations of the world. If all the nations, kindred, tongues, and people of the world kept the Sabbath, it would be *impossible* for God to use the Sabbath as a distinguishing sign. In fact God wished to keep Israel separate from the Heathen during the dispensation of the Torah (Exodus to the Cross) for good reasons. The Israelites were a stubborn and stiff-necked people according to God’s own assessment. He knew the Hebrews would easily be corrupted by associating with the Heathen. The ordinances of the Sabbath, circumcision, and the Jewish dietary laws placed a high wall of social separation between Israel and the Gentiles. If people don’t eat together, they are less likely to become friends. Along similar lines, the ordinance of circumcision made it a very painful process for the head of a Gentile household to make a decision to join an Israelite community and to live as a proselyte. Contrast this with God’s expressed New Covenant purpose to tear down this barrier between Jews and Gentiles after the cross. St. Paul was God’s specially designated ambassador of the Gospel to the Gentiles according to Scripture. We credit our reading of the works of **Robert D. Brinsmead** for the concepts I have mentioned in this paragraph.

It should be clear, now, that the Adventist interpretation that only the “ceremonial” laws were nailed to the cross is not possible for a number of reasons. The Sabbath was a ceremonial law designed to keep Israel and the Gentiles separate, and that barrier must come down if Jews and Gentiles are to be united in the Gospel. The Old Testament, as well as Jewish traditional theology, views the TORAH as absolutely inseparable covenant.

At least in the years subsequent to the writing of *From Sabbath to Sunday*, Dr. Bacchiocchi was fully aware of the Jewish concept of the circumcision-Sabbath connection, although he tried his best to discount it. In a later book he acknowledges that the opinion of Jewish rabbinical thought for hundreds of years before the birth of Christ was that the Sabbath was given to Israel at the time of the giving of the manna; that it was given only to Israel; and that circumcision was a prerequisite for both Israelites and proselytes to Judaism for keeping the Sabbath. Here is proof of what he knew, quoting a section of that book. Please keep in mind that the following statement is written by a pro-Sabbatarian, Seventh-day Adventist author. The trouble is that he wrote this at a time when he had unfettered access to scholarly studies that by that time had thoroughly disproved the concept that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance. We are referring again to the definite work of the **D. A. Carson** team. Dr. Bacchiocchi offers no proof that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance, perhaps because there is no proof to offer and all the evidence is against this point-of-view. **We do not approve of the content of the following quoted passage and it does not reflect the opinion of any of us four authors.** The following quote is from Bacchiocchi’s book, *The Sabbath in the New Testament, Answers to Questions*, Chapter 8, “Questions About The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” posted at Dr. Bacchiocchi’s website, Biblical Perspectives.)

QUESTION:

Have not Rabbis and Church Fathers taught that the Sabbath is a Mosaic institution established by Moses for Israel alone? Does not this historical view negate the creation origin and universal validity of the Sabbath?

ANSWER:

Mosaic Institution. Some Palestinian Rabbis and some early Church Fathers did reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance for mankind to a Mosaic institution for the Jews. Their teaching, however, does not negate the validity of the Biblical view of the creation origin and universal scope of the Sabbath, because the teachings of the Scriptures are not "a matter of one’s own interpretation" (2 Pet 1:20).

Jewish Identity. Furthermore, note should be taken of the factors which contributed to the adoption of the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. It was the strong desire to preserve a Jewish identity, at a time when Hellenistic forces were pressing for the abandonment of the Jewish religion, that apparently led Palestinian Rabbis to reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance established for mankind to a Mosaic ordinance given exclusively to Israel.

Such a development occurred in response to the determined efforts of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes to implement a program of radical Hellenization of the Jews through the prohibition of sacrifices and Sabbath-keeping (175 BC). The result was that many Jews fell away, "sacrificed to the gods and desecrated the Sabbath" (1 Macc. 1:43).

Pious Jews passionately resisted the Hellenization efforts of Antiochus Epiphanies, preferring to be slaughtered rather than desecrate the Sabbath (1 Macc. 2:32-38). The need to preserve a Jewish identity at that critical time inspired an exclusivistic and nationalistic view of the Sabbath.

The notion was introduced at this time by some Rabbis that the privilege of Sabbath-keeping was denied to the Gentiles and reserved exclusively for Israel. As stated in the book of Jubilees, "He [God] allowed no other people or peoples to keep the Sabbath on this day, except Israel only; to it alone he granted to eat and drink and keep the Sabbath on it" (2:31). If the patriarchs are sometimes mentioned as keeping the Sabbath, this is regarded as an exception "before it [the Sabbath] was given" to Israel.

A Secondary Development. The notion of the Sabbath as an exclusively Jewish institution, established not at creation for all mankind but by Moses for Israel alone, Makes God guilty, to say the least, of favoritism and discriminatory practices.

It must be said, however, that the notion of a Mosaic origin of the Sabbath represents a late secondary development rather than an original tradition. This is borne out by the fact that in Hellenistic (Greek) Judaism the Sabbath was viewed as a creation ordinance for mankind. Moreover, even in Palestinian literature (both apocalyptic and rabbinic) frequent mention is made of God, Adam, Seth, Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph as scrupulously observing the Sabbath.

Apologetic Need. The early Fathers adopted the notion of the Mosaic origin and exclusive Jewish nature of the Sabbath, to challenge those Christians who defended the binding obligations of the Sabbath commandment in the Christian dispensation. The standard and frequent argument is that the patriarchs and righteous men before Moses did not observe the Sabbath, and thus the day must be regarded as a temporary ordinance, deriving from Moses, and enjoined exclusively on the Jews on account of their unfaithfulness.

The reduction of a creation ordinance to an infamous sign of Jewish disobedience may reflect the need for short-term apologetic arguments, but it lacks a comprehension of the permanent and lofty values placed upon the Sabbath by Scripture.

(Dr. Bacchiocchi, from *The Sabbath in the New Testament, Answers to Questions*, Chapter 8, “Questions About The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” posted at Dr. Bacchiocchi's website, Biblical Perspectives.)

Again, our purpose in providing the above reference from Dr. Bacchiocchi is simply to show that he was well aware of facts that make his Sabbatarian views difficult to sustain.

BRENDAN KNUDSON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE CIRCUMCISION ARGUMENT

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Just because the Jews believed that circumcision was a prerequisite to Sabbath-keeping does not make it true.

AUTHORS: Thanks for acknowledging that the Jews have believed that circumcision is a prerequisite to Sabbath observance.

In order to understand a Jewish book like the *Bible*, you must understand Jewish language, culture, and history. We know that the Jews of Jesus' day believed that neither Gentile proselyte nor Jew could keep the Sabbath without being circumcised. Jesus Himself restricted the application of the Sabbath to Israel by excluding the Gentile “dogs.” It was a group of Jews—the Apostles—who, in apostolic times, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, decided that the Gentile converts coming into the Church did not have to be circumcised. The issue of Sabbath-keeping never arose after the Council of Jerusalem. Even if the Apostles happened to be wrong in their beliefs, this was what they believed, and it was this belief that guided their thinking about what Jewish requirements would be appropriate for the new Gentile converts.

What they believed about the relationship between circumcision and Sabbath observance affected how New Testament writers thought and wrote about it. The truth of the concept is found throughout the Law of Moses. The interpretation of this principle is manifest in how the Jews implemented it throughout their recorded history. Jesus even commented on the relationship between the two ordinances when He pointed out to his Jewish audience that their practice was to circumcise a new baby boy on the Sabbath if the 8th day of his life fell on the Sabbath.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The Bible demonstrates that Sabbath-keeping applied to the uncircumcised stranger who was passing through Israelite territory. The scope of the Pentateuch's teaching about Sabbath-keeping seems to include both the circumcised foreigner and the uncircumcised foreigner.

AUTHORS: Gentiles working within the national boundaries of Israel on the Sabbath would make it difficult for their Jewish hosts to keep the Sabbath. Almost certainly the Law of Moses regulated the foreigner's activity on the Sabbath so the Jews could keep the Sabbath at all times, as well as to prevent a Jew from working by proxy through Gentiles. **The Gentiles rested on the Sabbath only because Jewish law required them to appease their hosts while they were within their gates.**

When they left they were no longer bound by law to keep the Sabbath. They were no more “Sabbath keepers” than the animals within the gates of the Jews, who also rested/ceased. Imagine a Gentile merchant who wants to load the goods he purchased from an Israelite merchant on his camels after sunset on the Preparation Day. He wants his Jewish seller to unlock the storehouse and help him load-up for the long journey back to the Kingdom of Sheba.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: In this, we see that the Sabbath was binding upon the uncircumcised as well as the circumcised, thus demonstrating that its universal nature extended beyond the covenant God had established with Israel.

AUTHORS: God made no covenant with any other nation but Israel. The Law of Moses specified what was to happen within the territorial boundaries of His nation, Israel. The concept of national jurisdiction is recognized by the popular statement, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do.” The provision Brendan cites was enacted to enable the Jews within their own domain to keep the Sabbath without interference from their Gentile visitors. The law also prevented the Jew from using the Gentiles among them as proxy workers. Brendan draws a conclusion then that goes way beyond the confines stated in Scripture regarding the Gentiles who happened to be “within the gates” or borders of Israel. This restriction to territory within the confines of Israel hardly qualifies the Sabbath as being universal in nature.

The Sabbath was definitely a “religious” thing for the Jew, but it was merely a civil provision for the visiting Gentile. The Jew could be stoned to death for picking up firewood on the Sabbath, but there was no provision in the Law of Moses for stoning their Gentile guests who collected firewood on the Sabbath.

ROBERT K. SANDERS: Any Gentile or foreigner that wished to keep the Sabbath was required to obey all the Old Covenant laws which required circumcision. In Isaiah 56, we have the mentioning of the Eunuchs who kept the Sabbath. God told them that they must keep the covenant to be accepted and that the covenant requires circumcision.

Isaiah 56:4-5 (NIV) 4 For this is what the LORD says: “To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me and hold fast to my covenant— 5to them I will give within my temple and its walls a memorial and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: From the time that the Israelites refused to enter the Promised Land at Kadesh, the Scriptures reveal that the Hebrews were forbidden from performing circumcision (Joshua 5:7) and the entire next generation who entered the promised land were not circumcised until they had crossed the Jordan (Joshua 5:2-4). Circumcision was required to partake of the Passover (Exodus 12:43-49) and they did not eat it during all the 40 years in the wilderness until the rite of circumcision was renewed (Joshua 5:11). This fact represents a final blow to the anti-Sabbatarian argument that the Bible concept of circumcision is a barrier to Sabbatarianism.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: Brendan takes great liberty with Scripture, drawing conclusions not necessarily supported by the text. It does not say the Hebrews were forbidden from performing circumcision. The narrative indicates it was something neglected by them. Israel had a nasty habit of forgetting the law given to them down through time. The same can be said for the Passover. Brendan assumes; draws out a conclusion, that they had not kept the Passover for those 40 years in the wilderness. All the narrative does tell us that it was kept by them just prior to entering into the land, along with the next generation undergoing circumcision. Brendan wants desperately to turn this into the “last nail in the coffin” regarding the “alleged” connection between circumcision and Sabbath observance, when in fact all that is demonstrated is the Hebrew's proclivity at ignoring their own law.

KERRY'S RESPONSE: The root of Brenden's objection is based on the errant premise that the Sabbath ordinance is intrinsically moral. The Sabbath started out as an obedience test. Shortly thereafter it was elevated to the status of an obedience test that would distinguish Israel from all the other nations of the world. Because both are intrinsically “ceremonial,” God can do what he wants to with them. The whole world did without a Sabbath for two-thousand years before God gave it to Israel. The whole world went without the ordinance of circumcision until God called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees. God would not be intermittent with moral laws. For example, He would not ever suspend the natural law against adultery. Imagine God punishing Israel by taking away the prohibition against adultery because they had been doing evil! Recall that once God did threaten to take away Israel's Sabbaths:

Hosea 2:11 (NIV) ¹¹I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days—all her appointed feasts.

Note that once Israel crossed the Jordan and became established as a nation, the hierarchy between circumcision and the Sabbath remained unchanged until the time of Jesus, with circumcision, a “ceremonial” point of law, taking precedence over the sabbath. Circumcision remained the gateway to the privilege of keeping the Law of Moses, the Sabbath being the most significant seal of the contract between God and Israel from Mt. Sinai to the Cross.

BARRIER: THE SABBATH IS A TREATY WITH A CEREMONIAL REQUIREMENT IN THE MIDDLE

Robert Brinsmead's intense research prior to the publication of his 1981 essay, “*Sabbatarianism Re-examined*,” uncovered the fact that the 10 Commandments were modeled after the Hittite treaties of the time. (See “*Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*,” George E. Mendenhall, 1954; and “*The Two Tables of the Covenant*,” Meredith Kline, Westminster Theological Journal 22 (1960) 133-146, both available on the Web). Brinsmead says:

The ceremonial nature of the Sabbath law has been confirmed by Mendenhall's 1954 discovery that the Ten Commandments conform to the structure of treaties between Hittite kings and their vassals. Annexed to the stipulations of a Hittite treaty was a provision for a periodic ceremony to rehearse the treaty between the lord and the vassal. Meredith Kline beautifully demonstrates that the Sabbath law in the middle of the Ten Commandments is the counterpart of a Hittite treaty memorial celebration with respect to its provision for the rehearsal of God's covenant. The Sabbath law, therefore, was a law requiring a ceremony of covenantal rehearsal.

The Sabbath was a ceremonial rite given to Israel to help the Chosen People remember that God was the One responsible for bringing them out of the slavery of Egypt. It would be so very much like God to communicate His plan for them in the context of their contemporary culture because the people could understand it better. Moses, in Leviticus 23, lists the weekly Sabbath as one of the many ceremonial festivals given to the Israelite nation to be observed, labeling them “appointed feasts.” The evidence in this section combines with the fact that a study of the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story illustrates the -fact- that the Sabbath could not have been a Creation ordinance. There are two fundamental reasons God listed for giving the Sabbath to Israel, and BOTH specifications have to be met for its consistent application: (1) to help Israel remember that God created the world, and (2) to help Israel remember that God rescued them from Egyptian slavery. At the time of Creation, there was no Egyptian slavery to be rescued from. The specifications for the use of the Sabbath cannot be met for anyone living before the time of the Exodus.

A RESPECTABLE ARGUMENT AGAINST A GENESIS SABBATH: The Theory of Prolepsis

Sabbatarians think that if they can prove that the first Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping as the result of some kind of sinister apostasy, they can prove that the intent of the Sabbath commandment was universal and had to be present in Genesis. Circular reasoning results in the absolute necessity to find a plausible conspiracy theory to explain Sabbath abandonment by the early church. Christian scholars have known for a very long time that there is no such explanation. The fact that the first Christians abandoned the Sabbath on biblical grounds has been remarkably well understood by the larger body of Christians since the earliest roots of the Faith. The Greek Orthodox Church kept excellent records of its ecclesiastical history from the beginning of the Faith, and these records show that they never kept the Jewish Sabbath. Their records demonstrate that the Orthodox churches observed, instead, a Sabbath festival at several times during their liturgical year. This festival sometimes included the celebration of the Lord's Supper, but it was a social occasion that had many of the attributes of what we refer to today as a “party,” including excessive eating and even drunkenness. Unfortunately Sabbatarian writers often quote passages from these early Christian authors that refer to the keeping of the Sabbath festival to support the idea that the Sabbath was widely kept during these centuries. The truth, as conceded by SDA Sabbath scholar, the late Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, is that

Sunday observance was wide-spread by 100 AD and essentially universal by 140 AD. It is not even possible that the Roman Catholic Church could have "changed" the Sabbath. At the same time, we acknowledge that there have always been small pockets of Sabbatarians throughout the history of the church. In fact, Christian groups which kept the Sabbath during the first and second centuries quickly moved into the heresies of Gnosticism and Ebionism and disappeared from the Christian fold. The Church would have perished altogether if it had not been for the Sunday-observing Christians who preserved the purity of the Gospel. Citing the research of former Seventh-day Adventist independent theologian, Robert D. Brinsmead in his essay, "**Sabbatarianism Re-examined**" (1981), The Sabbath-keeping Christians were not the heroes of the Faith. They were its biggest enemies. We will expand on this fact as our study progresses.

MOSES AND THE LITERARY TECHNIQUE OF "PROLEPSIS"

It is tempting to draw a comparison between the reluctance of Sabbatarians, and Evolutionists to give up their beliefs in these highly flawed theories in the face of overwhelming evidence that they are impossible. For example, three absolute barriers to Evolution have come to light through continuing research: **(1)** Evolution defies probability. The chance that even one molecule essential to life could evolve by itself is greater than the ratio of one molecule to all the molecules in the known universe. **(2)** Mutations always result in a loss of information, so the evolution of increasingly complex body structures is impossible. **(3)** Strides in information theory prove that information comes only from an intelligent source, whether the vehicle that carries that information is DNA or the pages of a book. Evolution would therefore require parallel evolution of an organism and the attendant DNA information. Yet, despite the discovery of these impossible road-blocks to Evolution, the vast majority of scientists cling to the belief that simple organisms evolved into more complex ones. Similarly, if you confront Sabbath-keepers with the three absolute barriers to Sabbatarianism, the response is the same. No evidence to the contrary is allowed. It's like watching the black knight in the British comedy, "Monte Python and the Holy Grail."

Both adherents of these respective belief systems act as giant knowledge filters to make sure that no adverse information gets through to their minions. Unfortunately, most Sabbatarians abandon their critical thinking skills in favor of embracing the belief system they have adopted from their leaders—hook, line, and sinker. As William Hohmann observes, to them, the Sabbath law **MUST** be true. He adds that cult research has proven that cult members, after being confronted with overwhelming evidence that their belief system is wrong, usually react by developing a still greater commitment to their beliefs and, astonishingly, become even more zealous in converting others to adopt the cult's teachings. This attitude reflects circular reasoning at its worst. It goes like this. Since the Sabbath is true, there can be no real evidence against it, and since there is no real evidence against it, the Sabbath is true.

One respectable but less-than-definitive argument against a Genesis origin for the Sabbath is the possibility that the author of Genesis used a literary device called *prolepsis* in Genesis 2:2-3 to show the relationship between the events of the 7th day of Creation and the giving of the Sabbath commandment at Mt. Sinai. The Bible is literature. The books of the Bible share many attributes with world literature. We mentioned earlier that failure to understand the linguistics of the original language of the Pentateuch can lead to disaster. The same is true of a failure to understand it as a literary work.

The commentary on Genesis 2:3 in ***John Gill's Exposition of the Bible*** theorizes that since Moses wrote both the account of Creation and of the Exodus, he was likely thinking about both events when he wrote Genesis and Exodus. He chose to show the relationship between the 7th day of Creation and the 4th commandment through ***prolepsis***. *Merriam Webster's On-Line Dictionary* defines this term as "The representation of a thing as existing before it actually does or did so, as in "he was a dead man when he entered." [In regard to] literary [terminology], a figurative device in narrative, in which a future event is ***prefigured***, such as "the destruction of the Vendôme Column and his part in it are foreshadowed in moments of haunting *prolepsis*." Gill explains this way:

And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.

A day in which he took delight and pleasure, having finished all his works, and resting from them, and looking over them as very good; and so he pronounced this day a good and happy day, and "sanctified" or appointed it in his mind to be a day separated from others, for holy service and worship; as it was with the Jews when they became a body of people, both civil and ecclesiastical:

or this is all said by way of prolepsis or anticipation, as many things in this chapter are, many names of countries and rivers, by which being called in the times of Moses, are here given them, though they were not called by them so early, nor till many ages after: and according to Jarchi this passage respects future time, when God "blessed" this day with the manna, which descended on all the days of the week, an omer for a man, and on the sixth day double food; and he "sanctified" it with the manna which did not descend at all on that day: besides, these words may be read in a parenthesis, as containing an account of a fact that was done, not at the beginning of the world, and on the first seventh day of it; but of what had been done in the times of Moses, who wrote this, after the giving of the law of the sabbath; and this being given through his hands to the people of Israel, he takes this opportunity here to insert it, and very pertinently, seeing the reason why God then, in the times of Moses, blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it, was, because he had rested on that day from all his works, (Exodus 20:11) and the same reason is given here, taken plainly out of that law which he had delivered to them:

because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made;

which shows, that this refers not to the same time when God blessed and hallowed the seventh day, which was done in the times of Moses, but to what had been long before, and was then given as a reason enforcing it; for it is not here said, as in the preceding verse, "he rested", but "had rested", even from the foundation of the world, when his works were finished, as in (Hebrews 4:3) even what "he created to make" V5, as the words may be here rendered; which he created out of nothing, as he did the first matter, in order to make all things out of it, and put them in that order, and bring them to that perfection he did.

<http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/gills-exposition-of-the-bible/genesis-2-3.html>

It is possible, then, that Moses, writing about both events, comments on the blessing and the hallowing of the 7th day in Genesis 2 before it took place because in his mind he knew it had taken place in the future.

Brendan possesses a general knowledge of the Hebrew language. He does not, however, exhibit expert level knowledge of Ancient Hebrew. Nor does he speak for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in any official capacity, especially in view of his recent highly controversial activities in regard to the White Estate. He has reviewed our work, having posted refutations of it on the Internet. His challenges are well-articulated, and we will present his objections with appropriate rebuttals throughout this up-dated version. Here are his objections in regard to the concept of *prolepsis*:

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The author's defense [Wynne's] that you can have your cake and eat it too in regard to the possibility that Moses referred to the blessing and the hallowing of the 7th day of Creation as a literary *prolepsis*— is double-speak and amounts to a concession that the blessing and hallowing would have to have taken place on the 7th day of Creation. This concession backs Wynne away from an argument he initially presented as a weighty one.

AUTHORS: The question of WHEN it was actually blessed is insignificant because the real issue is whether one single day got blessed or subsequent multiples of it got selectively blessed at the same time. A special Hebrew usage device clarifies that only one day got blessed. The memory of this ONE is indicated by this literary indicator to have no boundaries. Therefore, there is no room on any subsequent day, whether it be a specific interval of it or not, to "place" any additional blessing on top of it. If something it set aside, it can only be set aside once, unless, of course, someone drags it out of its set aside place and puts it back into regular service again. There is no double-speak here because WHEN does not matter to our position. WHEN is, however, critical to Brendan's assumptive position. There is nothing available to last without boundaries but the memory of its significance. A day can last only 24 hours— an EVENING plus a morning. It can't apply to God's resting because God rested permanently from creating Planet Earth after the 6th day. It can't apply to man because Adam and Eve ended up having to earn their keep by the sweat of their brow. Likely they rested when they got tired because there was no resting pattern imposed on them by Genesis 2:2-3. The question of WHEN the 7th day of Creation got set aside will be addressed when we do a word study of the three key words in the passage. We will look deeply into Hebrew grammar at that time.

Moses would not worry that his readers would think that the 7th day he was telling about lasted any longer than 24 literal hours. Therefore, the only likely reason he would go out of his way to use this special linguistic indicator would be to clarify that it was the MEMORY of this day that was to last forever. At Mt. Sinai He blessed and hallowed a pattern of RECURRING 7th days as a new ordinance for Israel, modeling it after the length and structure of the days of Creation. Unlike what took place during the days of Creation, at Mt. Sinai God indicated that the new Sabbath ceremony was to take place every 7th day thereafter. Since the idea of a fixed calendar had not (so far as we know) yet occurred to human civilization at that time, it would go without saying that the special blessing of the Sabbath would occur on days that were multiples of seven in relation to the new moon. Later in the Old Testament, God tells His people that the Old Covenant will be replaced with a new one that will be very different. The New Covenant says nothing about the requirement to keep new moon sabbaths, annual sabbaths, or weekly Sabbaths.

We do not know if Moses was thinking in terms of *prolepsis*. This concept was developed by a theologian who did not seem familiar with the significance of the absence of the “evening and morning” suffix, but who, at the same time, recognized a number of other absolute barriers to a Genesis origin for the Sabbath. It would be natural for a theologian without expert level training in Ancient Hebrew to comprehend the fact that there is no Sabbath hiding within Genesis 2:2-3 because so many different facts, themes, and principles in the Bible absolutely contraindicate Sabbath-keeping in general for anyone but the Jews. Keep in mind that we believe that there is not enough evidence to prove there is a Sabbath in the Genesis account. Our position is that the blessing, setting aside, and the eternal memorialization of this one day can’t change it into a weekly ritual that governs the behavior of Christians in this world and for eternity in the next.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: No such Hebrew literary device exists. The absence or presence of the evening and morning suffix after the discussion of the events of a Hebrew day does not limit or un-limit it. Rather, the simple absence of it means nothing. The use of this argument represents the logical error of arguing from silence. It is inappropriate for Wynne to challenge Sabbatarians to provide “testimonies” from two experts in Ancient Hebrew that no such literary device exists. We can look at the evidence for ourselves.

AUTHORS: Neither of us is knowledgeable enough in Ancient Hebrew to look at the evidence by himself. We cannot, therefore, pretend the literary evidence of ancient Hebrew does not exist simply because we desire this to be true. Brendan assumes that we can use our knowledge of the English language and limited understanding of the “original” Ancient Hebrew language to evaluate this question. Unfortunately, the very structure of Ancient Hebrew is very different than English, and the language has its own history and culture. We have provided expert testimony for Sabbatarians to consider. This is not an argument from pure silence as Brendan alleges. The sound of this silence is deafening since the “silence” is actually a particular literary device characteristic of Ancient Hebrew that “jumps off the page” when a reader has a native understanding of the original language. The evening and morning suffix puts boundaries on a day—a *yom*. All the first six days have boundaries, and the reason for those boundaries is self-evident. They were task days with the work projects completed within a 24-hour periods of time as defined by an evening plus a morning. The MEMORY of 7th day has no boundaries because its memory is to last forever. A boundary would restrict the command to remember the day only for a limited amount of time.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Wynne’s explanation that the absence of the “evening and morning” suffix phrase gives this one 24-hour day unending attributes of blessing and setting aside (hallowing), thus preventing an recurrence of an application of this blessing and hallowing to future 7th days, is based on the logical fallacy of appeal to authority. The fact that various biblical scholars writing on various continents and at different times in the history of the Church have interpreted this wording to be a special Hebrew linguistic device means nothing. Again, Wynne has exhibited an error of logic by appealing to authority. He has flimsy evidence to purport that he presents a “verdict” in regard to the presence or absence of a Sabbath in Genesis 2:2-3.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: Researchers pour over a variety of expert sources, look for significant correlations and hope to discover and present something new. For example, in this paper, one of our contributions may be a new reason why Jewish writers frequently referred to the Sabbath system as a complete set— annual, monthly, and weekly. In turn, this concept would add still another biblical principle to demonstrate that St. Paul really did target the weekly Sabbath in Colossians 2:14-17.

From the early centuries of the Christian faith, various writers have commented about the anti-Sabbatarian significance of the absence of the “morning and evening” suffix. The VERDICT that there is no Sabbath in Genesis is based on at least four factors: (1) A full set of biblical themes and principles that forbids the structuring of Sabbatarian theology in general. (2) The evidence that the Sabbath cannot be proof-texted back into it, and: (3) the lack of evidence of its existence within Genesis 2:2-3 itself, and: (4) A significant indicator within Genesis 2:2-3 that the existence of one within it is deliberately excluded.

Note that the argument against a Creation origin for the Sabbath from Exodus 16 is unequivocal and that the argument from Exodus 20—that the Sabbath was modeled after the days of Creation—is strong.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: Arguing from authority is NOT necessarily a logical fallacy. An appeal to a supposed authority which really isn't an authority represents an informal logical fallacy. Brendan wants to label our appeal to credible authorities as a logical fallacy, but he is strangely silent over Cotto's appeal to both Sabbatarian and non-Sabbatarian sources, including SDA leaders, who are NOT credible authorities because they do not have proper backgrounds in Ancient Hebrew. So what we really see here is that Brendan's use of a flawed double standard. Credible authorities have supported a conclusion that is contrary to the results he wants. Unfortunately, if we can so easily dismiss the testimony of credible authorities, we can dismiss the conclusions of Seventh-day Adventist theologians and members of the Adventist community who have even less “authority” when it comes to expertise in Ancient Hebrew, including Brendan. Or, we can, as the Seventh-day Adventists do, believe whatever we want to without any true, sufficient, or credible evidence. Brandon's conclusion regarding a logical fallacy actually produces another logical fallacy; an “ad-hominem” where one goes about looking for a way to discredit credible witnesses or authorities.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Wynne's claim that the author of Genesis could still be thinking of the blessing and hallowing of the 7th day of Creation as a flash-forward to the giving of the Sabbath Commandment at Mt. Sinai is ridiculous in view of the book-end restrictions of the author of Genesis' use of the restrictive literary devices of *merismus* and *inclusio*. The use of these twin literary devices is mutually exclusive of *prolepsis*. His arguments side-step the real issue, which is the barrier to prolepsis imposed by *merismus* and *inclusio*. Wynne has ignored it completely by merely insisting on *prolepsis* as if these “excluding” literary devices do not exist. Again, he appeals to expert opinion to support his conclusions rather than the evidence itself.

The chiasmic [often saying the same thing twice but in somewhat different ways] structure of the account of the 7th day of Creation within the inclusion between its book-ends gives emphasis to the main point that the 7th day is blessed and set aside [made holy], which proves that this blessing and hallowing of the 7th day of Creation was equivalent to making it into a Sabbath concept because these things happened within the time-frame of the narrative. This represents a fatal blow to the desperate need of the authors of VERDICT: No Sabbath in Genesis!' to project this blessing and hallowing far into the future at Mt. Sinai. The chiasmic structure of the last verses of this inclusion looks like this:

A1 --- Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

A2 ----- And on the seventh day God finished His work that He had done,

B ----- and He rested on the seventh day from all His work that He had done.

X ----- So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy,

B ----- because on it God rested from all His work that He had done in creation. A1` -- These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, A2` ----- in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.

AUTHORS: It is Brendan who is ignoring the real evidence, which is expert scholarly opinion from multiple sources which all make the same observation. It is the strength of this scholarly opinion that has contributed to shaping our point of view. Both

the concepts of book-ending and *prolepsis* are literary devices common to many languages. If the author of Genesis 2:2-3 actually did use prolepsis here, he did so because writers have the creative power to write things any way they please. We acknowledge that book-ending exists in literature. However, our position is that book-ending does not have the magical powers of exclusion that Brendan ascribes to it. Anything can be placed between the two ends of a book. Furthermore, we do not insist that prolepsis is necessarily the case in this passage. We present it as a possibility that is compatible with the fact that the blessing and hallowing of that one, single day cannot repeat at recurring intervals because the memory assigned to it forever means there is no place on a subsequent day where such a blessing could be set down on it. The 7th day was memorialized, and the memory of that one single day would last forever. Once genuinely and permanently blessed, always blessed. Once set aside, always set aside.

Since neither Brendan nor the authors of this paper are experts in Ancient Hebrew, both parties are dependent on expert testimony when it comes to Hebrew linguistics. The experts have spoken, and what they have said is not acceptable to Sabbatarians. Brendan's reaction is to deny the evidence of experts he cannot refute, along with a thinly veiled ad hominem.

The 7th day of Creation lasted only 24 hours, but the memory of it will last forever. The day a person graduates from college is a very blessed day, and the day for the graduation ceremony is set aside by college leadership. A college graduate will always remember that day without the need for any weekly, monthly, or annual rituals.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Patterns of symmetry in the Creation account explain why the author of Genesis 2:2-3 left off the "evening and morning" phrase after the 7th day. To include it would be to write redundantly. There is no need to resort to creating an imaginary Hebrew literary device to explain its absence. The Creation account contains a symmetrical pattern for the six days of Divine activity. From a state of תהו (tohu) and בְּהוּ (bohu), literally formlessness and emptiness, the first three days describe God's activity in forming heaven and earth and then the second lot of three days see Him filling what He has just formed.

So we see some clear reasons why there should be a symmetrical pattern between the first set of three days and the second set of three days with the words "and the evening and morning were the ___ day". The final (in this case the seventh) in a series where the preceding instances are symmetrical does not have to follow the pattern of the preceding six. It is free to break its own ground to highlight its significance. And according to the established practice of Hebrew linguistics we have noted, breaking from the pattern at a climax highlights and focuses on the climax as the intended destination of the previous steps in the series. What this means is that while the six days of creating were important, the destination was always the seventh day.

Now, while the seventh day omits the pattern of "and the evening and morning were the ___ day", the Hebrew of Genesis 2:1-3 does not leave any excuse to think that this is anything other than an open and closed 24 hour period of time. This revolves around the triple use of the word "day" with the ordinal number "seventh".

The other six days of the creation account refer to the day in the order only once. So we can see "first day" (Genesis 1:5), "second day" (Genesis 1:8), "third day" (Genesis 1:13), "fourth day" (Genesis 1:19), "fifth day" (Genesis 1:23), "sixth day" (Genesis 1:31). In contrast, "seventh day" is mentioned three times in two verses (Genesis 2:2-3). Because the reference of the day is always connected to the phrase "the evening and the morning were the ___ day" in the previous six, while the ordinal number of the seventh day is mentioned three times with highlights on the climax of a series, it is no wonder that the rest of the formula is left off for space constraints to avoid being cumbersome.

KERRY'S RESPONSE: I enjoy the tongue-in-cheek idea that the destination day of Creation Week was the day God created Eve. What a great, incomparable fusion of incredible beauty, grace, and charm, presented to the Universe as the ultimate

achievement of God's creative power, all wrapped up in one gorgeous, unimaginable, heart-stopping package—the first creature in the entire history of the Universe, aside from Adam, to be made in the express image of God. The jaws of every created being in the universe, including the angels, must have dropped in breathless awe as the dust that God had sculptured into Eve sprang to life when it was fused with one of Adam's ribs and she began to talk, walk, and smile. Adam surely must have fainted "dead" on the spot. Even the angels must have been paralyzed with breathless awe as they looked upon her beauty. Perhaps God had to put the breath of life back into Adam to prevent him from suffering death before sin even had a chance to enter the world. None of us would be here today to rest on any day of the week if it had not been for the creation of Eve. Since Creation, every man who has ever lived has enjoyed the truly marvelous beauty and charm of the loveliest life-form ever imagined in the history of the Universe. Therefore, I am not convinced that a day that merely celebrates the finishing of all this creative activity could possibly be more important than the days when creative work was actually accomplished. Not even the Sabbath ordinance itself, which ruled Israel from Sinai to the Cross, held a candle to the supreme importance of Eve's creation.

More seriously, at the time— that is, at the time of Creation Week— the 7th day was presented as no more important than a boundary that marked the eternal end of God's creative work in regard to Planet Earth and the beginning of a new life for Adam and Eve. Its significant but modest importance is illustrated by the action language description of God kneeling down on this day for a moment followed by an announcement that everyone should remember that He ended His creation of Planet Earth on it. Then the story moves on. It was not until thousands of years later that the days of Creation were used as the MODEL for a new cultic ritual that Israel would practice to remind them that God had rescued their ancestors from slavery in Egypt and that He created them.

Is there really any significance to the fact that the 7th day is referred to three times in the passage that discusses the events of the seventh day? Three things happened on the seventh day, whereas only one thing happened on the first six days. However, quantity does not equal "quality." So far this morning I rolled out of bed, got dressed, and had breakfast—not particularly interesting. On the 7th day, God stopped creating, blessed the memory of the 7th day, and set it aside to be remembered forever— not particularly interesting at the time, but still part of the story of what God did. The supreme importance accorded to this day resulted from what happened to it thousands of years later at Mt. Sinai. Using the days of Creation, including the 7th one, as a model upon which to base His Sabbath concept, God did set aside intervals of seven days to be blessed. The story of the 7th day of Creation would be much more significant if God had told Adam and Eve to rest every seventh day thereafter, but He didn't. In fact it doesn't even tell us that Adam and Eve rested along with God. A day that God ceased creating cannot be intrinsically more important than the days He actually made something. The 7th day was not the focus of the days of Creation at the time of Creation. It signified the end of it. It was just another one of the days of Creation, and the story was about another day in the "life" of God. Stuff happened on every day of Creation.

Even if Brendan is right about the focus on the 7th day being produced by Hebrew linguistic structural patterns, focusing a flashlight's beam on it or blasting it with a powerful laser gun will not turn a boundary marker into a cultic ritual.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: These patterns Brendan sees may or may not exist. However, to utilize these patterns to explain the absence of this key phrase is nothing but pure speculation. If you read what Brendan wrote carefully, you will see a duplicity in what he says. Moses wrote with a "pattern of symmetry" regarding the phrase, "and the evening and the morning". Why then does Moses break with his "pattern of symmetry" when it comes to the seventh day? Brendan concludes it was a matter of space restraints and to prevent the narrative from being cumbersome. This self-serving statement helps to demonstrate the difference between what we are presenting as evidence to support our claims regarding the lack of credible evidence in Genesis to support a weekly sabbath there, and how Brendan and other SDA theologians treat their "evidence" as fact. Is Brendan right here, or wrong? What really matters is that Brendan here is speculating, even as we may speculate, the difference being we have no problem admitting when we are speculating. Brendon, et.al. offer speculations as facts engraven in stone.

Brendan then claims there are no linguistic indicators that prevent the reading into the text a weekly sabbath, ignoring the experts in the field. I like to refer to this as "Ostrich theology" where one buries his head in the sand, and pretends evidence contrary to one's beliefs simply does not exist. Brandon would better serve his position by examining the claims of those scholars such as D.A. Carson, and offer up evidence to the contrary instead of just dismissing what they have demonstrated in their scholarly works out of hand.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The fact that the Hebrew word for day, יוֹם (*yom*), has been categorically established as including "evening and morning" over the preceding six ordinal references rules out any attempts to protract the seventh *yom* into an indefinite, unending eternity. An ordinal day has already been defined six previous times as "evening and morning". By the time we get to the seventh, the word is pregnant with this undeniable meaning. A study of the literary features of the Genesis 1:1-2:4 *inclusio* demonstrates the internal reasons for breaking with the pattern on the seventh day.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: Brendan's conclusion appears to dismiss Hebrews 4. Indeed the "day" began and ended, but there is a bit more to the story, for there is a spiritual aspect to this day also, hinting at the nature of the "day" of God's rest, entered into by the faithful, while it is still called "To day" as related in Hebrews 4. God's rest then is not limited to any one day, or multiple of days. Some will enter into God's rest "To day". Some will enter into God's rest "tomorrow" when it then becomes "To day". The weekly sabbath that Sabbatarians so desperately need to find in Genesis 2, which was to be a shadow of God's rest, is not there. What is there is tripped over and unrecognizable due to its association with faith, whereas points of law are not of faith, according to Paul. The Sabbatarian's distinctive is, after all, the sabbath, and without it, they have no distinctive, and the obvious becomes painfully clear and unavoidable; their whole theology is built on lies, and they have been partakers of those lies.

KERRY'S RESPONSE: No one is trying to protract the seventh YOM into an unending eternity for mankind. It is the memory of that one day that this literary device protracts into eternity.

Hebrews 4 talks about a Sabbath rest that never ends for the Christian believer. It points out that Israel never experienced the rest that it was intended to provide even when they had the seventh day Sabbath. Christians will find real rest in the truths of the Gospel that Israel never realized under the Old Covenant. They will experience this rest for eternity.

Apologist Brendan speaks with an impressive knowledge of Hebrew grammar and structure, but as we have pointed out before, his training in Ancient Hebrew is not at the near-native level it would take for him to be familiar with the language's advanced concepts. He would demonstrate better scholarship by deferring to the authorities we have cited who recognize the fact of these literary device's existence—unless, of course, he can find a competent authority to testify that it actually does not exist.

Brendan argues against the limitations of a very specific Hebrew linguistic device with the implications of the characteristics of language in general. Even if he is right about this emphasis, it does not turn one single day in the history of Planet Earth into a cultic ritual that threatens the penalty of death to those who would gather a stick of firewood on it or to an Eskimo who would dare to light a fire in an Igloo during an Arctic winter. Instead, it emphasizes this one day, and only this one day, the emphasis serving the purpose of demonstrating a striking and significant barrier marking the transition from God's creating to His ceasing from creative activity.

Furthermore, informed anti-Sabbatarians do not teach that the concrete actions God took on the 7th day of Creation, including His literal ceasing, took more time than an evening plus a morning. Rather, they teach that the attributes He assigned to this one day memorialized it forever, removing any boundaries to how long it was to be remembered. Anti-Sabbatarians also point out that Genesis 2:2-3 is only an account of what God did on the 7th day of Creation. Brendan's assumption that God intended His action to be an example for man to follow simply because the two things are mentioned together in the same story is not a respectable theory. (We are sure Brendan wished Moses would have supported his assumption by recording Adam and Eve resting the day after they were created).

We have reached the Verdict that there is no Sabbath in Genesis via a wide range of biblical facts, principles, and themes that demonstrate to the point of over-kill that a Sabbatarian belief system is diametrically opposed to the teachings of Scripture and the facts of history. In regard to the historical side of this issue, Sabbatarians seem unable to grasp the fact that Christians did not abandon Sabbath-keeping because of some kind of sinister apostasy-conspiracy. Rather, the first Christians abandoned it on biblical principles, writing about the fact that the Sabbath was not given at Creation, that it was a definitive sign between God and Israel, and so on. The widely Sabbatarian-touted story of how the Catholic Church supposedly "changed the day" is now the laughing stock of the Christian world. Apologist Brendan has been deceived by a religious environment characterized by denial and Ostrich head-burying in regard to the truth about Sabbath abandonment. The early founders of

the Christian Faith argued against a Creation origin for the Sabbath utilizing most of the key arguments anti-Sabbatarians use today. The conspiracy theory of Sabbath abandonment is pleasing to those who want to feel like they are specially chosen by God, but this idea is nothing more than a cherished, self-serving historical fairy tale.

COTTO'S RESPONSE TO THE CHALLENGE: A SERVING OF BALONEY

Amidst this background of ecclesiastical knowledge and a mountain of biblical evidence to the contrary, SDA apologist, Edwin M. Cotto, seeks to convince us that the Sabbath is found in Genesis 2. In subsequent pages we will provide both evidence and proof that no Sabbath ordinance exists in Genesis and that it is impossible to legitimately proof-text it backwards into it. Even Catholic scholars understand the biblical reasons for Sabbath abandonment. While a number of unauthorized spokespersons for the Catholic Church have claimed that the Mother Church changed the Sabbath by arbitrary ecclesiastical authority alone, its official position, expounded on the official website of the Catholic Church, is that the Sabbath was abandoned for the same biblical reasons cited by Protestant and Orthodox scholars.

HEBREW LINGUISTIC DEVICES

We will have much more to say about this subject later. In Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, Moses utilized a variety of Hebrew meaning indicators to clarify that the Sabbath did not exist until the time of the giving of the Manna. Since these Hebrew literary devices convey their meanings through ways that are uniquely characteristic of Ancient Hebrew, they are invisible to those who lack advanced training in it. At this level of linguistics, one must possess a nearly "native" command of the language—difficult, as we have noted, since it evolved from its "original" form of Ancient Hebrew into Modern Hebrew, and then into Aramaic well before the time of Christ. These clarifying indicators may have developed out of necessity to compensate for the limitations of this primitive action-based language. Modern languages are more versatile. Perhaps Ancient Hebrew developed a seemingly wider variety of meaning indicators because of the conceptual limitations imposed on it by being an "action" language based on "root structures." While modern languages such as English may also use textually subtle meaning indicators, the need for them might be diminished by their greater flexibility and resources. Whereas modern languages have an abundance of words which are capable of communicating abstract concepts, Ancient Hebrew usually required the use of a concrete action to represent an abstract idea.

Although Ancient Hebrew utilized idioms, the usage conventions we discuss are not idioms. While a guidebook to Ancient Hebrew idioms would help us recognize them, it is useless to decode the other kind of not-so-obvious literary devices that Moses used in these three key passages. One example of a non-idiomatic indicator is that in Ancient Hebrew, the lack of a definite article before a noun signifies that the whole idea is new. This particular indicator has critical implications for determining what Moses conveyed about the Sabbath in the Pentateuch.

You can't argue with the way people use their own language. When Moses, the assumed author of Genesis, assembled it from oral traditions and authored the remaining books of the Pentateuch, he was so successful in wording the Sabbath-related passages in Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 that those who have possessed a native-like understanding of Ancient Hebrew have not been able to find an actual weekly Sabbath in Genesis. This fact is validated by reviewing thousands of years of rabbinical writings.

THE EVER-CHANGING NATURE OF LANGUAGE

The language spoken by the Children of Israel during the time of the Judges seems not to have fully evolved from the Ancient Hebrew until sometime after the kingdoms of Judah and Israel had become established. Over the hundreds and hundreds of years that transpired between the early kingdoms and the various periods of captivity, Ancient Hebrew evolved into "Modern" Hebrew. These Hebrew languages were very different from one another, including their written characters. Modern Hebrew had a long life-span, but by the time of Christ, the Jews, with the exception of specially trained rabbinical scholars, could not speak, read, or write either of the old Hebrew languages, and they were speaking Aramaic. Both the ancient and modern forms of Hebrew were known only to the rabbis. The Old Testament, whether written in Ancient Hebrew or Modern Hebrew,

had to be translated again into Aramaic. Recall that Jesus read Scriptures about Himself from Aramaic scrolls in the synagogue. By the time of Christ, both the Ancient and Modern Hebrew languages were used only for religious studies. Some rabbinical scholars were responsible for keeping the knowledge of Ancient Hebrew alive, and they used it for specialized work such as studying the Pentateuch in its “original” language. Unfortunately, many Christian scholars have attempted to study the Ancient Hebrew text of the Pentateuch without sufficient training. The results have been disastrous.

The wording of Genesis 2 is unfavorable to the Sabbatarian belief model, especially in view of the fact that Exodus 16 utilizes a full set of specific indicators to clarify that the Sabbath commandment was being introduced for the first time. This fact is not surprising, since, as we recall, the Israelites under the direct leadership of God did not keep their first Sabbath until the 31st day of the Exodus. Finally, Exodus 20 contains four Hebrew usage indicators which clarify that the Sabbath ordinance was a new concept that was merely modeled after Creation week. We will explore these things in detail later.

Scholars are also faced with the challenge that God spoke to the Hebrews in anthropomorphic and cultural terms they could understand. For example, when God talked with Moses, He expressed human-like emotions such as jealousy or anger. Let us not think for a moment that the purity and selflessness of God’s “jealousy” or “anger” could be fully represented by the use of these human terms.

In the Creation story, Moses described God’s Creative work in terms of the action-based language that his readers would understand. However, since the language of the Pentateuch may have developed from Egyptian (or something else) into the Ancient Hebrew language, we should not assume that the anthropomorphic explanations of His activities in Genesis 1 & 2 can be taken with the degree of literalization that would provide a solid basis for the formulation of a universally applicable Christian doctrine. The literalness of God’s “resting” is very important to the concept of Sabbatarianism, yet it collapses unless these anthropomorphic representations can be taken to represent the full reality of His actions. The nature of the Ancient Hebrew language does not give us license to do so. We will be taking a look at these limitations of Genesis 2 in this paper.

WHAT LANGUAGE WAS THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE PENTATEUCH?

Recent archaeological discoveries silence the skeptics by validating the Bible story of King David. However, they also provide evidence we are talking about that the language used during the time of the Judges had not yet evolved completely into Ancient Hebrew. Inscriptions dug up in cities dated to near the time of King David are currently undecipherable, even though there are some rough similarities between the characters they used and those of Ancient Hebrew. The language in which the Pentateuch was originally recorded was almost certainly not Ancient Hebrew. This fact gives us plenty of reasons to make us even more reluctant to construct a major Christian doctrine on two verses from the Pentateuch.

Reflecting on Judaism.Com is a Jewish website that focuses on the theological issues within Judaism. The question of the original language of the Pentateuch is a sensitive one among Jewish scholars. In his essay on the question of the original language of the Torah, lay scholar, Woolf Abrahams, reports that he submitted this question to a variety of Jewish scholars and found no consensus. One professor he consulted, an anonymous orthodox Jewish professor of Jewish History at an Israeli University, provided these comments regarding the question:

The question has some merit but is problematic because you do not define what you mean by Torah. The Torah (as in the Pentateuch) informs us that what was given at Sinai (and this presumes that the events described in the Torah are historical – a rather difficult presumption) was the 10 commandments only. It is pretty clear that the Torah (as we have it now) was written down in stages at a much later period (probably after the setting up of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah) when Hebrew would have been the spoken language, hence it is written in Hebrew. The stories about Abraham and co [Company?] were told and written down in Hebrew without anyone questioning what languages were spoken at that time. The authors had a few other things on their minds when they compiled the Pentateuch... Hence, even the 10 commandments as they appear in the Pentateuch reflect different oral traditions and transmission; hence, it is impossible to know in what language they originally appeared. There were clearly translated at some stage into Hebrew in two similar but slightly different versions as can be seen in Exodus and Deuteronomy. I hope that is helpful.

OSTRICH THEOLOGY: THE IGNORIZATION OF D. A. CARSON

In 1982 a group of biblical scholars under the leadership of D.A. Carson published research that demonstrated conclusively that the linguistics of the Ancient Hebrew text of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 unequivocally prove the Sabbath did not exist until the time of the Exodus. We have other evidence from the Pentateuch that this is so, including the chronology of the Exodus journey.

Without a Creation origin for the Sabbath, the idea that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath collapses. How would a Christian theologian develop a belief model that would justify requiring Christians to keep the Jewish Sabbath when Adam and Eve, Enoch, and Abraham did not keep it? It is no surprise, then, that the **Adventist Defense League** would attempt to re-establish the credibility of the idea that the Sabbath is a Creation ordinance by publishing a new paper, "**The Sabbath in Genesis**," authored by **Edwin M. Cotto**. Assuming the Adventist Defense League offers the best available apology for a Creation origin for the Sabbath, our paper, "**VERDICT: No Sabbath in Genesis**," evaluates and refutes his methods and conclusions. We have quoted or summarized each of his major points, which are followed by appropriate rebuttals. As you have been following in this presentation, we have expanded our discussion to include the objections to our position by another Sabbatarian scholar, **Brendan Knudson**.

Since the Sabbath-Sunday Question is possibly the most complex of all Christian controversies, we ask our readers to study Book II of the 8th Edition of ***Lying for God***, before drawing any final conclusions or contacting us. This subject is so huge that a comprehensive treatment of it, such as is found in our full-length ***Lying for God*** may be necessary to enable the reader to grasp the principles we set forth in ***VERDICT***. Further study is especially important for inquiring Seventh-day Adventists, whose views are further complicated by their additional traditional belief in the Church's prophetess, **Ellen G. White**. She claimed that God showed her the Sabbath "truth" in vision.

Cotto released his defense of the Sabbath-in-Genesis theory over thirty years after a team of biblical scholars, working under the leadership of Evangelical scholar, **D.A. Carson**, published their definitive findings in regard to the Sabbath-Sunday Question in the 1982 book, ***From Sabbath to Lord's Day***. Carson published this research as a rebuttal to an earlier book authored by SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, ***From Sabbath to Sunday***. Carson and his associates laid out a formidable case against Bacchiocchi's research methods and conclusions, each chapter having been researched and written by outstanding scholars with expertise in each area impacted by Dr. Bacchiocchi's claims. Cotto writes as if he is unaware of their work.

While Bacchiocchi explored a variety of Sabbath-Sunday issues in ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, his main focus was to re-establish the credibility of the idea that the so-called "change" of the Sabbath was the result of sinister forces conspiring to destroy the genuine worship of God. In his doctoral studies at the Gregorian University at the Vatican, he discovered that the Seventh-day Adventist teaching that the Catholic Church "changed" the Sabbath was wrong. He was forced to concede that this "change" happened hundreds of years earlier. One of his theories was that the Church at Rome "changed it" between 100-140 CE because it feared that the Roman Empire's persecution of Jews would be extended to Christians because of the SUPPOSED common link of the Sabbath. (The first pope was seated about the year 600 CE.) Another of his theories was that Mithraism— or sun worship— had become popular by this time and had influenced Christians to adopt the same day of worship for utilitarian purposes. These and his other theories had been thoroughly debunked by the Carson team and a variety of other scholars. Bacchiocchi's book, ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, was published in 1977. Virtually all of these conspiracy theories are outlined and refuted in our complete book, ***Lying for God***.

SDA leaders have known for a long time that Ellen White was dreadfully wrong about the Catholic Church changing the Sabbath. Subsequent to the release of Bacchiocchi's 1977 book, ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, SDA Sabbath scholars began developing their own alternate conspiracy theories. Even the General Conference developed one with a team approach. A

plausible Sabbatarian-supportive theory was desperately needed for two reasons. **First**, Carson and his associates had thoroughly discredited Bacchiocchi's ideas, leaving in disrepute the entire concept that sinister forces had worked together to change the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. **Second**, Bacchiocchi's theories conflicted with what Ellen White claimed God told her. Any new theory would have to solve both issues for Adventists, but such was never achieved. Most Seventh-day Adventists, including the majority of the clergy, are unaware of this unsavory history because the source for Sabbath-related things is sifted through the restrictive knowledge filter of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (note that information control is a practice of cults).

The Carson scholars drew from the greatly improved understanding of the diversity of the early church to demonstrate that these conspiracy theories were historically impossible and that the scholars of the Early Church had been articulate in spelling out the biblical reasons for Sabbath abandonment. Unfortunately, Seventh-day Adventist apologists have never acknowledged the existence of Carson's comprehensive research or made any effort to refute it, despite the passage of over 30 years. This is the epitome of Ostrich Theology.

Some years ago, two prominent SDA apologists, confronted with our summary of Carson's work in *Lying for God*, challenged the validity our position on the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20. We asked them to find a Hebrew scholar to refute Carson, but no one has come forward until Brendan Knudson, who, professing a working knowledge of biblical languages, reviewed our book and paper. One of the two apologists who challenged us prior to Knudson had told us that the only Hebrew scholar he knew was a former Hebrew professor of his, **Dr. A. Jerry Gladson**, who very soon afterward abandoned Adventism. (We note that Dr. Gladson was fired by Southern Adventist University for his views on the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment.) He was awarded a Ph.D. in Old Testament Studies from Vanderbilt University and served there as Adjunct Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature upon the completion of his studies.

In light of Carson's unchallenged and definitive work, Cotto is obligated to uncover hidden content, unknown to or misunderstood by the Carson scholars, and found strictly within Genesis 2:2-3, that would cause an expert in Ancient Hebrew to "see" in Moses' account of what God did on this one day an example of what man should do at every interval of seven days thereafter. The pressure on Sabbatarians is more intense than ever, now that we know for certain that Colossians 2:14-17 represents a command from God through St. Paul not to enforce Sabbath-keeping on the Gentile believers. Intense research on Colossians 2:14-17 over the past three decades has been devastating to the Sabbatarian belief model. Multiple angles of evidence have now come together to demonstrate to the point of over-kill that Paul meant exactly what he said. To the already definitive list of research findings, as we mentioned earlier, we add our theory that the Hebrews' use of the lunar calendar may have contributed to the fact that Hebrew writers often referred to all three sabbath types as a set (annual-monthly-weekly). In turn, this fact would provide further evidence that the Sabbath in the third position of Colossians 2:14-17 is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue and, therefore, is labeled an obsolete ordinance.

THE THREE KEY WORDS OF GENESIS 2:2-3

Three key words within the text of Genesis 2:2-3 must be clearly understood to comprehend why the case for a Sabbath in this passage is extremely weak. Of course other factors are involved. We have called bluff on the hand of cards typically played by Edwin M. Cotto, Brendan Knudson, and other Sabbatarian apologists. Now is a good time to review what little substance either side has to work with in this passage. Here is a literal translation of Genesis 2:2-3 from the Ancient Hebrew by Jeff Benner of www.ancient-hebrew.org:

GENESIS 2:2 AND 2:3

And He will much-FINISH (verb) Elohiym in the Day the SEVENTH BUSINESS-him WHICH he did DO (verb) and he will CEASE (verb) in the DAY the SEVENTH from ALL BUSINESS-him WHICH he did DO (verb).

And he will much KNEEL (verb) Elohiym AT DAY the SEVENTH and he will much SET APART (verb) AT him GIVEN THAT in-him he did CEASE (verb) from-ALL BUSINESS-him WHICH he did-FATTEN (verb—in the sense of “to fill up”) Elohiym to DO (verb).

The story we find here has no information useful for developing Christian doctrine. In Exodus 20 and other passages of the Pentateuch, Moses presented the Sabbath as an institution designed to set Israel apart from everyone else. Additionally, the Law of Moses specified that neither Jew nor proselyte could keep the Sabbath without first complying with the Ordinance of Circumcision—a purely Jewish requirement. In the case of Genesis 2, he simply tells the story of what God did on this one day in the history of Planet Earth. As we will point out later, the account doesn't even say that Adam and Eve rested in celebration with God, or that the celebration was to be repeated every seven days thereafter.

These following three things tend to indicate Genesis 2:2-3's lack of support for Sabbatarianism: (1) The Ancient Hebrew verb for “set apart” cannot mean “set aside for religious services.” (2) The Ancient Hebrew verb translated “cease” likely does not mean “rest” in the English sense of “repose.” (3) The lack of the evening and morning suffix, in effect, LIMITS the blessing and setting aside to this one day because it EXTENDS its MEMORY from this one point in time on a continuum which projects into the future with no boundaries. Since this one day has been blessed forever, it is impossible to bless or set it aside again. There would be no point in blessing it again and again by observing a recurring cultic ceremony.

The 7th day's status of being blessed and set aside to be remembered forever resulted from direct assignment by God. By contrast, His eternal resting/ceasing merely resulted of the fact that He didn't do any more creating. No special linguistic indicator is needed to communicate the fact that God's rest lasts forever. As we will point out later, if Adam and Eve had followed God's example, they would have rested that day and never worked again.

To indicate that God had set this day aside, Moses said that God "knelt down" on it. People do not remain in a kneeling position for very long because it is uncomfortable. Apparently the special qualities of this day were to be recognized, but not dwelt upon. His recognition of it, represented only by a quick kneeling down, was commensurate with its limited significance as a boundary day. The implication here is that He set down His creative "wand" and walked away from His work area. Perhaps He headed in the direction of the bowered kitchen where He likely joined Adam and Eve for a celebration banquet. It would seem likely that after they might have enjoyed hours of blessed fellowship together, God might have returned to His usual dwelling place and left Adam and Eve to enjoy their garden home until His next visit. It is difficult not to talk about these things in anthropomorphic terms, but is believable that God appeared to them in a human-like form to which they could relate, since the writer of Genesis records the fact that He walked with them in the Garden.

Benner describes the Hebrew language as an "action" language. The author of Genesis only says that God CEASED on this one day. If Moses had intended to indicate that God reposed on the 7th day, he would have said something like, "God stretched out" on it instead.

THE WORD “BLESSED”

The meaning of the word translated “blessed” is clear in both Hebrew and English. Sabbatarians want the fact that the 7th day of Creation was blessed to mean that every subsequent recurring interval of it was also “blessed.” How would anyone come to this conclusion based on the passage itself if they had not heard about the Sabbath commandment that came into existence thousands of years later? **By indicating that the memory of the blessing and hallowing of this one day had no boundaries, the author of the passage clarifies that the only thing left to do with this day is to remember it.**

It is always important, as we have said before, to keep in mind that Moses was telling a story about what **God did**—not what Adam and Eve did, or what they were supposed to do in the future.

BRENDAN'S OBJECTIONS

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The word “blessed” is parsed as Piel Imperfect 3rd Person Masculine Singular. If the author of Genesis had used the perfect tense of this word, it would have implied a completed action. However, the imperfect refers to an on-going action that was not completed. This implies that every 7th day

thereafter was specially blessed. The Piel verbal form intensifies the verb so that in this instance, the full force would be represented in the phrase, “He caused to be blessed,” rather than simply “He blessed.”

AUTHORS: Simply intensifying the recognition of one single day in the history of Planet Earth does not turn it into a recurring cultic ritual. There is no logic to this assertion at all and no magic to explain how simply making one day stronger than the other ones could cause it to replicate itself after intervals of a certain integer.

Furthermore, the assumption that God intended to establish the length of a “week” to be seven days appears to be contrary to God’s explanation of how man was to keep track of time. The minimum measurement of time specified by God was to be marked by the Moon, or roughly 30 days. Before the Great Flood, one rotation of the month might have equaled 1/12 of a solar year. The only other time marker God specified was the sun, or roughly 360 days. There is no indication that God cared about how man divided up the approximately 30 days of the lunar month except that He gave the moon four phases in which it appears to look the same for seven days at a time. It is not safe to make assumptions about things for which we have no proof when it comes to establishing Bible doctrine. We only know one thing for certain, and that is that at Mt. Sinai, the Mountain of the Moon, a mountain which sat at the edge of the Wilderness of the Moon, God did specify a 7-day length week with a recurring Sabbath. We do know another thing, and that is that the lunar calendar is believed to have been nearly universal in early civilizations. Therefore, it is likely that God intended the 7th day cultic ritual to be referenced to the lunar calendar.

Since the early, ancient civilizations appear to have used lunar calendars, why would we expect still earlier, nomadic clans and small cities to have developed a fixed calendar? Recall the implications of the fact that when God called Abraham, He called him out of a Heathen culture that had almost completely forgotten the worship of the True God.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: the imperfect tense of the verb, blessed, IMPLIES an on-going action that was not completed, and this fact IMPLIES that every 7th day thereafter was specially blessed.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: To the contrary, the imperfect tense of this verb likely indicates that memory of this **one** day is on-going and without boundaries. If God says something is blessed forever, it is blessed forever. This blessing of the 7th day only blesses ONE day forever. Blessing one day does not bless any day that comes after it. Where is the “Thus saith the Lord” for a recurring Sabbath at intervals of seven days in Genesis?

Exodus 16 does not merely imply that the Sabbath is being given for the very first time. It states this fact unequivocally when you combine the description of the events that took place with the defining clarity of Hebrew linguistics. The faint suggestion of a Sabbath presence that might possibly be assumed into Genesis 2:2-3 holds no water against the absolutes of Exodus 16 and the strong evidence that the Sabbath was MODELED after Creation Week found in Exodus 20. Add that to a host of biblical impossibilities that in themselves would contraindicate the idea that Christians must keep the Sabbath, and there is no justification for reading a Sabbath into Genesis. Even Jesus excluded the application of the Sabbath to the Gentile “dogs” when He clarified through the cultural terminology of His day that the Sabbath was given only to “man” – or to the Jews only. Recall that to the Jew, all the other people on Earth were subhuman.

To meet Brendan on his own ground, however, recall that his concept of the book-ended *inclusio* of Genesis 2:2-3 requires that the events told about therein must be interpreted as having completely taken place within the 24-hour boundaries of that *inclusio*. Which of his perceived principles of Hebrew linguistics is stronger? The *inclusio*, or the tense of the verb? If it is the *inclusio*, the idea that the passage could discuss repetitive rituals that extend beyond the bookend is excluded.

The practical way of looking at the question of whether the Piel verbal form suggests a 7th day ceremony that must be observed at every 7th day thereafter for eternity is like this. The author of Genesis 2:2-3 is telling us the story of what God did on this day of Creation. We are only assuming that God must have spent some special time with Adam and Eve on the 7th day to celebrate His creative achievement. No matter HOW INTENSE the blessing of this one and only special celebration the tense of the verb makes it, it does not turn a picnic lunch that he might have celebrated with Adam and Eve into a cultic institution that requires everyone in the world to stop working on the 7th day of a seven-day week or face death by stoning. The Heathen around Israel did not keep the Sabbath. Israel was never sent to rebuke all the heathen people around them because they broke the Sabbath. On the other hand, Israel’s prophets were sent to Israel to rebuke the Hebrews for Sabbath-breaking.

If Brendan's book-end/*inclusio* theory does not stop the 7th day's resting, blessing, and hallowing from recurring at seven day intervals thereafter, a very SPECIFIC Hebrew literary device does, and that is the absence of the evening and morning suffix. This is a real literary device characteristic of Ancient Hebrew which has been recognized by biblical scholars who have written on different continents and over centuries of time.

THE WORD "REST" ("CEASED")

The word for "rest" used in Genesis 2 means "to cease" or "to stop." In Genesis 2, it is the "Qal" form, which has its own specific variant definitions. Note that it is only the **alternate** reading of the **second** definition of the "Qal" form that actually means "rest" in the sense of repose. The word simply means to "cease" or "stop." In Exodus 20, the word commonly translated as "rested" CAN mean "repose," but some authorities point out that its meaning is more precisely rendered as ceasing or stopping. (We will have more to say about this later in our section on Exodus 20.) The ceasing, or stopping—or even the resting—took place on one single day. There is no suggestion here that man is supposed to stop doing anything. The story tells us about what God did. The passage doesn't even tell us that Adam and Eve rested that day because this part of the story was not about them. God's rest from that Creation lasts forever. The **memory** of this ceasing was to last forever. The day itself, however, was 24 hours in duration, like all the other days of Creation. Informed Sabbatarians do not teach that the 7th day of Creation was unending.

STRONG'S CONCORDANCE WORD #7672 – SHABATH

shabath: to

Original Word: שָׁבַת

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: shabath

Phonetic Spelling: (shaw-bath')

Short Definition: to

BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS - SHABATH

shabath: to

Original Word: שָׁבַת

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: shabath

Phonetic Spelling: (shaw-bath')

Short Definition: to

71 שָׁבַת verb cease, desist, rest (As šabātu, probably cease, be completed DIWB ZimKAT 3. 593 (JenZA iv (1889), 277 f. is sceptical); Arabic: cut off, interrupt; Late Hebrew has שָׁבַת neglect, etc., Aramaic שָׁבַת cost of neglect);

Qal 27 Perfect 3 masculine singular שָׁבַת Genesis 2:3 +; 3 plural שָׁבְתוּ Lamentations 5:14, etc.; Imperfect 3 masculine singular יִשְׁבֹּת Hosea 7:4; יִשְׁבַּת Proverbs 22:10 2t.; 3 feminine singular תִּשְׁבַּת Leviticus 26:35; תִּשְׁבַּת Leviticus 26:34; Nehemiah 6:3 +, etc.; —

1 cease: (absolute 13 t.) of seasons Genesis 8:22 (J); manna Joshua 5:12 (P), etc., Isaiah 14:4 (twice in verse); Nehemiah 6:3 +; with מָן Hosea 7:4 3t. [Ed. Note: First, original meaning of the Qal form.]

2 desist from labour, rest: [Ed. Note: Second meaning of the Qal form.]

a. with מָן (of God) Genesis 2:2,3(P). [Ed. Note: The ceasing of God.]

b. מָן omitted, כּ temporal Exodus 23:12 (E), Exodus 16:30; Exodus 34:21 (J), Exodus 31:17 (P); שָׁבַת וּבְקִצֵּיר שָׁבַת Exodus 34:21 (J; i.e., even in these busy seasons).

BRENDAN'S OBJECTIONS

BRENDAN: Not only does the word translated REST mean “repose,” but the fact that this word is parsed entirely as Qal Perfect 3rd Person Masculine Singular causes it to represent a completed action. That is, the “rest” was begun and finished on the day in question. Because of this fact, Anti-Sabbatarians are wrong to teach that the 7th day of Creation was unending and that God’s rest, therefore, lasted forever. The Hebrew does not say that God rested from the Seventh day onwards—only at a time within the Seventh day period of time between the book-ends. So we have several indicators which point to the idea that the rest of the Seventh day was limited to that day alone.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: It is self-evident that God’s rest from creating Planet Earth lasts forever. Again, we teach that the MEMORY of the 7th day lasted forever— not that the “day” did. As noted elsewhere, if Adam and Eve had followed God’s example, they never would have worked again. Anti-Sabbatarians have no problem with the idea that God stopped creating and celebrated His great work on the 7th day. The Qal Perfect may very well indicate that the rest was a completed action— something very easy to understand if you view the word commonly translated as “rest” to be its more accurate meaning— ceased. At some point, God set aside His creative “wand,” and His creative activity was over— completed. Notice that elsewhere we have provided ample evidence that the best rendering of the word “rest” is actually “ceased.” Perhaps God relaxed with Adam and Eve that day in the cool of the garden. This likely action would have been completed when God said “Good-night,” returned to His throne, and Adam and Eve retired for the night in their bower-constructed home. However, there is no reason for Anti-Sabbatarians to invent a perpetual rest for the 7th day for God since He has not worked at creating Planet Earth since the 6th day of Creation. As Brendan stresses, the concept of resting applied to that one day only. He is right about the detail but wrong in its application.

In keeping with the concept that the best rendering of this word is “ceased,” Anti-Sabbatarians are happy with the understanding that this action was completed within this 24-hour period of time. Here is an illustration. A man is chopping wood. His wife calls him in for supper. There is an actual moment when he stops using the ax, lays it down on the ground, and heads toward the house. He continues to have “ceased” chopping wood even when he has arrived at the kitchen. As always, what Anti-Sabbatarians are trying to get across is that this account tells what God did—not what man is supposed to do. Even if God’s action was taken as an example for Adam and Eve, they would have been required to stop what they were doing, kneel down for a moment, and never work again. Remember the example of Jesus cursing the fig tree. Just because his ceasing/resting is mentioned in a narrative that also mentions that Adam and Eve were made in God’s image does not mean that they must repeat His action at every 7th interval thereafter—book-ends or no book-ends.

One way to check one’s logic is to follow an argument to its greatest possible extent. Note that if Brendan’s book-end theory is correct, it would seem that the blessing and hallowing of the 7th day could not apply to any time after the end book-end.

WILLIAM’S RESPONSE: So, we are to believe that God is not resting/ceasing forever in relation to that Creation, but the seventh day, as a Sabbath, which is not even addressed here, mysteriously does last forever, all from the narrative here in Genesis 2? Pull the other leg. Again, Brendan is appealing to his own authority in matters where he claims that to appeal to any other authority is to avail ones-self of a logical fallacy. There is a disjoint in logic with Brendan. God ended His work of Creation on or by that seventh day. He did not pick up where He left off on the next day, whether we want to call it day “8” or a new day “one”. That Creation was finished; over with, and duly noted and memorialized for all eternity.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The Hebrew word translated “rested” in Genesis 2:2-3 does not simply mean “ceased.” Since it implies a formal period of rest, Anti-Sabbatarians are wrong to teach that the 7th day of Creation simply represents a boundary day between God’s creative activities and His non-creating activity. There are linguistic indicators that it is an extended ceasing that is spread out over the 24-hour period of the “yom” day, which, again, is book-ended to form an *inclusio*. This special resting makes it a good candidate for being the first Sabbath ever

observed, and it precludes the Anti-Sabbatarian claim that this passage could be used to teach that the rest that man is required to “observe” is merely an eternal spiritual rest.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: How could simply extending the special resting to cover 24 hours of this one day make it a good “candidate” for the first Sabbath? This argument simply doesn’t follow. Anti-Sabbatarians do not have to demonstrate that God’s resting was less than 24 hours to muster a solid defense. What He did is not indicated to be a pattern for man to follow. God stopped “working” and never worked again at creating Earth. It was never a candidate for the first Sabbath. The story is about what God did. Genesis 2:2-3 doesn’t even say that Adam and Eve rested on the 7th day. Not only is the form of the word translated “rest” better translated “ceased,” but the context, content, and structure of the passage support the concept that the 7th day WAS a boundary day between God’s creating activity and his cessation from that creating activity. God did not indicate that man was to rest on the 7th day of Creation, on any subsequent multiple of it, or some kind of eternal spiritual rest.

WILLIAM’S RESPONSE: Again, Brendan resorts to himself as his own authority, which when applied to anyone else is a logical fallacy. Regardless, it would appear that Brendan attempts to redefine his opponent’s position (again) by saying we claim this is about “observing” an eternal spiritual rest, when in fact what is believed and taught is that this represents a rest one enters into through faith, as contrasted to the weekly Sabbath that was not entered into through faith, and was indeed a shadow of this rest we call “God’s rest” which, the author of Psalms points out is entered into while it is still called “To day”. Is this too cryptic for Sabbatarians? That seventh day shows having an open end thorough the lack of the phraseology found at the end of the other days, so that we understand that God is still in that rest, and we can enter into His rest while it is still called “To day” regardless of which day of the week it presently is. “To day” God is still in His rest. In an allegorical sense, He is still in that “day” of rest. The Sabbath, like so many other physical things found in Scripture, serve as a type or “shadow” of something spiritual; in this case a rest or ceasing that is permanent, as compared to the temporary rest or cessation from labor the Israelite (Jew) enjoyed, and which came about, not every day, but once every seventh-day. Faith had nothing to do with whether they entered into the weekly Sabbath. It came about, regardless. When the day was over, the Israelite had to resume a work that was vain in nature, eventually leading to death, despite their best efforts! Our assurance through faith is that we have passed from death to life. We no longer live a vain existence, seeing as our lives are now hidden in Christ. Our lives have meaning and purpose, where God is at the center of our existence. Can those who blindly kept the shadow weekly Sabbath, whose works God called “. . . evil even from their youth” have any true spiritual value? No more so than one who refrains from murdering another who still possesses that heart of stone where that one harbors hatred for another. Lastly, I cannot help but wonder, if a Genesis weekly sabbath was indeed established for mankind, why God was so cryptic about it that it requires such linguistic gymnastics to flesh it out of the narrative. With all the importance Sabbatarians attach to a Genesis sabbath, there is an expectation it would be plainly so stated. God could not have been more explicit in the instructions given to the children of Israel. But here, in Genesis, the narrative requires contortions of interpretation the likes of which is not found elsewhere in Scripture. It all begs the logical question, “how would one go about establishing a false belief held to be true when there is no plain statement to that effect? Answer? Pretty much the way we see Sabbatarians make the case for a weekly Sabbath instituted at Creation week.

Apologist Brendan: The close proximity of the account of God resting on the 7th day the fact that the newly created mankind were created in God’s “image” shows that what God does at this point is exemplary for what mankind must do. Furthermore, the word translated REST—does not merely mean “ceased.” Therefore, this passage teaches that all people must rest like God did on every 7th interval from the 7th day of Creation.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: It does nothing of the sort! Again, if Adam and Eve did what God did, they would have ceased all activity, knelt down too acknowledge the day, and never to work again. There is no known literary convention in English that establishes that the mention of two such things close together in a written work creates the requirement that an action by the former must be performed by the latter, much less at recurring intervals. I suspect that there is no such literary convention in Ancient Hebrew either. Two writers of the Gospels tell about how Jesus cursed the pretentious fig tree. Jesus’ disciples were in very close proximity to Him when He performed this surprising action. If we apply Brendan’s principle to the cursing of the fig tree, all followers of Jesus would have to curse at least one fig tree.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: Another logical fallacy is a "Non Sequitur." This is where a conclusion is drawn that is not supported by the context. Brendan resorts to this "proximity" argument to convince us that because God's action is close to the mentioning of the fact that man was created in His image, man is required to copy His actions. This is the sort of thing you would expect when one tries to make a case for a belief where there is no "Thus saith the Lord." Do we see any evidence from Scripture this was the case then? Do we see Adam and Eve resting every Sabbath thereafter? Do we see any examples of anyone else prior to Exodus 16 getting the message that God needs be emulated in this regard? The straight facts without extrapolation state that God quit working on that seventh day and that He blessed and sanctified the day on which He quit creating. Anything concluded beyond the scope of this is merely speculative and assumptive. These are methods commonly employed in deceptions.

THE WORD "SANCTIFIED" [HALLOWED]

Using the dictionary definitions below as a reference, observe that the form of the word translated "sanctify," means "consecrated" or "dedicated." The author of Genesis in this passage states that this one single day has been dedicated, or "set aside." The meaning that it is "set aside for a holy purpose" is permitted by this form of the word. In Exodus 20:8 however, the form of this word used is different, and it can mean something akin to be "set aside to be observed." We maintain that the word, "qadash," in Genesis 2:2-3 indicates that this one, single day in the history of Planet Earth was set aside for the holy use of "memorializing" God's completion and cessation of creative activity. Please study the following Hebrew dictionary definitions from two authoritative sources:

Gen 2:3 (KJV) ³And God^{H430} blessed^{H1288} the seventh^{H7637} day^{H3117}, and **sanctified**^{H6942} it: because^{H3588} that in it he had rested^{H7673} from all^{H3605} his work^{H4399} which^{H834} God^{H430} created^{H1254} and made^{H6213}.

STRONG'S #6942 – QADASH

qadash: to be set apart or consecrated Original Word: **קָדַשׁ**

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: qadash

Phonetic Spelling: (kaw-dash')

Short Definition: consecrate

Word Origin

denominative verb from [qodesh](#)

Definition: to be set apart or consecrated

NASB Translation

(1) become consecrated (2), become defiled (1), become holy (1), consecrate (43), consecrated (35), consecrates (7), consecration (2), declare holy (1), dedicate (2), dedicated (8), dedicating (1), holier (1), holy (5), keep (1), keep it holy (2), keep the holy (3), made it holy (1), manifest my holiness (2), prepare (2), prove myself holy (2), proved himself holy (1), purified (1), regard as holy (1), sanctified (9), sanctifies (10), sanctify (12), set them apart (1), set apart (4), set apart the consecrated (2), show himself holy (1), transmit holiness (2), treat me as holy (3), treated as holy (1), vindicate the holiness (1), wholly dedicate (1).

Credit: BibleSuite.Com

BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS – QADASH-STRONG'S HEBREW WORD #6942

Another source, *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, gives the following definitions. Note that a secondary use of this word can mean "to set aside for religious services," but this definition is EXCLUDED from Genesis 2:2-3 but is accepted in Exodus 20 and other later texts. The key area our readers need to focus on is highlighted in yellow, but for best comprehension of the involved principles, please study the entire definition. The first meaning of the exact form of the word as used in Genesis 2 is "to set apart." Editor's notes are in red type and separated from the sources by brackets. Note that this word has at least three forms and that sometimes the different forms have variants with

their respective definitions. The following entry, for example, lists two variants of the Pi'el form with their different meanings and the texts in which those variants are found:

verb denominative be set apart, consecrated (Gerber^{238ff.}); —

Qal Perfect3masculine singular ק' [Exodus 29:21](#); suffix קדשתיך [Isaiah 65:5](#); 3masculine plural קדשו [Numbers 17:2](#); *Imperfect*3masculine singular יקדש [1 Samuel 21:6](#); יקדשו [Exodus 29:37](#) +, etc.; —

1. *be set apart, consecrated, hallowed, of shew-bread* [1 Samuel 21:6](#) (dubious Passage, but compare especially RS^{Semitic i. 436; 2nd ed. 455} [also Dr^{sm.293}], who proposes יקדש); Aaron and his sons by blood [Exodus 29:21](#) (P); other persons [Isaiah 65:5](#) (Di; but

Pi`el Gei RS^{Semitic i. 431; 2nd ed. 451} Che Du Buhl).

2. *be hallowed, by contact with sacred things, and so tabooed from profane use, of forfeited to sanctuary* [Exodus 29:37](#); [Exodus 30:29](#); [Leviticus 6:11](#); [Leviticus 6:20](#) [Numbers 17:2](#); [Numbers 17:3](#) (P), [Haggai 2:12](#).

3. *consecrated, tabooed* (above) [Deuteronomy 22:9](#) (law against mixtures).

Niph`al Perfect. 3 masculine singular נקדש [Isaiah 5:16](#); [Exodus 29:43](#), etc.; *Imperfect*3masculine singular ויקדש [Numbers 20:13](#); 1singular נקדש [Leviticus 10:3](#); *Infinitive construct.* suffix הקדש [Ezekiel 36:23](#); [Ezekiel 38:16](#);
—

1. *shew oneself sacred, majestic:*

c. נ person, + לעיני [Ezekiel 20:41](#); [Ezekiel 28:25](#); [Ezekiel 36:23](#); [Ezekiel 38:16](#); [Ezekiel 39:27](#); with נ [Isaiah 5:16](#); [Ezekiel 28:22](#), compare [Numbers 20:13](#) (P).

2. *be honoured or treated as sacred* "" נכבד [Leviticus 10:3](#) (P); opposed to הללשם [Leviticus 22:32](#) (P).

3. *be consecrated, dedicated, by* י כבוד [Exodus 29:43](#) (P).

Pi`el Perfect3masculine singular קדש [Numbers 6:11](#); [1 Kings 8:64](#), etc.; *Imperfect*3masculine singular יקדש [Genesis 2:3](#) +, etc.; *Imperative* masculine singular קדש [Joshua 7:13](#); קדש [Exodus 13:2](#), etc.; *Infinitive construct* קדש [Exodus 29:1](#) +, etc.; *Participle* מקדש [Exodus 37:28](#); suffix מקדשכם [Exodus 31:13](#) +, etc.; — [Note [Genesis 2:3](#) uses this variant of the Pi`el form, which means, “be consecrated, dedicated, by]

1. *set apart as sacred, consecrate, dedicate:*

a. places: Sinai [Exodus 19:23](#) (J), alter, etc., [Exodus 29:36,37](#); [Exodus 30:29](#) (P), tabernacle, etc. [Exodus 40:9,10,11](#); [Leviticus 8:10,11,15](#); [Numbers 7:1](#) (twice in verse) (P); tent of meeting [Exodus 29:44](#) (P); place of sacrifice [1 Kings 8:64](#) [2Chronicles 7:7](#); gate [Nehemiah 3:1](#) (twice in verse); — [Ezekiel 7:24](#) see מקדש below

b. wave-offering [Exodus 29:27](#) (P).

c. persons: priests [Exodus 28:3,41](#); [Exodus 29:1,33,44](#); [Exodus 30:30](#); [Exodus 40:13](#); [Leviticus 8:12,30](#); firstborn [Exodus 13:2](#) (P); keepers of ark [1 Samuel 7:1](#).

d. 7th day (by God) [Genesis 2:3](#); [Exodus 20:11](#) (P). [Ed. Note: [Gen. 2:3](#) simply means “set apart—not set apart for sacred services.]

2. *observe as holy, keep sacred:* feasts, Sabbath [Exodus 20:8](#) = [Deuteronomy 5:12](#) (Decal.), [Jeremiah 17:22,24,27](#); [Ezekiel 20:20](#); [Ezekiel 44:24](#); [Nehemiah 13:22](#); fast [Joel 1:14](#); [Joel 2:15](#); year of Jubilee [Leviticus](#) [HYPERLINK "http://interlinearbible.org/leviticus/25-10.htm"25:10](#) (P); so עצרה לבעל [2 Kings 10:20](#). [Editor’s Note: this is not the variant of the pi`el form used in [Genesis 2:2-3](#). Therefore, it cannot mean observe as holy, or keep sacred; so it is not responsible interpretation to try to make it mean that the day was set aside for sacred services.]

3. *honour as sacred, hallow:*

a. God [Deuteronomy 32:51](#), his name [Exodus 36:23](#).

b priest [Leviticus 21:8](#) (H).

4. *consecrate* by purification:

Credit: BibleSuite.Com

Here is a summary of Brendan's objections to our interpretation of the word, "hallowed" (sanctified) and our rebuttal:

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The word translated as "HALLOWED" is parsed as Piel Imperfect 3rd Person Masculine Singular. If the author of Genesis has used the perfect tense of this word, it would imply a completed action. However, the imperfect refers to an on-going action that was not completed. This word, properly understood, implies that every 7th day thereafter was specially set aside. The implications of the tense of the verb—a grammatical consideration—trumps the so-called specific Hebrew literary indicator – the absence of the evening and morning suffix clause—and provides evidence that the setting aside of the 7th day means every seventh day thereafter is intended to be set aside. If you allege a literary device in a passage, you had better make sure it fits with all the grammatical senses of the words! Again, the Piel form of the verb intensifies it so that it is most fully represented by the translation, "He caused to be set apart."

AUTHORS: The claim that the use of a tense that means the action was not completed possesses no such magic to transform one day into an endless number of days, much less days that can figure out the neat trick of jumping over six days at a time and landing on the 7th interval of the initial one. How could Brendan explain the logic of this claim? There is no explanation—just a wish and a hope. The incomplete action implied by this choice of verb tense is more likely designed to convey the idea that one day is set aside to be remembered.

In Genesis 2:2-3 the writer does not seem to be trying to say anything profound. He reported what God did on that day. It was set aside as a day that was to be remembered. It was set aside for this express purpose before there was a Jewish Sabbath, and it is still set aside to be remembered after the Sabbath perished at the cross. There is nothing to stop it from being remembered. Christians remember it still even though they don't keep the Sabbath.

Even after the Old Covenant Sabbath ended at Calvary, Paul writing to the Colossians makes it plain to them that it was Jesus that created the world without having a Sabbath ordinance:

Col 1:15 - 17 (NIV) - ¹⁵He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. ¹⁶For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him. ¹⁷He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.

The 7 days of Creation was a member of a set of things God could have chosen to use as a model to design and implement a cultic ritual to remind the Hebrews that He had rescued them from Egyptian slavery. For example, He could have made a five day week based on the four sides of a pyramid for working with the pinnacle point at the top representing the day when their labor stopped as a model for the Sabbath. But when God looked at all of His choices, He decided the Creation one suited His purposes the best.

As always, we are back to a key point of contention. Brendan is a linguist with an impressive knowledge of the Hebrew language. The problem is that he has just enough knowledge to get himself into trouble. Few Rabbis in Israel today have an expert education in Ancient Hebrew, and Brendan would like us to think that he knows enough about this language to act as his own authority in translating its special shades of meaning to us? As a general rule, informed Rabbis throughout the history of Judaism have not taught that the Sabbath existed before the giving of the Manna. Why should Brendan expect to be able to win, on his own steam, against a host of Rabbinical scholars? We have referenced these authorities and others who testify that there is no Sabbath in Genesis, as well as scholars who have explained the significance of the absence of the evening and morning phrase.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: Isn't Brendan arguing both ends here? He insists the day is book-ended when it comes to the exclusion of "and the evening and the morning" phrase, but then he argues the exact opposite when it comes to "hallowed" and "blessed."

APOLOGIST BRENDAN – In his paper, “The Sabbath and Genesis 2:2-3, H. Ross Coe, a Seventh-day Adventist writer, defends the presence of a Sabbath in Genesis very well, using arguments from Hebrew structure and grammar. You need to read his paper. His arguments from Hebrew grammar and structure are strong.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: Understanding this next quote from Coe’s paper, some knowledge of Hebrew’s fine shades of meaning inherent within the tense of Hebrew verbs is needed. I adapted the following explanation from an authority on Hebrew grammar, Ronald J. Williams of the University of Toronto in his *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, Third Edition, by Ronald J. Williams, University Of Toronto Press, Inc., 2007, which is available on Google Books: FACTITIVE PIEL FORM – If a verb has a factitive meaning in the Piel, then the subject of the verb in the Piel causes its direct object to enter a state that can be described by the same verb in the Qal. For example, the subject of the Piel in “he glorified” causes the direct object to enter the state described by that verb in the Qal, as in “he was glorious”. CAUSATIVE PIEL- Whereas “factitive” refers to causing a state, ‘causative’ refers to causing an action. Causative verbs are rare in the Piel and Pual. The subject of a causative verb causes the direct object to do some action. For example, in “They made him sing,” the subject “they” causes the direct object “him” to do the action “to sing,” so the verb “to make” has a causative meaning in that sentence.

Coe, our SDA apologist, argues that the tense of the verb chosen by the writer of Genesis 2:2-3 indicates a degree of immediacy plus an element of a declarative announcement which, to him, conclusively demonstrates that the 7th day was made into a Sabbath ordinance on that very day. Note that we are not able to print the Hebrew characters in this extensive quote from Cole, so Cole’s quote is modified for best understanding without them. We are talking about the Hebrew word for “set aside” in both cases:

The clearest evidence in favor of the Sabbath as a Creation ordinance comes from a close study of the statement, “and he sanctified it” in Genesis 2:3.

Some interpreters have attempted to separate the divine sanctification of the seventh day from the institution of the Sabbath. For example, R.J. Griffith has suggested that at Creation “God blessed and set apart the day for its future use as a day of rest and worship for Israel under the Law . . . In like manner He set apart Jeremiah while in the womb (Jer. 1:5), though his ministry as a prophet did not commence until years later [Richard James Griffith, “The Eschatological Significance of the Sabbath” (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1999), 32, 43-49].]

The difference between Jeremiah and the seventh day is that Jeremiah had to be born, grow, and mature before he could assume the prophetic office, whereas the seventh day is an impersonal abstract object that does not require growth or maturity. However, the most basic problem with this proposal is that it automatically equates the use of the Piel stem [of the Hebrew word to sanctify in Genesis 2:3] with the use of the Hiphil stem of the same verb in Jeremiah 1:5.

Stative Qal verbs . . . form factitives in the Piel and causatives in the Hiphil [Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 400,437.] It is true that factitives and causatives lie so close together in meaning that often “the English tends to blur the distinction [Ibid., p. 438]. However, a good case has been made that there is a real distinction, consisting primarily in the notion that Piel factitives “direct attention to the results of the situation apart from the event,” while Hiphil causatives refer to “the process” involved [Ibid.]. The use of the Hiphil stem [of this verb] in Jeremiah 1:5 would thus stress the process by which YHWH set Jeremiah apart as a prophet even before birth, irrespective of when he might actually assume the prophetic office. However, the use of the Piel stem of [the word for sanctified] in Genesis 2:3 would stress that here is an action whose results are evident immediately, and the canonical picture of the Creation origin of the Sabbath would be clearly affirmed. (H. Ross Coe, “The Sabbath in Genesis 2:2-3, Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 41, No. 1,5-12. Copyright Andrews University Press, 2003.)

It was immediately evident that this one day—the 7th day of Creation—was considered by God to be such a special day that it was to be set aside to be remembered forever, but what kind of magic is there that turns one day into unlimited multiples of itself that go on forever? Perhaps Coe has presented a good case for the 7th day of Creation receiving special recognition at the very time of Creation, but he has not provided any evidence that would explain how the blessing and memory bestowed upon this one day would magically travel six more days down the line and jump on the next 7th day and continue to do that forever—even after this world’s sun grows cold and the eternally saved are living on a new planet going around a new sun in another dimension in another universe. What would happen to the memory of this day on the six days in between?

It is possible to specify the significance of the use of the Piel stem of [the word “sanctified”] in Genesis 2:3 even further. “The factitive Piel can be the result of a sensory causation, causation, a mental change or a speech act that reflects a mental change [Waltke and O’Connor, p. 401]. In cases of psychological causation, the Piel is designated as estimative, while in cases of linguistic causation, it is designated as declarative/delocutive [Ibid., p. 402]. Apart from Gen 2:3 and the reference of Exodus 20:11, the Piel stem of is used, with a period of time as its object, a total of thirteen times in the OT. There is no instance of a “real” factitive Piel in this list, as is to be expected, given the abstract nature of time. However, it is used as an estimative Piel eight times and as a declarative Piel five times. In Genesis 2:3 and Exodus 20:11, the estimative use of the Piel can be ruled out since these texts do not state that God sanctified the seventh day by stopping all activity on it. Instead, they state that he sanctified it because he then ceased his work. Accordingly, the Piel in these instances must be declarative, with an emphasis on the public proclamation of the sanctity of the seventh day right at the time of Creation.” A grammatical analysis of the statement, “and he sanctified it [the seventh day]”; Gen 2:3) thus provides persuasive evidence in favor of the Sabbath being presented here as a Creation ordinance. (H. Ross Coe, “The Sabbath in Genesis 2:2-3, Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 41, No. 1,5-12. Copyright Andrews University Press, 2003.)

No matter how loud you shout something—no matter how magnificently you proclaim something from the top of a mountain—it cannot transform ONE day of resting in the history of Planet Earth into an unlimited number of days of resting in the future. If the memory and blessing of this ONE day is to be remembered forever, the blessing and memory of it have to sit on top of every single day thereafter. This understanding dove-tails nicely in relation to Psalms 95 and Hebrews 4, which teach that Israel never achieved the rest that God had planned for them, Sabbath or no Sabbath.

If the Bible story took us only as far as the crossing of the Red Sea, it would never occur to anyone that multiples of the 7th day of Creation were intended in Genesis 2:2-3. Where is the “Thus saith the Lord” content in Genesis 2:2-3 to establish a doctrine that would affect Jews and non-Jews beyond the known Universe for eternity? It just isn’t there! The story of the Exodus so clearly excludes the possibility of a Creation origin for the Sabbath that any attempt to read one into it betrays a doctrine in search of support.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: What we witness here so far is a case where very specific recent linguistic studies of Hebrew and the precursors of Ancient Hebrew by both rabbinical and Christian scholars with expert backgrounds are summarily dismissed and replaced by extremely general linguistic concepts theorized by non-expert Sabbatarian apologists. What is lacking by the pro-Sabbatarian crowd is any scholarly rebuttal of the linguistic findings by these experts that point out the impossibility of Creation content in Genesis for the establishment of a weekly Sabbath. Instead, they offer up a parallel examination of Genesis 2, drawing opposite conclusions. This does not demonstrate proper biblical scholarship and hermeneutics. It does demonstrate what is commonly practiced as a form of indoctrination. Proper scholarship demands that one examine ALL the evidence to the contrary, and explain, convincingly, using the proper methods of scholarship, why and how the evidence to the contrary does not actually contradict one's position. This has not been done by these Sabbatarian apologists. The linguistic studies of Carson, et. al. were simply dismissed out of hand. They are treated as though they do not exist. The unspoken claim that results is that all the other Hebrew scholars, admittedly with a greater background and understanding regarding Hebrew and the linguistics of Hebrew, got it wrong. It is a fiat declaration, pulled out of thin air. Again, Sabbatarians have provided nothing of substance to demonstrate why and how the greater experts down through history are wrong. All they have done is offer up an alternative linguistic interpretation that contradicts the findings of both Jewish and Christian scholars throughout history. Sabbatarians have a vested interest in the outcome, and judging by the other doctrines they hold true, and the scholarship behind them, we would do well to take what they say and teach with the proverbial dose of salt.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Thus the sum of the evidence is that the *inclusio* serves as a pattern for the continuation of the blessing that began on the initial Seventh day of Creation. The Seventh day of Creation was set aside from the week as holy and the imperfect form of the verb shows that this incomplete action continues in every subsequent week. The Hebrew grammar and literary techniques used by Moses are unequivocal on this point. Without an anti-Sabbatarian bias, it is clear that God intended to continue to spend time with humanity on every Seventh-day after the first one. All the features of this passage come together to show that the Sabbath was an institution God instituted for his *imago dei* to repeat after Him.

AUTHORS: Moses’ choice to use the imperfect form of the verb did nothing of the sort! It is incapable of empowering the blessing of it to skip six days, and land back on a 7th day, and follow this pattern forever after. This is not even a new trick for

a new dog to learn. And how could all of the verb tenses and structures Brendan talks about add up to demonstrate, unequivocally, that God intended to spend special time with the human race every seventh-day thereafter? This assumption is as imaginative as it gets. Unfortunately for both points of view, the Hebrew grammar and literary techniques used in Genesis 2:2-3 do not produce an unequivocal statement useful to either side. Following this method of Bible study, one could prove anything from the Bible. If it isn't there, just put it there!

Putting a halt to all this speculation is Jesus' own statement that the Sabbath was made for man—thus powerfully communicating to His hearers via the cultural "language" of His time that the Heathen "dogs" were excluded.

Colossians 2:14-17 forbids the church to require Sabbath observance of its new Gentile converts. St. Paul, who recorded the chronologically last complete list of sins in the Bible, mentioned 23 things that would keep a person out of Heaven, and Sabbath-breaking was not one of them. St. Paul stated that no day possesses any sacredness in itself.

God rescued the Israelites from the slavery of Egypt. Deductive exegesis readily demonstrates that the 10 Commandments are equivalent to the Old Covenant, the work of Robert K. Sanders being particularly definitive in this case. Sabbath keepers "forget" to "remember" the command that God gave in the Ten Commandments to "remember that they were slaves in Egypt as the reason for "observing" the Sabbath.

Deut. 5:15 (NIV) ¹⁵*Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.*)

(See http://www.truthorfables.com/Sabbath_Not_A_Law.htm)

God said that the Old Covenant was to be replaced with a new covenant that would be very different. Only the Old Covenant included the Sabbath. Furthermore, Sabbath-keeping was permitted only for those who were circumcised whether they were Hebrews or proselytes. The Council of Jerusalem decided against circumcision for the Gentiles, thus settling the Sabbath question forever. You would expect that if the Sabbath were an eternally binding requirement for the people of God, the apostles would have noted it as such when it came to teaching the gentiles.

The Sabbath ordinance is NOT in Genesis 2:2-3. If there was a Sabbath commandment given during Creation Week, the passage does not tell us. It doesn't specify that Adam and Eve rested on it, much less what they were supposed to do thereafter. God accomplished the memorialization of this one day by indicating that the blessing of it was to be remembered without boundaries. This one day was to be remembered as long as there would be people to hear about it. Scripture is full of both evidence as well as proof, that the Sabbath did not exist until the Exodus and that it represented a temporary cultic ritual imposed on Israel between Sinai and the Cross. At the Cross all 613 requirements of the Law of Moses as a codified law perished for Israel.

We are anxious that our readers understand that the subject of the LAW is different from that of the subject of SALVATION. From the best that we can understand from our study of the Scriptures, salvation is through FAITH and its attendant GRACE, alone. Since all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, when it comes to the process of how believers are saved they could not possibly be "under" a codified law set of any kind, or not one person could be saved. The topic of how salvation works is a subject for another book, and to explain it or to understand it fully is very difficult to convey to those who insist on the observation of commands outside the realm of the intent of heart. Salvation is by faith alone and its attendant grace alone. It is difficult for those raised with the cultic belief that they must do works of the law, and if not, they are sinners and will be lost. We are saved by faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ and placed under His grace. The gospel consists of faith, that the blood of Jesus Christ that was shed on Calvary, on our behalf covered our sins, past, present and future, this is His grace. There is nothing we can do to merit salvation as we all are sinners. This is the *gift* of God. If salvation were dependent on any works then it is no longer a gift and Jesus' sacrifice was incomplete. Claiming one must keep the Sabbath in order to be saved, or maintain one's salvation status is to falsify the gospel, no matter how well-intended the belief may be.

John 3:16 - 21 (NIV) ¹⁶“For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that **whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.** ¹⁷For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but to save the world through him. ¹⁸**Whoever believes in him is not condemned,** but whoever does not believe stands condemned already because he has not believed in the name of God's one and only Son. ¹⁹This is the verdict: Light has come into the

world, but men loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil. ²⁰Everyone who does evil hates the light, and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed. ²¹But whoever lives by the truth comes into the light, so that it may be seen plainly that what he has done has been done through God.”

Acts 16:29 - 34 (NIV) ²⁹The jailer called for lights, rushed in and fell trembling before Paul and Silas. ³⁰He then brought them out and asked, “**Sirs, what must I do to be saved?**” ³¹They replied, “**Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved—you and your household.**” ³²Then they spoke the word of the Lord to him and to all the others in his house. ³³At that hour of the night the jailer took them and washed their wounds; then immediately he and all his family were baptized. ³⁴The jailer brought them into his house and set a meal before them; he was filled with joy because he had come to believe in God—he and his whole family.

Rom 5:9 - 11 (NIV) - ⁹ **Since we have now been justified by his blood,** how much more shall we be saved from God’s wrath through him! ¹⁰ For if, when we were God’s enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, how much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved through his life! ¹¹Not only is this so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation.

This one thing we do know, however, and that is that the Holy Spirit leads and guides the “believer”. It seems that those who are saved are those who follow the leading of the Holy Spirit.

HOW THE PENTATEUCH GOT INTO ANCIENT HEBREW

Rabbinical Judaism gives 1391 to 1271 BCE as a likely life-span for Moses, and Christian tradition has assumed a much earlier date (www.crystalinks.com, article, "Moses"). A primitive form of what might possibly be a precursor to Ancient Hebrew appears to have begun to emerge from the Canaanite family of languages not long before the time of King David. This proto-Hebrew language developed into its final Ancient Hebrew form sometime after the reign of King David. Looking at things from the perspective of this time in Israel's early history, the evolution of the language would have been slow. Each generation of scribes might have had to up-date the language in increments, but they would have no trouble understanding the current version they were working with and up-dating it to a somewhat more “modern” usage, much like the *King James Bible* was up-dated in small increments until the current age is well represented by something like *The New International Version*.

The concept that the Hebrew language had not fully evolved into Ancient Hebrew by the time of King David is verified by recent archaeological discoveries of artifacts with inscriptions that date back to the 10th Century BCE, including one found at a dig in a village believed to have been built near the time of the early Kingdom of Judah. While these discoveries have helped establish the authenticity of the biblical stories of the first kings of Judah, they reveal that the written form of the language was only remotely similar to Ancient Hebrew. In fact these inscriptions are currently undecipherable.

The Canaanite group of languages formed a branch of the Northwest Semitic family of languages (*Wikipedia* article, "Hebrew Language"). From Moses through the period of the Judges, God’s people almost certainly spoke a precursor to Ancient Hebrew. The original language of the Pentateuch may have been Egyptian or an early form of the Canaanite family of languages. It may have been re-translated from time to time as the language spoken by Israel evolved during the period of the Judges into the Ancient Hebrew.

The scribes responsible for safe-guarding the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible credited to Moses' authorship) over the centuries between the Exodus and the Captivity undoubtedly confronted significant challenges. This fact should make us more reluctant than ever to formulate a globally applicable Christian doctrine on parts of the Pentateuch that are just telling a story. It is one thing to base a Christian doctrine on a statement credited to God that reads with perfect clarity, such as “Thou shalt not steal,” but it is another thing to base the doctrine that all people must keep the Sabbath for now and eternity on a

passage that tells the story of what God did on a certain day in the history of Planet Earth. All other facets of Scripture teach that the Sabbath was for no one else but the children of Israel. Even Jesus excluded the Heathen "dogs" from the Sabbath. The only possible hope Sabbatarians have to make the Sabbath a universal requirement is to prove there is a Sabbath at Creation. This simply cannot be done without violating proper methods of interpretation and scholarship.

The fact that Moses' books probably went through additional steps of translation prior to settling into its Ancient Hebrew form does not provide any support for the skeptical point of view that the events he described were not real. Even if all of the Book of Genesis came to Moses in oral form, this would be an inadequate excuse to disbelieve the truth of what he wrote. Scholars understand that in many primitive societies, important histories have been memorized word-for-word and passed down from one generation to the next. This process was considered to be sacred.

One of the world's greatest guitarists has an amazing photographic memory. It is not unreasonable to assume that in the early generations of human history, a high percentage of the population had photographic memories that would facilitate the maintenance of highly accurate oral histories.

As the Pentateuch was up-dated into Ancient Hebrew, nothing was placed in the text of Genesis 2:2-3 to suggest that the seventh day was more than 24 hours in length. Nothing was said about either God or man "kneeling down" on every interval of the 7th day of Creation. This day was to be set aside forever to be remembered as the day the creating of Planet Earth was completed. Moses was telling a story, choosing his words carefully to prevent his future readers from seeing things in his account that weren't there. In the translation up-dates between the Exodus and the time when the Pentateuch took its final shape in Ancient Hebrew, the translators were successful in preserving these key distinctions.

Because Moses wrote both the account of Creation and the giving of the Law from Mt. Sinai, he likely recognized the need to make these critical clarifications with the appropriate language "tools" he had at his disposal. If these tools were not characteristic of the original language Moses used, the translators who brought the books of Moses into the Ancient Hebrew used the tools they had to make clear what they understood Moses to mean. Note that if this is the case, they were closer in time to the earlier languages that it might have been written in— perhaps like the translators of the New International Version are in relationship to the translators of the *King James Version*.

Thanks to the inspiration of God through Moses and/or the translators between Moses' original language and the Ancient Hebrew, Israel and its Levitical and rabbinical scholars never generally believed the Sabbath was intended for anyone else but them, and they generally always believed the Sabbath was introduced for the first time in the history of the world with the giving of the Manna. **If you want to understand the perspective of Bible writers on the Sabbath, you must understand the perspective of the Jews on the Sabbath because those who preserved the Bible WERE JEWS THEMSELVES.**

MARK 2:27 CANNOT BE USED TO STUFF THE SABBATH BACK INTO GENESIS

Other than a misreading of Genesis 2:2-3, the only other Bible text that appears on the surface to teach a universal Sabbath requirement is Mark 2:27. All other Sabbath-related passages band together to form a sturdy chain of concepts which work together to teach that the Sabbath was a distinguishing identifier that was designed to rule over Judaism for the duration of the Mosaic Covenant. In Mark 2:27, Jesus said that the Sabbath was "made for man." Later we will demonstrate that by indicating that the Sabbath was intended for the Jewish "humans," versus the Heathen "dogs," Jesus restricted the application of the Sabbath ordinance to the Jews. In doing so, Jesus validated the principle that the Sabbath is subordinate to the Ordinance of Circumcision. He also most likely prevented Himself from an attempted stoning, as the slightest suggestion that the Gentiles were included in the ordinance of the Sabbath would have incited the crowd like almost nothing else.

Recall that elsewhere Jesus illustrated the principle that the Sabbath is subordinate to the Ordinance of Circumcision again when He called attention to the fact that the Jews circumcised a male child on the 8th day of his life even if that eighth day fell on the Sabbath. It is Benner, an expert Hebrew scholar, who says that it is not possible to understand Ancient Hebrew without knowing its cultural context. No better example of this principle can be found than Mark 2:27.

Language changes significantly even over a few centuries. In the King James Era the word "let" meant to hinder or prevent. Now, less than 500 years later it means the opposite— to allow or permit. Imagine a language that changed like this for

thousands of years, and you will understand how language's constant change creates problems for translators working millenniums later! Take the epic poem, *Beowulf*, which is believed to have been composed between the 8th and 11th centuries. Most of its content was written in Old English. Although the language is "English," it is mostly unintelligible to the modern English reader. Today, even a person who speaks English as his or her native language will have to read an English to English translation of it to get very much out of the story.

We will have more to say about Benner later, and the "dog versus human Jews" aspect of Mark 2:27 will be expanded later. For the present, our focus will return to the question of whether there is a good case for the presence of a Sabbath in Genesis 2:2-3.

SABBATARIAN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROOF FROM HEBREW LINGUISTICS

We have EVIDENCE from several perspectives that the Sabbath did not exist until the time of the Exodus, and we have PROOF of it from Hebrew linguistics. The Ancient Hebrew text of Exodus 16 is unequivocal. There was no Sabbath until a week after the giving of the Manna. Carson and his associates identified a variety of Hebrew meaning indicators Moses used to make these distinctions.

Since the Carson research was published in 1982 as a rebuttal to Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's *"From Sabbath to Sunday"* (1977), Adventist leaders have known the facts about the so-called Creation origin of the Sabbath ordinance since no later than 1982. Sadly, when Adventism was confronted with this twin combination of proof and evidence that the Sabbath did not exist prior to the events of Exodus 16, the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not discard its Sabbath doctrine. The "sister" Sabbatarian church to Adventism, The Worldwide Church of God, DID discard its Sabbath doctrine after the Carson research came to light. This fact is extremely significant, since both denominations came out of the very same group of Sabbath-keeping believers that emerged from the aftermath of the Millerite Great Disappointment of 1844.

Until the early 1980's Sabbatarians had never had to face the implications of findings of the highest level of Hebrew linguistics studies to any significant degree. Cotto is unwilling to accept the fatal-to-Sabbatarian meaning of the original Ancient Hebrew text of Genesis 2:2-3 because their work conflicts with his system of cherished beliefs. It is interesting to note that one of the Sabbatarian apologists who helped shape the approach of our paper actually thought he found support for his Sabbatarian reading of Genesis in Benner's research. He wants to believe that a mechanical translation is very good at giving an English-speaking reader a very accurate understanding of the Hebrew writer's intent. The reality is that Benner's work seems to teach nearly the exact opposite.

While Benner believes that the new "mechanical" translation methods enable readers to have a better understanding of the intent of the Ancient Hebrew, he teaches that there are many limitations created by our ignorance of the cultural environment that surrounded the writer at the time. He adds that Ancient Hebrew communicates meaning through structural patterns and usage conventions that transcend word translation accuracy or the understanding of idioms. Sabbatarians, including Cotto, simply cannot accept the possibility that Genesis 2:2-3 does not instruct the reader to set aside every subsequent seven-day multiple of the 7th day by setting aside the one and only 7th day of the days of Creation and that this possibility is negated by a non-idiomatic meaning indicator that the average Hebrew scholar can't even see.

The more one reads Benner's explanations of the difficulties involved in translating Ancient Hebrew into Modern English, the greater the linguistic barriers to finding any real substance in Genesis 2:2-3 appear. According to Benner, Ancient Hebrew is put together using "root" structures. English and other modern languages are more expressively flexible, but not necessarily more "poetic." Languages based on root structures approach the communication of ideas differently than languages that have different operational principles. ***Benner says that in many cases accurate translation of Ancient Hebrew into modern languages is not even possible.***

And, as we mentioned before, Ancient Hebrew is very different than the Modern Hebrew language that evolved from it, including its written characters. Even a modern Jewish scholar may or may not have expertise in Ancient Hebrew. If a significant number of Jewish rabbinical scholars have not completed advanced studies in Ancient Hebrew, it is unreasonable to suppose that more than a tiny fraction of Christian scholars would have this degree of Hebrew expertise. By the time of Jesus even Modern Hebrew was no longer spoken. Jesus read to the people in a synagogue from a scroll written in Aramaic. Only

specially trained rabbis understood the Hebrew and used it for religious studies. Israel as a nation wrote and spoke Aramaic. The scrolls were written in Aramaic, and the rabbis read the Scriptures to the people in Aramaic in the synagogues. Benner clearly does not say that a mechanical translation such as his can communicate all the meaning intended by the writer. At his website he says:

Because the meaning of a Hebrew word cannot be conveyed completely through one or two English words, each word found in the MT [Mechanical Translation] will be included in the dictionary. This dictionary will more accurately define each word within the context of Ancient Hebrew language and culture."

Benner also has this to say about translating Ancient Hebrew into modern languages:

The Hebrew language, as is the case with every language, is closely tied to the culture the speakers and writers belong to. When reading the Bible, whether in Hebrew, English or any other language, it is essential that it be read through the eyes and mind of the Hebrew culture and not one's own culture.

With this new understanding of ancient biblical languages it is easy to see that much that goes into producing a translation of the Bible is unknown to the typical reader. Most Christians assume modern translations represent a close equivalent of the author's original intent. A good example of this fallacy, as I mentioned before, is that once the Jewish culture during the time of Jesus is understood, we see that when He told the Jews that the Sabbath was made for man, speaking in Aramaic, or course, He was excluding the Gentile "dogs." **In this particular case an understanding of what Jesus really said is fully dependent on knowing the language's cultural context.** Jesus spoke these words in Aramaic and His words were recorded in the original language of the Gospel writer who recorded the story. **Note that in this case, the importance of the culture in which His words were formulated transcends the importance of the language in which it was spoken, or even the language in which it was recorded.** However, the solution is not to modify the translation process. The student of the Bible must make up the difference by striving to understand the influences that produced what the writer penned. Concluding that "man" here by Sabbatarians and the SDA means all mankind without examining the cultural influences on the statement only serves to further demonstrate the tendency towards shoddy scholarship when doctrines of questionable authenticity, yet critical to their theology, are at stake. The SDA has a culture of biblical interpretation from its inception that was so poor that even similar sounding words were grounds for a particular interpretation, with no proper examination of the etymology of the words. For example, Easter in the SDA theology is associated with *Eostre* which they define as the goddess of spring, of pagan origination. Yet *Webster's Dictionary* provides this etymology of the word:

Middle English *estre*, from Old English *ēastre*; akin to Old High German *ōstarun* (plural) Easter, Old English *ēast east*.

The true connection is in regards to the association of sunrise in the east with the resurrection or rising of Christ. There is no other legitimate association of the "Easter" in the Christian faith. What this demonstrates for our readers is the proclivity in the SDA culture to use whatever association or interpretation they desire, despite the reputability of the method, in order to achieve the desired outcome; in this case the "poisoning of the well" when it comes to the observance of the resurrection of Christ with the associative word/term: Easter. Is it any wonder or surprise then, given the culture of the SDA, that they would also use whatever means possible to find a Sabbath instituted at Creation, when their theology demands it?

Because of the significant differences between Ancient Hebrew, Modern Hebrew, English, and the cultures they represent, a mechanical translation of one isolated passage of Genesis is insufficient to support the doctrine that God requires all Earthlings to keep the Sabbath for eternity.

CLAIM: JEWISH LINGUISTS ARE INFLUENCED BY GREEK CULTURE IN THEIR INTERPRETATION

The allegation is that the Jews do not believe the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance because they were influenced by Greek culture and that this interference has biased the thinking of rabbinical scholars from classical times onward. He alleges the following:

There are two broadly different Jews living today both biased in perspective viewpoint on Ancient Hebrew. Modern Jews are broadly influenced by Greek thinking. Ancient Hebrew thinking is based on Eastern values which original Hebrew was. Modern scholars doing any Bible study think in terms of Greek culture, not the ancient Hebrew culture.

To the contrary, it is the more mature knowledge of ancient Hebrew culture and linguistics among Christian scholars that has sealed the doom for Sabbatarian theology.

Our Adventist apologist has the “Veil of Moses” over his eyes (See II Cor. 3). Rabbinical scholars did not conclude that the Sabbath was given only to Israel as a result of Greek cultural influences. They studied the Old Testament and arrived at conclusions based on their knowledge of the historical development of their own cultural, linguistic, and scriptural heritage. They did not need any help from Greek influences to see the following principles that are fatal to Sabbatarian theology: (1) No Creation origin for the Sabbath. (2) Sabbath as a sign to set Israel apart from all the other nations of the world. (3) No Sabbath-keeping for Jews or proselytes without circumcision. To the contrary, Cotto demonstrates the Sabbatarian tendency, based on its internal “cultural” influences, by producing a claim that is couched in an accusation. The proper tools of biblical investigation are thus circumvented.

Additionally, Christians understand that the Old Covenant was represented by and is essentially equivalent to the Ten Commandments, and the Scriptures teach that the Old Covenant would be done away and replaced with something radically different—in other words, a New Covenant would replace the 10 Commandments. (This concept is another entire study in itself.)

Many of the fathers of the early church understood these things. The vast majority of the reformers understood these things, and some of them wrote about the obsolescence of the Sabbath, including Martin Luther and, later, the Lutherans who drafted the *Augsburg Confession*. Biblical scholars from the era of Charles I of England through the contemporaries of Ellen White in the mid 1800's understood and wrote about these principles. Farmers, living in the mid 1800's, intent in starting their own religious movement based loosely on the religion of the Puritans, failed to “get the memo.”

CLAIM: THE JEWS ARE WRONG IN BELIEVING THE SABBATH WAS GIVEN ONLY TO THEM

The allegation is that the Jews view the Sabbath as a law for Jews only because they see the Talmud as more important than the Torah. Cotto believes, therefore, that this view is not based on the principle of “*Sola Scriptura*,” i.e. “the Torah and the Torah alone.” He adds, “**The Bible must be its own interpreter!**”

“The Bible and the Bible alone” is a dangerous idea if Benner's precautions are not observed. The Bible cannot be properly understood without a comprehensive knowledge of the culture that produced it and a native-like understanding of the language. One must also consider to whom God was speaking and under what circumstances. Again, there is no better example than the “Dogs versus Jews” cultural understanding that shows us that Jesus did define the Sabbath as strictly for Jews in Mark 2:27, as contrasted to the SDA cultural interpretation of “man” that is based solely on their need. Recall that **even the Canaanite woman who came to Jesus for help for her demon-possessed daughter understood that Jews regarded them a “dogs” in Matt. 15:22-28**. The Sabbatarian dodge regarding the interpretation of “man” (Gr. *Anthropos*) actually supports the “Dogs versus Jews” interpretation as *anthropos* does not always translate as “all men” but rather can and does refer to even one man or any subset of men, such as the Jews. The fact that the Greek word chosen here being *anthropos* only supports the Aramaic/Hebrew concept of “dogs” being exclusionary regarding the rest of mankind. Sabbatarian apologists ignore the cultural implications and language considerations in favor of their desired conclusions.

Properly understood, the books of Moses alone provides all the proof necessary to see that neither Jews nor converts to Judaism were permitted to keep the Sabbath without first meeting the requirements for circumcision. This principle is part of the Law of Moses and is illustrated by both the record of Old Testament Scripture and the rabbinical writings. Recall, once again, that Jesus commented on the subordination of the Sabbath to the ordinance of circumcision when He called attention to the fact that according to the Law of Moses, a male child is to be circumcised on the 8th day of his life even if that 8th day falls on the Sabbath. When the Council of Jerusalem decided that the Gentiles should not be subjected to the Ordinance of Circumcision; the entry sign to the old covenant law, Sabbath-keeping was declared officially closed for the Gentiles in the

early church as a result. In reality it was finished for all the church when Christ died on the cross. Some scholars find evidence that the part of the *Didache* which documents Christians meeting for worship on Sunday was written as early as 53 AD. Paul's last epistle was authored around 63 AD. It was St. Paul who commanded the early church not to enforce Sabbath-keeping on Christian believers in Colossians 2:14-17.

The Jews are correct, therefore, in believing that the Sabbath was only for them. Only the Jews observe circumcision as a religious rite.

SABBATARIAN CLAIM: THE SABBATH IS MORAL SO IT HAD TO BEGIN AT CREATION

Our same apologist declares that the Sabbath is a moral law because we have a body clock that dictates that our bodies rest every 7 days in order to maintain good health. This begs the logical question regarding clean and unclean meats and their associated health benefits. Would they not be "moral" laws also, using this same reasoning?

He says, "[The 7 day bio-rhythm clock is genetically wired into man.](#)" Then he references an article in *Discover Magazine*, entitled "Reading Your Body Clock with a Molecular Timetable Inspired by Flowers."

This article says nothing about a weekly body rhythm. Instead it discusses a daily body rhythm and provides evidence that trying to work against this daily rhythm is detrimental to one's health. As an example, the author mentions lack of sleep— a 24-hour rhythm controlled by an astronomical pattern. Interestingly, there is a body "rhythm" of approximately 28 days with women of child-bearing age. There is no such thing as a 7-day body cycle so far as we know. If any of our readers can provide proof of a 7-day body rhythm, I invite them to submit the research. Even if there was, a good scientist would ask if that rhythm was not induced by the body constantly following a seven-day pattern of activity and would theorize that if a person operated in a culture with a 10-day week if the body would not also create a 10-day rhythm for itself.

Moses explained God's two reasons for giving the Sabbath ordinance to the Hebrews: **(1)** To help them remember that He created them. **(2)** To keep the memory of the fact that He rescued them from slavery in Egypt. The Sabbath rest was given to them as a form of restitution for the 400 years their slave masters did not let them rest. Christians were never slaves in Egypt and they do not need compensation for prior suffering.

No person raised in a Heathen land wakes up to the conclusion that he or she needed to rest one day out of seven, much less determines which one of those days was the "right" one— unless he or she gets a little help from a Seventh-day Adventist missionary.

EVIDENCE FROM THE BOOK OF ENOCH

You can track the cover-up of this problem within Adventism from the 1840's to the present day on our time line of Adventist history. The affinity for a 7-day week among various Heathen civilizations does not seem to depend on a "dim" memory of the seven days of Creation as passed down through the earliest ages of human history, although such is certainly possible. However, since the moon seems to come to a standstill for 7 days at a time during its 28-29 day cycle, a seven-day week would be more likely to develop for astronomical reasons. Quoted in the *Book of Jude*, *The Book of Enoch* discusses the 7-day duration of the four phases of the moon. Purportedly written by Enoch, the 7th from Adam, most scholars believe it was put together from a number of sources about 200 BCE. It makes no reference to the Sabbath or the Mosaic Covenant. A fragment of *The Book of Enoch* which talks about these four phases of the Moon was featured in a recent national exhibit of the *Dead Sea Scrolls*.

The absence of any reference to the Sabbath or the Mosaic Covenant is remarkable regardless of when *The Book of Enoch* was written. If it was written during the pre-Flood time of Enoch, it provides additional evidence— not proof— that the Sabbath was completely unknown to the descendants of Adam and Eve, Noah, and Abraham prior to the Exodus. If the story was fabricated by some well-meaning rabbis a few hundred years before the birth of Christ, those who put it together were careful to make their work credible by avoiding any mention of things that did not exist at the time of Enoch. Either scenario provides additional evidence that the Jews did not believe the Sabbath originated at Creation.

A POINT-BY-POINT ANALYSIS OF EDWIN M. COTTO'S METHODOLOGY

COTTO: THE HEBREW WORD, "SHABBATH," THAT MOSES USED IN EXODUS 20:8 IS NOT FOUND IN GENESIS 2. ALTHOUGH ANTI-SABBATARIANS USE THIS AS PROOF THAT THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF THE SABBATH ORDINANCE IS FOUND IN EXODUS 16, THE EXISTENCE OF THE SABBATH IN GENESIS 2 HAS BEEN ACKNOWLEDGED BY BOTH SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS AND SUNDAY-OBSERVING SCHOLARS.

Cotto hasn't been reading the right books. The quality of one's sources is important. As a claim of evidence, it stands on very shaky ground, when you realize you can make a similar claim regarding "experts" who believe the earth is flat, or that of some scientists and others who insist man never walked on the moon.

Since few biblical scholars have the expertise in Ancient Hebrew to evaluate what is and what is not in Genesis 2:2-3, the opinion of scholars without this advanced Hebrew training can vary widely. The Sabbatarian knowledge filter has not allowed him to find out, for example, that the Sabbath-Sunday Question was completely resolved back in the 1600's when there was a huge crisis which nearly turned England into a Sabbath-keeping nation. One large faction wanted King Charles I, the successor to King James, to require the Church of England to impose the observance of the Jewish Sabbath on the entire country. At the same time the large population of Puritans was pressuring him to require Sunday to be kept in much the same way the Jews kept Saturday. King Charles I turned to his court chaplain, Peter Heylyn, a well-respected biblical scholar, and demanded that he research the subject. Heylyn investigated and reported on every significant historical and biblical fact relating to the Sabbath-Sunday Question that was available up to that time.

By the time Peter Heylyn's exhaustive Sabbath research was published in 1636 (*History of the Sabbath*), he had a vast amount of information to report, including conclusive arguments in favor of an Exodus origin for the Sabbath and proof that the Hebrews did not keep their first Sabbath until over a month after they left Egypt. Thanks to Heylyn's definitive work, the Sabbath-Sunday issue remained largely dormant for the next 200 years. Of course there have always been small enclaves of Sabbath-keeping Christians, and this 200 year period of church history was no exception. (Note that Sabbatarians often quote Heylyn out of context to support Sabbatarian ideas; a further example of Sabbatarian "culture" when it comes to evidence. Heylyn reported on all three sides of the issue, so isolated passages from his book can be irresponsibly used to support the Sabbatarianism which he wrote to refute.) The Sabbath-Sunday Question did not come to the forefront of Christian controversy again until the late Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, began to confront the clergy of the world with his iconoclastic views through the mass marketing his 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*. Bacchiocchi's work was thoroughly refuted by D.A. Carson, who headed a group of some of the finest biblical scholars in a top priority project to evaluate Bacchiocchi's theological ideas and twisted view of the status of the Sabbath during the first thousand years of the Christian Faith. They published their findings in their 1982 book, *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, which included a comprehensive debunking of the idea that there is Sabbath content in Genesis 2:2-3.

Much background information is needed to grasp the water-tight case for the Exodus 16 origin of the Sabbath. As we mentioned earlier, under God's direct leadership the Children of Israel treated Friday nights and Saturdays like any other days of the week until the 31st day of their journey out of Egypt. They left Egypt on a Thursday night and traveled for several days into the wilderness at the onset of their journey, marching and working on Friday nights and Saturday. It is inconceivable that God would lead His people to transgress a so-called "eternal, moral law" just because it wasn't convenient for Him to stop the action so His people could "keep" the Sabbath. Weeks later the Hebrews arrived at the Wilderness of the Moon [Sin] on a Saturday night about 5 pm, having marched across the desert on Friday and Saturday, and didn't keep the Sabbath until a week later. The biblical account of the first Sabbath reports that some of the people behaved as if they had never heard of it before, even collecting firewood on it after God specifically told them not to. (There is no indication that these people were put to death by stoning, which would be in keeping with our expectations of how we might think God would deal with first-time offenders.) Recall, also, that God explained the Manna collection laws on the Saturday evening they arrived at the Wilderness of Sin, but He did not introduce the Sabbath Obedience Test until the following Friday—the day before they actually kept their first Sabbath. See:

THE HEBREW LINGUISTICS OF EXODUS 16

EVIDENCE FROM DEFINITE VERSUS INDEFINITE ARTICLES

A Hebrew keeper of the written records who lived in ancient Israel would instantly recognize that the text of the Pentateuch was carefully worded to clarify that the Sabbath was introduced for the first time in Exodus 16. A biblical scholar who wrote during the time of Ellen White, Robert Cox, F.S.A. (Scotland), published a comprehensive two-volume report on the Sabbath-Sunday Question in 1865. The Seventh-day Adventist Church was organized in 1863. While Cox was reporting on the fatal-to-Sabbatarianism implications of Hebrew linguistics and the chronology of the Exodus on the Sabbath-Sunday Question, Ellen White was spinning her scripturally unsupportable, imaginative tales about Adam and Eve, Enoch, and Abraham keeping the Sabbath. Sabbatarians sometimes quote Cox out of context because like Heylyn, he reported on all sides of the Sabbath controversy. I quote Cox from his 1865 edition of the *Literature of the Sabbath Question*, published that year in Edinburgh by MacLachlan and Stewart, and in London by Simkin, Marshal, and Company— available to all readers as a Google Book:

In the Hebrew phrase here (Exodus 16 verse 23] translated, “the rest of the holy Sabbath,” and in that translated “a Sabbath” in verse 25, and “the Sabbath” in verse 26, the article is wanting; and consequently, instead of using the *definite* English article in the first and third instances, our translators [probably referring to the King James Version] ought to have used the *indefinite*, as they have done in the second instance. The words in verse 23 mean literally, “A resting of a holy Sabbath to Jehovah is tomorrow.” In verse 29, where the article *is* prefixed in the original, we have a correct translation in the phrase “*the* Sabbath,” the institution thus being now spoken of as known to the hearers. This distinction between the 29th and the previous verses in regard to the article, is preserved in the Septuagint, and also in De Wette's translation. Geddes inconsistently gives “a sabbath” in verse 25 and 29, and “the sabbath” in verse 26.

The true rendering of these verses ought to be kept in mind while judging whether or not the Sabbath is in this chapter spoken of as an institution previously known to the Israelites. In reference to that question, see Gen. ii. 3 (p. 3); Exod. xx.8-11 (p. 11); Deut. v. 12-15 (p. 25; Neh. ix.14 (p. 35); Ezek. xx. 12 (p. 44).

Here is an explanation that will help us understand why a proper translation of the definite versus indefinite article was so important to Cox. In the English language an ARTICLE modifies a noun (the name of a person, place, or thing), making it either indefinite (“a” or “an”) or definite (“the”). Unlike English, Hebrew does not have an indefinite article— just a definite article.

Credit to: www.hebrew4christians.com/grammar/grammatical_terms

The linguistic term ANARTHROUS means, in reference to a noun, that it does not have an article, definite or indefinite, before it (e.g. the Sabbath or a Sabbath).

Nouns that do not have an article before them in Hebrew are generally translated into English with the indefinite article (e.g. “a” or “an”). However, in the case where the anarthrous nouns are qualitative, the Hebrew noun is often translated without any article.

Credit to: www.hebrew4christians.com/Grammar/Grammatical_terms

In Hebrew, the occurrence of an anarthrous noun (one without any kind of an article associated with it) carries the significance that the whole idea is new. It is of great significance, then, that the Hebrew word for “Sabbath” in Exodus 16:23, Exodus 20:10, and Exodus 35:2-3 is articular in construction. There are only four places in the Pentateuch where this particular form of the Hebrew word for Sabbath is found, again ***indicating that the noun is a new thing.*** In the three latter

instances this anarthrous construction occurs within a formula (= Work six days, but on the seventh there is a rest.) The combination of the anarthrous construction within a specified formula gives even more support for the likelihood that the intention of Moses was to emphasize that the concept of the Sabbath was new.

There is significant academic recognition of this important characteristic of the Hebrew language. It was researched in depth by **Harold H.P. Dressler** as part of the Carson project. In 1982, he was teaching Old Testament as Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at Northwest Baptist Theological College in Vancouver, BC, Canada. His paper, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament," is one of the chapters in the book, ***From Sabbath to the Lord's Day*** (1982), edited by **D.A. Carson**. Dressler, provided these scholarly references in footnote number 39, p. 37 in ***From Sabbath to Lord's Day***:

39 The anarthrous construction carries significance (i.e. "The whole idea was new") as pointed out by G. Rawlinson, *Exodus* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., 1906), p.52; A. Dillman, *Die Bucher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: S. Hitzel, 1897), p. 175; P Heinisch, *Das Buch Exodus* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1934), p. 133; G. Henton Davies, *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1967), p. 140. This construction of the word [Hebrew characters not renderable in our word processing program, the particular form of the word Sabbath found in this passage] occurs only four times in the Pentateuch, Exodus 16:23; 20:10 (followed in v. 11 with an articular construction) and Exodus 35:2 (followed in v. 3 by an articular construction). In the latter three instances this construction occurs within a formula: "six days work may be done, but on the seventh day there is a Sabbath . . ." The anarthrous construction in Exodus 16:23, 25 is unique and may, therefore, well signify the newness of an idea.

The www.Bible.Ca staff completed an exhaustive linguistics study that provides even further evidence that the Sabbath was introduced for the first time in Exodus 16. Combined with our understanding of the significance of the anarthrous construction of nouns in Hebrew, it is clear that the majority of the scholars who translated the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament into English have recognized the existence of this usage indicator for a long time.

The first time any Jewish holy day is mentioned in Scripture, it always lacks the definite article ("a" Sabbath versus the indefinite "the" Sabbath, for example).

The Jewish holy days are never introduced the first time in Scripture with the definite article "the" but with the indefinite "a" or "an".

This powerful argument provides more than ample evidence that the weekly Sabbath did not exist before Exodus 16:23.

What makes it irrefutable is the fact that every Jewish Holy Day follows this same pattern!

FIRST TIME: tomorrow is a Sabbath: Ex 16:23

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: the Lord has given you the Sabbath: Ex 16:29

FIRST TIME: A solemn rest "a" holy Sabbath: Ex. 16:25

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: "the" Sabbath: Ex 20:11

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: "the" Sabbath: Deuteronomy 5:12

FIRST TIME: "a" memorial: Exodus 12:14

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: afterward, "the" Lord's Passover

FIRST TIME; "an" holy convocation:

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: "the" day of Pentecost: Acts 2:1

FIRST TIME; Unleavened bread: "a" feast: Ex 12:40

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: afterward, "the" feast: Lev. 23:6

FIRST MENTION: "an" altar Gen. 8:20

SUBSEQUENT MENTION: “the” altar: Gen. 8:20

Not all English translations follow this principle with 100% accuracy, however. In Exodus 16 the NIV appears to supply the indefinite article correctly, whereas the King James Version does not. Here is a comparison of the same passage in both translations:

NIV translation of Exodus 16:21-26:

Each morning everyone gathered as much as he needed, and when the sun grew hot, it melted away. ²²On the sixth day, they gathered twice as much—two omers [b] for each person—and the leaders of the community came and reported this to Moses. ²³He said to them, “This is what the LORD commanded: ‘Tomorrow is to be a day of rest, a holy Sabbath to the LORD. So bake what you want to bake and boil what you want to boil. Save whatever is left and keep it until morning.’” ²⁴So they saved it until morning, as Moses commanded, and it did not stink or get maggots in it. ²⁵“Eat it today,” Moses said, “because today is a Sabbath to the LORD. You will not find any of it on the ground today. ²⁶Six days you are to gather it, but on the seventh day, *the* Sabbath, there will not be any.”

King James translation of Exodus 16:21-26:

And they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating: and when the sun waxed hot, it melted. ²²And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. ²³And he said unto them, This is that which the LORD hath said, Tomorrow is *the* rest of the holy Sabbath unto the LORD: bake that which ye will bake to day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. ²⁴And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. ²⁵And Moses said, Eat that to day; for to day is a sabbath unto the LORD: to day ye shall not find it in the field. ²⁶Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is *the* Sabbath, in it there shall be none.

BRENDAN’S OBJECTIONS TO ANARTHROUS CONSTRUCTION ARGUMENT WITH OUR REBUTTALS

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The argument from anarthrous construction, which in Hebrew suggests that the whole idea is new, is highly questionable. Even Wynne’s expert witness, Harold H. P. Dressler, quoted in D.A. Carson’s (editor) book, *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*, is tentative in his mention of this idea, stating only that “The anarthrous construction in Exodus 16:23-25 is unique and may, therefore, well signify the newness of an idea.” He even delegated the mention of this to a footnote, suggesting that it wasn’t particularly important.

KERRY’S RESPONSE: The arguments available to support the concept of no Sabbath before the giving of the manna are so strong that these other arguments were the focus of Dressler’s work. The complete quote of Dressler’s footnote lists support for his idea from four prominent biblical scholars who wrote between 1897 and 1967 on two different continents. Dressler appears to be utilizing scholarly restraint—a trait that both Brendan and the three of us could strive better to emulate. Dressler is also correct. This argument is not conclusive in itself.

WILLIAM’S RESPONSE: Taking one argument of many, and one piece of evidence from among many, and disparaging this one item does not in turn discredit all the evidence and proofs available. You will find this approach to be a common ploy whenever people are defending a weaker position. In turn, they demand that every point of “evidence” that they produce be addressed. They never admit to being wrong, no matter how persuasive and airtight the evidence. Brendan offers no explanation as to why Dressler is wrong. He sees no reason to truly address the evidence. He merely dismisses it based on the perception of it all being of minor importance and lacking credibility. If we were to treat the Sabbatarian’s arguments in such a manner, they would be screaming foul.

Brendan offers no evidence from any credible sources that would disparage the significance of the anarthrous construction in these key texts. What is self-evident to anyone, willing to look at all the available examples, is summarily dismissed by Brendan based solely on his own bias.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Two important books about Hebrew linguistics do not say anything about the significance of anarthrous construction, including *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* by Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka and *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* by Bruce K Waltke and M. O'Connor.

KERRY'S RESPONSE: A careful reading of our presentation includes an extensive section on the significance of the anarthrous construction of the word, Sabbath, in various passages related to our study. Brendan fails to mention that we cite a variety of sources that go back at least as far as the early 1600's (Peter Heylyn's *History of the Sabbath*) that mention it. No book on any subject can cover every possible aspect. Most likely the authors of these two books were not interested in the Sabbath-Sunday question, and they were not fortunate to have stumbled across it. The argument applies to the introduction of new Jewish holy days only—something that would be easy for researchers to miss who had no particular interest in Sabbath-Sunday issues.

WILLIAM'S RESPONSE: For someone who at first was intent on making an accusation regarding the alleged use of a logical fallacy; "an appeal to authority", Brendan has now availed himself of a number of true logical fallacies. Here, we see an attempt to provide evidence based on a negative-- an argument based on silence. Can we ask a few logical questions? Does the omission of evidence in one book negate the evidence of another? Is Brendan offering us a reasonable explanation regarding the actual evidence, or is he out to seeking ways to disparage the evidence through association or the lack of association with other scholars in the field? This comes across more like a dodge rather than a scholarly response.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: There is a logical reason for the anarthrous use of šabbāṭ in these texts - that the word šabbāṭ was an intrinsically definite noun! Divine names, Human names, Place names, most pronouns, unique appellatives, certain cosmological elements and human institutions, unique titles are all intrinsically determinate – not needing the article! The anarthrous use of šabbāṭ in its first literary reference by that name in Exodus 16 (and many places thereafter) shows that it was already an established institution recognizable by the Hebrews! The use of the article with šabbāṭ after it has been mentioned in the context without the article is not uncommon in Hebrew. In such cases it acts as a weak demonstrative.

AUTHORS: Brendan would do well, here, to provide us with an authoritative source to support his claim that what he says about important proper nouns not needing an article in front of them is true. If the Ancient Hebrew language provides that self-evidently important Hebrew nouns do not need to be introduced by an article, why in the Old Testament Scriptures do subsequent mentions of Jewish holy days ALWAYS have the definite article before it and initial mentions of them NEVER have articles before them? Brendan's theory makes no sense when applied to the mention of Jewish sacred days. Also, note that Brendan proposes a general principle of Hebrew to challenge a specific Hebrew literary convention—a convention that can be easily validated by checking out how the mention of Jewish holy days is handled in the original Ancient Hebrew text or a Hebrew-English interlinear translation.

In fact, if Brendan is correct, he bestows an ever higher degree of credibility to our theory of anarthrous construction. It would mean that in every instance Old Testament writers went out of their way to make an exception to a general grammatical rule to comply with a special rule that regulates how the mention of Jewish holy days is to be handled in Hebrew. To the contrary, it appears that the SPECIAL principle in this case trumps the GENERAL principle. If a Jewish holy day, such as the Sabbath, is self-evidently important and needs no article before it, we should never find a mention of it that has an article before it. Would not the presence of such an article suggest, in this case, that the holy day was not self-evidently important?

The only claim we have really made is that in every case, when a Jewish holy or feast day is mentioned in the Old Testament for the very first time, it is preceded by an indefinite article and that every subsequent mention of it features a definite article in front of it. (Actually, you may recall that in Hebrew there is no such thing as an indefinite article, but rather in the case where an indefinite article would precede it in English, no article precedes it at all. In a proper English translation, the presence of the equivalent of an indefinite article is indicated by the article "a," as in "a Sabbath.") Before incorporating the argument from anarthrous construction, we took the time to work through a Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible to see if we could find even one

instance where a Jewish holy or feast day did not follow this principle, and we could not find one as long as common sense linguistic principles of context were considered.

We cannot speak for Hebrew nouns in general. Brendan comments about the example of the word, altar, mentioned in the early chapters of Genesis. The rule is followed even there, but he argues that the concept of an altar was probably in place before the altar was mentioned in the story. Whatever, the best way to refute Brendan's argument is to find an example of where a Jewish holiday, feast, or holy day is mentioned for the very first time in the original Hebrew that is preceded by a definite article. We make no claims for ordinary nouns. To do so would seem to present an unreasonable task for any Hebrew writer, who would have to look at every noun he used to make sure that if he had never mentioned it before, he could not put an article ("the") before it.

A NEW TESTAMENT EXAMPLE OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEFINITE VERSUS INDEFINITE ARTICLES

Thomas Preble was the first Millerite to write in favor of keeping the Jewish Sabbath. It was his pro-Sabbath tract entitled, "Tract, Showing That the Seventh Day Should Be Observed As the Sabbath," reprinted from an article he had published in the early Advent publication, *Hope of Israel* in the Feb. 28, 1845 issue, that influenced the parents of J. N. Andrews, the future wife of Uriah Smith, and Joseph Bates to become Sabbath-keepers. It was Joseph Bates who introduced the Sabbath to Ellen White. However, he kept the Sabbath only until mid-1847, at which time he repudiated his own work. (Credit to <http://www.imsmedia.org/adventist-pioneers/thomas-m-preble>.) In 1867 he published an expose of the cult of Adventism in 1867 entitled ***The First Day Sabbath Clearly Proved***. You can find it in Google Books. While he incorporated many of the same anti-Sabbatarian concepts that are used against the 7th day Sabbath doctrine today, his main thesis was that at the Cross, the Jewish Sabbath of the 7th day of the week, ended, and the Christian "Sabbath" began. He called attention, among other things, that in Genesis the only principle for Sabbath-keeping is that the human race should work six days and rest one day. His argument is difficult to follow, but fighting to understand it is worthwhile for many reasons:

Did the Lord Jesus keep the seventh-day Sabbath? He evidently did, as he was "made under the law" (Gal. 4 : 4), and was "circumcised;" He no doubt observed the Sabbath, as it ought to have been observed at that time; although his manner of keeping it, however, was such that the Pharisees accused him of breaking it, because he did not observe their traditions, which they had connected with the observance of that day. There is no doubt but the women mentioned in Luke 23:55, after they had "prepared spices and ointments" for the body of Jesus, returned and rested the Sabbath-day according to the "commandment ;" yea, the "fourth commandment."

Good, says the Sabbatarian. And I too say, Good ; because I have no doubt of its truth. But when this matter shall be critically examined, I think all candid minds will acknowledge that this was the last seventh-day Sabbath ever kept according to the commandment: as I believe the following facts will abundantly prove. The original Greek words for Sabbath, as found in the New Testament, in their singular and plural form, are *Sabbaton*, and *Sabbata*. The number of times these words occur in the New Testament is sixty-eight. They are found in different books, as follows : in Matthew, eleven times ; in Mark, twelve times ; in Luke, twenty times ; in John, thirteen times; in Acts, ten times; in 1 Corinthians, once; and in Colossians, once. These words are transferred (not translated) into our English version, in all, fifty-nine times ; and thus called Sabbath, or Sabbath-days, etc. But the translators saw fit to render the word *Sabbaton*, by the word "week," in nine cases out of the whole number sixty-eight, and these nine cases are found in the following places : in Matthew 28: 1; Mark 16: 2, 9; Luke 18: 12; 24 : 1 ; John 20 : 1, 19 ; Acts 20 : 7 ; 1 Corinthians 16 : 2. In Matthew it reads, "In the end of the Sabbath [*Sabbaton*], as it began to dawn toward the first [day, is a word supplied by the translators] of the week [*Sabbaton*], came Mary," etc. In Mark : "And very early in the morning, the first of the week [*Sabbaton*], they came," etc. "Now when Jesus was risen early the first of the week [*Sabbaton*], he appeared," etc. In Luke: "I fast twice in the week [*Sabbaton*], I give tithes," etc. Now upon the first of the week [*Sabbaton*], very early in the morning," etc. In John: "The first of the week [*Sabbaton*] cometh Mary Magdalene early," etc.

"Then the same day, at evening, being the first of the week [*Sabbaton*], when the doors were shut," etc. In Acts: "And upon the first of the week [*Sabbaton*], when the disciples came together to break bread," etc. In 1 Corinthians: "Upon the first of the week [*Sabbaton*] let every one of you lay by him in store," etc. Now let us turn back to Matthew 28:1, and see if we can ascertain the true import of this word "week," as it has been thus found in the cases above referred to. It appears that the word *Sabbaton*, as found in this verse, occurs twice, and in both instances it is in the plural, form ; and this being the case, the true rendering of the passage requires us to read it, in substance, like this : At the end of Sabbaths, in the beginning of the first of Sabbaths, etc. Or as Mark has it: And very early in the first of Sabbaths (lit. of one of Sabbaths), etc. But Luke and John appear to have it still stronger: And in the first of the Sabbaths, etc; **the definite article the being placed before the noun *Sabbaton***. Now it is evident that if the translators had transferred the word *Sabbaton*, in these nine cases just examined, as they did in the other fifty-nine instances above referred to, then we should have had less difficulty than we now have, and we should see that at the end of the seventh-day Sabbaths (or at the end of the Jewish Sabbath — which was given to the "children of Israel" to be a "sign" unto them "throughout their generations"-- there would be the beginning of the Lord Jesus Christ's day, or "Sabbath." Or in other words, where one series of days ended, there another series of days began. And this change of days was marked by the most important events that ever transpired in the history of man. "The veil of the temple was rent in twain," "the middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles, was "broken down," and thus they were "made both one."

Here are our observations:

1. This theory deserves some consideration, but it needs to be evaluated by linguists who have special training that gives them a near-native understanding of biblical languages.
2. Biblical scholars are interested in the significance of definite versus indefinite articles even in different languages. It is not safe to ignore the implications of these articles, but arguments based on them are probably insufficient to prove a point without support from other textual evidence.
3. Literal translation of words and phrases from one language into another is often impossible. Notice that the King James translators had to make decisions about how the words for Sabbath in Greek were to be TRANSFERRED into English. It is not safe to build key Bible doctrines on just one, or even just a few, texts that are not definitive when taken in themselves and in their context.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE MANNA AND SABBATH OBEDIENCE TESTS

J. N. Andrews, the first Advent Movement Sabbath scholar, theorized that some aspects of the "Manna Test" given to the Hebrews in the early verses of Exodus 16 suggest that the Israelites were already familiar with the Sabbath. He pointed out that God didn't seem to feel the need to explain His reason for the six days of work followed by one day of rest at that time. Our analysis of his manna argument resulted in these findings that are not favorable to this claim:

1. There is no indication in the Exodus 16 verses to specifically suggest that the people were familiar with the Sabbath concept. **If the Israelites were familiar with the Sabbath, they would not need to have been told not to gather manna on the 7th day, since that would represent work.**
2. The Hebrews had just come out of Egypt, which utilized a 10-day work week. This is probably the reason why the first mention of the Sabbath in Exodus 16 is the full form of the word, meaning: "*a sabbatical celebration, a holy sabbath*" (Dressler, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament," Chapter 2 in D.A. Carson (ed.), *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*).

3. In Exodus 12, when God explained His instructions for the ordinance of the Passover, He did not mention the Sabbath Day when one would expect Him to have done so. He instructed them to continue preparing food on the seventh day of the Passover Week— a task forbidden by the Sabbath-keeping laws He gave them later:

“This is a day you are to commemorate; for the generations to come you shall celebrate it as a festival to the LORD -a lasting ordinance. For seven days you are to eat bread made without yeast. On the first day remove the yeast from your houses, for whoever eats anything with yeast in it from the first day through the seventh must be cut off from Israel. On the first day hold a sacred assembly, and another one on the seventh day. Do no work at all on these days, except to prepare food for everyone to eat—that is all you may do. Exodus XII, 14-16 (NIV)

4. The Manna obedience test stands on its own without any dependence on the Sabbath because during the week the Hebrew people were instructed to gather no more than an Omer for each person. A significant number of the people broke this new law right away, gathered more than they needed for the next day, and found that the extra portions rotted.

Then said the LORD unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. – Exodus 16:4

5. Andrews says this chapter suggests that the Israelites were familiar with the work-six-days/rest-on-the-7th-day pattern because they did not agitate for an explanation regarding it. Arguments from silence are among the weakest ones. Note that God seems to have chosen the 7 days of Creation because it was an easy formula to remember. It would seem that if God spoke something to any of us out of a cloud and it was readily understandable, we would not agitate for an explanation of it. God is a good communicator—the best ever.

6. The wording of the passage identifies the Sabbath requirement as an obedience test. If the Israelites were keeping the Sabbath up to that point, they would have had their obedience tested continually along the way. Perhaps a different kind of obedience test would have been appropriate in that case.

7. Recall the expert sources which indicate that there is evidence that the Egyptians, like many of the civilizations of the time, observed a pagan “sabbath” that was based on the four phases of the moon and elements of fertility rites. There is evidence that when God gave the Sabbath to Israel on Mt. Sinai, He took a cultural concept that they were already familiar with, cleansed it of its pagan and fertility connotations, and presented it to Israel in a newly redeemed and holy form.

BRENDAN KNUDSON’S OBJECTIONS TO THE MANNA OBEDIENCE TEST ARGUMENT

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Perhaps the clearest evidence that the Sabbath preceded the giving of the manna is the conversation God has with Moses at the start of the chapter which gives the reason for the giving of the manna.

Exodus 16:4 - "Then the LORD said to Moses, 'Behold, I am about to rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day, that I may test them, whether they will walk in My Law or not.'"

AUTHORS: Because Brendan assumes that there was a Sabbath prior to the Exodus, he views Moses' instructions regarding the Manna as primarily a Sabbath obedience test. Observe that at the beginning of the week, shortly after the Children of Israel arrived at the edge of the Wilderness of Sin and complained that God had called them out of Egypt to starve them to death in the desert, God gave Israel Manna, along with collecting and keeping instructions which included acquiring a double

portion on the 6th day of the week. At this point God said nothing about the double portion having to do with a Sabbath that would occur on the 7th day. All week long the Israelites tested God by deviating from His Manna-collecting instructions, finding that if they collected more than an omer per person, and kept it overnight, the excess spoiled. It was not until the 6th day of that first “Manna week” that God explained that this double portion was in preparation for a new special day He called the “Sabbath.”

The Sabbath concept focused on the cessation of labor whereas the Manna collection instructions regulated a work process. Some of the Israelites collected excess Manna in defiance of God’s special instructions. Then, some of them gathered firewood on the Sabbath in defiance of God’s special instructions. There were two obedience tests, and Israel failed them both. Combining both the Manna and Sabbath regulations, there was a number of rules, or “laws” that Israel could break and did break. He had commanded them to collect the manna and keep the Sabbath. Brendan’s claim that God was chiding them for breaking a Sabbath commandment that existed prior to the Exodus is completely unnecessary and has the effect to adding things to this passage of Scripture that is not there.

The plain sense of the use of the term “law” here would indicate that whatever God commanded of them or instructed them to do was “law.” It could also easily connote that which was to follow; a codified law to govern them. If, from the perspective of God, they could not follow the simple commands and instructions being given them regarding the manna and the Sabbath, He could hardly expect them to keep any other commands and instructions that were to follow. The example here revolving around the Sabbath and the manna “test” indicate that they were not going to walk in His law. It should be noted that Christians are called to walk in faith and that the Christian law is a law of faith (Rom. 3:27). The Old Covenant law is described by the apostle Paul to not be of faith. Romans 3:27 covers another relevant issue:

Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. – Romans 3:27 (KJV)

In the law of faith, there is no boasting. In the law of works (do this, don’t do that; keep this) one could conceivably boast, such as a boast in keeping the Sabbath. Do Sabbatarians boast in the Sabbath? Most assuredly. It is their distinctive. It is what they claim delineates a real Christian from a false one. One of the real issues here is whether Sabbath-keeping relates to faith, or a practice that has the potential for boasting.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: In the writings of the 10th and 11th centuries of the Current Era, some rabbis interpret some places in the account of Moses’ experiences in Egypt, prior to the Exodus, as evidence that Moses attempted to bring Sabbath-keeping reform to the Hebrew slaves and that the resting that resulted from that attempted reform was the reason that Pharaoh decided to double-up on their work-load. They have written stories about this.

AUTHORS: There is nothing wrong with the Jews writing religious novels. Christian authors write Christian novels. We have never claimed that rabbis who have not had the rare and special advanced education in the Ancient Hebrew form of the Hebrew language have not viewed the Sabbath as a Creation ordinance. It is not strange that some of them would write imaginative accounts of what they conceived might have taken place during the period of Egyptian slavery. If a rabbi was not one of the chosen few to receive expert level training in Ancient Hebrew, but instead received only training in Modern Hebrew, the striking contraindication of a Creation origin for the Sabbath found in Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 might be obscure to him. The word, “sabbath,” simply means rest. The fact that the Sabbath is introduced to the Hebrews as a totally new concept as well as a test of obedience in Exodus 16 seems to argue forcefully against a previous existence. Keep in mind that just like some of the people who discarded God’s instructions regarding the collection of the manna prior to the introduction of the Sabbath, some of them chose to challenge the new Sabbath law almost immediately after God gave it to them.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: It can be seen here that God already considered the Sabbath His law which He intended to test/train them in by the giving of the Manna. Combined with the fact that the first reference to šabbāṭ is without the article and therefore considered an established proper name, it is evident that the Sabbath pre-existed the Manna as God’s Law and as we have seen, that ordinance was established during Creation week. The first references by name to šabbāṭ in Exodus 16:23-26 lack the article not because something new is being introduced, but because even at this stage it was already considered a proper noun.

In looking at the example given of the first explicit mention of an altar in Genesis 8:20 in light of the sacrifices implied in Genesis 3 and 4 and the mention of 7 of every clean animal being taken onto the ark, we can see that altars were implied to have existed from the fall of man. Indeed, the context of the passage, with the introductory reference by God that He was to "test them" according to His "Law". All of this fits with what we learned by studying the Hebrew of Genesis 1-2 in Creation week where God instituted the Sabbath as an example for His "Image" in Adam and Eve to keep to.

AUTHORS: We addressed Brendan's theory earlier. To our rebuttal, we add the fact that all the other holy days given to Israel subsequent to the giving of the Sabbath reflect the fact that their first mention has an anarthrous construction and every subsequent mention of it is preceded by a definite article. It is wrong to add words to Scripture. Where is the "Thus saith the Lord" for the idea that merely mentioning the Sabbath in the same story that discusses the fact that Adam and Eve were made in God's image requires that man follow God's example of resting? With this assumed license to add words to Scripture, Brendan can make God's Word teach anything he wants. Here is an example of this kind of thinking taken to the level of the absurd. In the same New Testament story about how Jesus was taken prisoner in the Garden of Gethsemane, it states that Judas went out and hanged himself. Therefore, we illogically conclude that if a Christian leader is ever taken captive in the presence of his followers, they are to go out and hang themselves.

A MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE EXODUS JOURNEY

We introduced this subject to you at the very beginning of this paper. Here is more information, including documentation, for this key argument against a Sabbath prior to the Exodus, followed by Brendan Knudson's objections and our rebuttals.

A theologian characterized by Cox as "pious and profoundly learned," Joseph Mede (died 1638), developed evidence that the Israelites did not keep the Sabbath on their way from the Dead Sea crossing to the camp at the Wilderness of Sin. Here is what he said, quoted by Cox in *The Literature of the Sabbath Question, Vol. I*, pages 155-156. Keep in mind, for the moment, that the entire context of Mede's comments is an argument that the Christians are obligated to keep one day out of seven, since the Sabbath was given at Creation Week, but that which day out of seven they keep doesn't matter, since the Sabbath was probably "re-set" to the day the Hebrews marched out of Egypt at the time of the Exodus. However, we are mostly interested in Mede's analysis of the time and events of the journey from the Red Sea to Mt. Sinai that proves that the Israelites did not keep the Sabbath during the first 31 days of their journey:

Certain I am the Jews kept not that day for a Sabbath till the raining of manna. For that which should have been their Sabbath the week before, had they then kept the day which afterward they kept, was the fifteenth day of the second month, and which day we read in the 16th of Exodus, that they marched a wearisome march, and came at night unto the wilderness of Sin, where they murmured for their poor entertainment, and wished they had died in Egypt. That night the Lord sent them quails; the next morning it rained manna, which was the sixteenth day, and so six days together; the seventh, which was the twenty-second day, it rained none, and that day they were commanded to keep for their Sabbath. Now, if the twenty-second day of the month were the Sabbath, the fifteenth should have been, if that day had been kept before; but the text tells us expressly they marched that day; and, which is strange, the day of the month is never named, unless it be once, for any station but this where the Sabbath was ordained, otherwise it could not have been known that that day was ordained for a day of rest, which before was none. And why might not their day of holy rest be altered as well as the beginning of the year was (Exodus xii.2), for a memorial of their coming out of Egypt? I can see no reason why it might not, nor find any testimony to assure me it was not."

Cox comments that if this argument is sound, it endangers the idea that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance. To his credit, Cox demonstrates his commitment to balanced reporting by mentioning that an opponent of Mede by the name of Stopford (*Scripture Account of the Sabbath*, Section X) had challenged the validity of one element of Mede's day and time calculations—

a point which was nonessential to demonstrate that the Hebrews did not keep the Sabbath weeks into the Exodus journey. Paraphrasing Stopford, Cox says of Mede's position:

He [Stopford] contends that Mede (with whom Heylyn and Bramhall agree) mistakes in supposing that quails were sent on the evening of the fifteenth day, and manna the next morning.

When studying excerpts like this, context is critical. In the next passage from Cox, the setting for his comment (that Mede might be totally mistaken) is in reference to Mede's belief that because the Sabbath was given at Creation Week, but "re-set" at the time of the Exodus, Christians are morally obligated to rest one day out of every seven days and that which day of the week they rest on is not important. Cox is not saying that Mede's theory that Israel did not keep the Sabbath on the way from the Red Sea to Mt. Sinai is wrong, and he did not necessarily agree with him that the Sabbath was given at Creation Week:

But there is a more vital question, the decision of which in the negative might leave the whole reasoning of Mede without any foundation whatever. Is it allowable to assume that Moses, professing to repeat to the Israelites the laws inscribed on the tables of stone, omitted a part of the Fourth Commandment there written, and substituted something else in its place; expressly telling them at the conclusion of the ten, that the words just repeated were those which the Lord had spoken to them in the mount— to which He had there "added no more"— and which He had written on the tables of stone and delivered to Moses? (See Deut. v.22.) **In considering this question, it will not be overlooked by the careful student of the chapter [Exodus 16], that what it records is not a repetition of the Sabbath-law, in the sense of its re-enactment or re-imposition, but a retrospective narrative, orally given by Moses, of its enactment on the sole occasion at Sinai, in which narrative he included a historical repetition of the Ten Commandments which had been then and there proclaimed.** [Emphasis supplied].

While it is interesting to know what kind of information was available to Adventist leaders regarding the keeping of the Sabbath during this part of the Exodus journey in the past, it is enlightening to know what is available to them now. A number of exhaustive studies have been done by modern scholars who have more information about Hebrew culture and better analytical tools than ever before. Calculations done by the staff at **Bible.Ca** conclusively demonstrate the non-observance of any Sabbath for the first few weeks of their Exodus journey. The Hebrews left Goshen in Egypt on Nissan 14, a Thursday, and a Passover, and arrived at the Wilderness of Sin 31 days later on a Saturday evening about 5 pm. That evening, God explained the Manna Obedience Test, and the Manna fell the next morning—a Sunday. It wasn't until the following "Friday" that God gave them the Sabbath Obedience Test. He explained the Sabbath along with instructions for gathering twice the normal amount of Manna that evening. Therefore, the first Sabbath ever kept in the history of the world was observed on the 38th day after the Hebrews left Egypt.

See: <http://www.bible.ca/archeology/bible-archeology-exodus-route-travel-times-distances-days.htm>

Since they did not arrive at the Wilderness of Sin until late Saturday afternoon, they marched on the seventh day of that week the week before the first Sabbath was observed. No wonder the Jews have never believed that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance! These calculations can be made with only a moderate level of knowledge about Hebrew history, culture, and calendars. These facts are especially compelling because the Hebrew people were led directly by God to treat all days the same for the first five weeks of their journey.

BRENDAN'S EXODUS TRAVEL RECORD OBJECTIONS

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: **There isn't enough detail in the travel record to determine what day of the week or month of most of the events recorded for the journey.**

AUTHORS: Enough information is available to determine when they were at enough places to construct an itinerary with enough detail to conclusively demonstrate that God didn't provide a day of rest every seventh day during their journey to Mt. Sinai. All it takes is a little knowledge of how the Hebrews labeled their markers of time to figure out that God didn't provide a Sabbath or a Preparation Day until the 5th week of the Exodus.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The people at Bible.Ca utilized the lunar calendar. There is no evidence that the Hebrews used a lunar calendar. The Sabbath has always been fixed.

AUTHORS: We are as surprised as Brendan by the concept that the Hebrews probably used a lunar calendar to calculate their Sabbaths. Two highly authoritative Jewish encyclopedias have a number of articles each that document the fact that the Hebrews utilized a lunar calendar for calculating their sabbaths. Genesis Chapter One explains that God gave Earthlings the sun and moon to help them keep track of time. As William H. Hohmann points out, the biblical principle for determining a day is that a day is constructed from an EVENING and a morning. Why the evening first? He suggests that it is because it was the first appearance of the moon in the night sky that determined the new moon, which began each Hebrew month, the first week of that month, and the first day of that month. The literal translation of Genesis's account of Creation is that God gave His human creatures the sun and moon to help them keep track of holy days. The research by the people at Bible.Ca is conclusive whether one uses a lunar calendar or a fixed one because the period of time involved is only a week or so longer than one month. There are enough time markers in the journey's record to establish the fact that Hebrews did not keep the Sabbath without the benefit of a lunar calendar.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: The principle of "the ox is in the ditch" applies here if for some reason they were not keeping the Sabbath at this time.

AUTHORS: We are talking about God. It is difficult to imagine that God did not have complete control over the circumstances of the Exodus. This is Brendan grasping at straws. If there had been a Sabbath to keep, He could have struck the Egyptians (or whoever) with blindness beginning on the Preparation Day, and would not have released them from their blindness until the sun went down the next day.

COTTO: THE 4TH COMMANDMENT POINTS US BACK TO CREATION WEEK. THE QUESTION, "IS THE SABBATH IN GENESIS?" IS FULLY ANSWERED RIGHT HERE IN THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT ITSELF. He quotes Genesis 2:3, "and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Then he quotes Exodus 20:10, "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God." He says that the definite article, "the," indicates that the Sabbath has been present since Creation.

AUTHORS: Wrong! The definite article "takes us back" only as far as Exodus 16.

We thank Cotto for acknowledging that a definite article before a Hebrew holy day indicates that it was introduced previously and the reciprocal that the lack of an article (anarthrous construction) before it indicates that it had not existed previously. The use of the definite article here does indicate the previous existence of the Sabbath, but only back to the events of Exodus 16 where it was introduced for the very first time in the history of the world WITHOUT an article before it. Furthermore, Cotto seems unaware of the possibility that Moses might have been speaking about the blessing and hallowing of the 7th day in Genesis 2:2-3 in terms of *prolepsis*.

A few weeks later, Israel kept the Sabbath at the foot of Mt. Sinai. At this time the Sabbath ordinance was given formal status and codified into covenant law. It is no surprise after reviewing the chronology of the Exodus that Carson's linguistic work would conclusively demonstrate that Moses, in his wording of Exodus 20, used a set of indicators to clarify that the Sabbath ordinance was merely MODELED after Creation week.

The MODELING of the Sabbath commandment after the seven days of Creation is a key point in comprehending why one cannot proof-text a Sabbath back *into* Genesis. A model is not the thing itself. The object used as a model and the model itself can have significant differences, just like a plastic model of a 1957 Chevrolet might not have a working motor. Since we are discussing a comparison between the real thing, (the Sabbath commandment) and a model for it (the structure of the days of Creation), whether God actually reposed on the 7th day of Creation is not a deal breaker.

Recall that in Exodus 20 Moses used a word that is closer to meaning "ceased" than "reposed." Some scholars do not accept the "reposed" reading. In either case the comparison does not have to be exact. On the 7th day of Creation, God "knelt down" on it. Perhaps, like an attorney, God might have been said to have "rested" [set down] His case after He summed up the events of His work in creating Planet Earth. The Bible tells us that God sits on His throne, and some day He may appear to

us sitting on a throne so we can relate to His presence in a way that we can comprehend. But does God, Who created gravity, need that gravity to hold down the throne that He presents Himself sitting on to His created beings? All we really are told about the seventh day of Creation is that God stopped creating.

The 4th Commandment required the Israelites not only to stop their worldly activities, but to fully rest (in the sense of repose) for the entire day. Also, they must work for the previous six days. Also, they were not supposed to leave their dwelling places. If Sabbatarians kept the Sabbath according to its requirements, they would stay in their homes from sundown on Friday night to sundown on Saturday night.

One Adventist apologist argues that some historical sources suggest that Egypt utilized a seven-day week during the Egyptian captivity. He suggests that we are picking the source that is most convenient to our point of view when we argue that the Hebrew people were accustomed to a 10-day week in Egypt. Chapter Two of Carson's book, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament," written by Harold H. P. Dressler, says, "Their sojourn in Egypt had taught them the ten-day week," and quotes Egyptologist, Richard A. Parker, "*The Calendars and Chronology, Legacy of Egypt* (Oxford University Press, 1971, p. 17) where Parker adds, "The seventh-day was called "part day." If Parker has identified the names given to each of the 10 days of the Egyptian week, he would appear to be knowledgeable.

At the same time we recognize that the Hebrews may have kept track of a 7-day week while in slavery, whether the knowledge of it came from oral history, astronomy, or both. We simply do not know.

These various Hebrew literary conventions are detailed by Carson and his associates in their 1982 book, ***From Sabbath to Lord's Day***

COTTO: THE FACT THAT GOD BLESSED THE 7TH DAY IS EVIDENCE THAT HE GAVE EVERY 7TH DAY THEREAFTER A SPECIAL STATUS. Not only did He bless it, but he hallowed it.

How could blessing one single day bless multiple days thereafter? This idea makes no sense. Before every meal Christians ask God to bless their food. There is no doubt that He blesses it. But blessing the food for one meal does not bless every meal thereafter. Only by taking what we know about the model of the days of Creation (the Sabbath commandment of Exodus 20) and reading its characteristics back into what it was modeled after (the seven days of Creation) can we read a special status for every 7th day after the 7th day of Creation. This approach seems to put the cart before the horse.

The Hebrew language is known for its poetic qualities— particularly for its use of parallelism, or the saying of the same thing in two somewhat different ways. There are some differences between the meaning of "blessing" and "hallowing," but in view of the fact that Moses is telling the story of what God did, and not what man was supposed to do, it is only speculation that Moses intended two separate theological distinctions in regard to sacredness of this one day. It is difficult to imagine how Cotto might support his idea that the blessing of the day plus the hallowing of it equals an evening and the morning for the 7th day.

The significance of the absence of the evening and morning suffix after the account of the events of the 7th day is that it applies the blessing and hallowing only to one 24-hour period of time and memorializes the memory of that one day for eternity. Every day that comes after it has this memory resting on top of it. There is no place to "put" any additional memorialization on top of any subsequent day because there is no room for it. Again, this fact is nothing profound in view of the fact that we are reading a story that simply tells us about what God did on one single day in the history of Planet Earth. Why is this so difficult to comprehend?

COTTO: THE SABBATH DAY IS PRESENT IN GENESIS 2 BECAUSE GOD USED A SIMILAR FORM OF WORD IN EXODUS 20 FOR THE SABBATH (SHABBATH) THAT MOSES USED FOR "REST" IN GENESIS 2. THIS PROVES THAT THE SEVENTH-DAY OF CREATION IS THE SABBATH OF THE MORAL LAW.

Yes, Moses used a different form of the same word in these places. However, Hebrew usage conventions give different meanings to these different forms of this word, so it is more like Moses used different words. The Hebrew word translated into English as "rest" is in the **verb** form of that word. It means TO CEASE. The verb form of the Hebrew word is not used here to

mean REST. Moses said that God STOPPED on that day. It is far from accurate to say that the verb form of a Hebrew word and the noun form of it have the same exact meaning.

By contrast the form of the same word that is used in Exodus 20 is a **noun**, which **can** mean REST. Chapter Two of **From Sabbath to Lord's Day**, pages 22-23, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament," authored by Harold H. P. Dressler, Dressler observes the following: Footnote #30 is typed afterward because it provides additional clarification.) Also please observe that some sources appear to render the Hebrew characters from right to left as they would appear in a Hebrew manuscript, whereas other sources show them from left to right as they would be if they were written in English:

A question that must be discussed in connection with the origin of the Sabbath is the etymology and meaning of the word שָׁבַת (Hebrew word translated "rest"). Lexicographers group it with the verb שָׁבַת (to cease, stop; to stop working, celebrate, to rest). Hehn emphasizes that the meaning "to rest" is foreign to this verb; the nature of *sbt* is "to cease, to be finished (J. Hehn, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat*, p. 101. Schmidt sees no original interdependence between the verb שָׁבַת and the noun "Sabbath"; there is only a very early connection (W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), p. 156. From the etymology, Beer and Mahler understand the action of "being complete" (G. Beer, *Schabbath-der Mischnatractat "Sabbath"*, p. 13; E. Mahler, *Der Sabbat*, p. 239.) De Vaux points out that the noun formation from the verb שָׁבַת is irregular; "the regular form would be shebeth." In its grammatical form it "ought to have an active meaning, signifying 'the' day which stops something, which marks a limit or division..." (R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 476). The Sabbath would thus be a day that marks the end of the week or the ceasing of the week's work.³⁰

³⁰(R. North, *Derivation*, p. 186, especially note 3: "sbt" has nothing to do with resting in the sense of enjoying repose . . . It certainly cannot be translated as "the day of rest." This latter statement can be questioned [however] since it is based on the etymology rather than the usage of the word.

There is insufficient support for the idea that Moses meant that God indicated that He wanted the Hebrews to rest on the Sabbath because He had reposed on the 7th day of Creation. Most likely, in Exodus 20, Moses indicated that Israel was to repose on the Sabbath because God CEASED, or STOPPED creating Planet Earth on the 7th day of Creation. Once more, this distinction is not pivotal because Genesis 2:2-3 tells the story about what God did and says nothing about what man is to do— not even that Adam and Eve rested on it. Furthermore, God's cursory acknowledgment of the boundary characteristics of the 7th day of Creation, indicated by His kneeling down on it for a moment, does not favor the suggestion of a grandiose purpose for it. The day had minimal significance in itself, only becoming an icon when it became part of what God used as a model for the Sabbath commandment later. In an action language, as Ancient Hebrew is, it would seem that if God had wanted to elevate the 7th day of Creation to a momentous event that would affect the universe for eternity, He would have said something like, "God threw the 7th day up to the top of a mountain that reached above the clouds and touched the stars."

Since there is no evidence that God reposed on the 7th day of Creation, the suggestion that God would be bound by His own law to keep His own Sabbath appears doubly incredible. We are talking about I AM, the Great Creator God Who is all powerful and omniscient. Christians have no trouble believing that God can meet privately with each one of us when we arrive in Heaven. If we worship a God Who can be everywhere at once and answer everyone's prayers at the same time, what sense is it to talk anthropomorphically about God as if He were chained to the time constraints of a day on Planet Earth? For all we know, God was creating ten billion universes at the same "time" He was creating Earth. We are not told that part of the story. Jesus tells the Jewish Sabbath keepers that He and the Father work on the Sabbath. Jesus called what he was doing "work."

John 5:17-18 - In his defense Jesus said to them, "My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I too am working." ¹⁸For this reason they tried all the more to kill him; not only was he breaking the Sabbath, but he was even calling God his own Father, making himself equal with God.

Notice that John observes that Jesus did, in fact, break the Sabbath. Clearly the Sabbath can't be a moral law if God Himself violated it. Kerry Wynne tells the following story about God's ability to be everywhere:

Some years ago my step son, Kevin, began to attend the independent Bible church my wife and I had joined after leaving Adventism. After attending several Sunday services he gave his heart to

Jesus. After a few more months, the sermon on a particular Sunday morning was about healing. It was not a healing service. After the pastor finished his sermon, he suddenly paused and said, “I seem to be impressed that there is a person in this room who has a problem with his arm— perhaps his wrist or shoulder. Let us raise our arms to Jesus and ask Him to heal that person.” Years earlier Kevin had broken his right elbow in five places, having one of the most severe fractures his doctor had ever seen, but Kevin had no money for surgery. The result was his arm had only 30% of its normal range of motion. It was pitiful to see him bowling or playing any kind of sports, and hundreds of people were daily witnesses to his severe handicap. Kevin, seated beside me, raised his crooked arm and prayed that the person the speaker was referring to would be healed. Since the pastor had suggested a problem with the wrist or shoulder, Kevin wasn’t thinking that his elbow was included. He remembered praying something like, “Lord, please heal that person, and if You aren’t too busy, You might think about healing my elbow also. My life would be so much easier if you did.” Nothing seemed to happen in the sanctuary, but when we got out to the coffee bar in the lobby, Kevin came running up to me, shouting excitedly, “Kerry, Kerry, I’ve been healed! Look at my arm! I can touch my shoulder now!” To my utter astonishment he reached up and put his hand on his shoulder—something that was impossible only moments earlier! This miracle required the creation of new bone, sinews, and ligaments out of nothing—*ex nihilo*. As a result of this undeniable miracle, many individuals came to Christ, including a number of people who were about as un-churched as a non-believer could be. If God could not be everywhere at once and could not do everything at once, it is too incredible to believe that the only thing in the Universe He was doing at that moment was healing Kevin’s elbow?

One of the unfortunate effects of the development of the Sabbatarian heresy is the harboring of a highly anthropomorphic concept of God. God spoke to humans in ways that they could understand Him. It is profitable for God to speak of Himself in terms that his human creatures can understand, but it is dangerous for humans to limit God by ascribing human attributes to Him that He does not possess. Not only do we have the problem of translating Ancient Hebrew into our modern languages, but we have the challenge of avoiding the error of finding anthropomorphic statements in Scripture and throwing them back at Him under conditions that do not apply. God can CEASE but He cannot REST because He never becomes weary. Therefore, there are limitations to how far one can take God’s analogy between the ceasing on the 7th day of Creation and the Sabbath rest of the 4th commandment. Kerry Wynne provides the following illustration of the limitations of anthropomorphic analogies:

My wife and I have a little Cockatiel. When Sunny the Cockatiel gets on top of a chair, he thinks he’s king of the roost. If anyone walks by him, he spreads out his wings and flaps them at the “challenger.” Sometimes I show him that I am the alpha bird by putting my arms at my side and flapping my elbows at him. He acknowledges my challenge by flapping his wings at me with even greater force. I have gotten down to the bird’s level of communication, but I am not an “Alpha Bird”, and I don’t have real wings any more than God needed to repose after creating Planet Earth.

Please note that, as conceded by our quoted linguistic expert, his argument against this key word meaning, “repose,” is based not on word usage, but on its etymology, and therefore is subject to some question. For this reason we do not claim that this argument settles the case against proof-texting the Sabbath back into Genesis was Exodus 20 by itself. We present it as one of a set of arguments from the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 that all work together to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the Sabbath ordinance is not to be found in Genesis.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT GOD GAVE THE SABBATH FROM MT. SINAI WITH THUNDERINGS AND LIGHTENINGS SHOULD BE ENOUGH EVIDENCE FOR ANYONE THAT CHRISTIANS MUST KEEP THE SABBATH. THIS IS SO EASY TO UNDERSTAND THAT EVEN A CHILD CAN GRASP IT. He quotes Psalm 119:89: “For Ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.”

Cotto again resorts to a logical fallacy; a “Non Sequitur” if you will. It is quite a leap here to conclude from the thunderings and lightnings of this event in turn signaled God’s requirement of these commandments as binding on all mankind, but it is common for falsehoods to be propagated in this fashion. As William Hohmann observes, Cotto’s conclusion also ignores the

context leading up to this momentous event, where God said it was all for the purpose of insuring the people believed and followed Moses! Do we believe God, or Cotto?

God's children, the Jews, have always understood that the Sabbath was given as a sign to set them apart from every other nation. They were a very stubborn, idolatrous people devoid of the spirit of God and had been immersed in a heathen culture for hundreds of years. As a people, the Children of Israel came directly out of heathenism even as when God directly intervened and called Abraham to learn about the Real God. A good show of power and fireworks was just what they needed. Down through time our Jewish brethren deserve credit, however, for being able to take into account not only what God said, but to whom He said it— as well as to consider the context of time, place, and circumstances of the occasion—to figure out that the Gentiles were not a party to Sabbath observance. The other nations of the world were accountable to the Law of the spirit; intent of heart or conscience:

Romans 2:14-15 - For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: ¹⁵Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.

Once an expert in the law wanted Jesus to tell him what he must do to have eternal life. Jesus questioned him as to what was written in the law and how he read it. He responded saying to love the Lord with all your heart, strength, and soul, and mind and love your neighbor as yourself. Jesus then told him to "do this and live."

Luke 10:25 - 28 (NIV) ²⁵On one occasion an expert in the law stood up to test Jesus. "Teacher," he asked, "what must I do to inherit eternal life?" ²⁶"What is written in the Law?" he replied. "How do you read it?" ²⁷He answered: "'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind'; and, 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'" ²⁸"You have answered correctly," Jesus replied. "Do this and you will live."

If the Jews had been willing to obey these two commands God would not needed to give them even the Ten Commandments. Even having the Ten Commandments, the Old Covenant Jews broke all Ten throughout their history. They did not have the "heart" to follow God.

O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children forever! – Deuteronomy 5:29

COTTO: PROOF THAT THE SABBATH IS IN GENESIS IS FOUND IN THE FACT THAT GOD BOTH BLESSED AND SANCTIFIED THE 7TH DAY OF CREATION WEEK. IN FACT, GOD KEPT THE 7TH DAY OF CREATION WEEK AS THE FIRST SABBATH BECAUSE HE STOPPED THE SECULAR WORK OF CREATING THE WORLD AND PERFORMED SPIRITUAL WORK ON THE FIRST 7TH DAY IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD.

God is a Spirit. Everything He does would seem to be "spiritual." This distinction is embarrassingly anthropomorphic. Cotto implies that God was forced by His own new "rule" to keep His own Sabbath. An Omnipotent God who can do anything can't work on the Sabbath. If you follow what we have learned about the meaning of the Hebrew word translated "rest" in Genesis 2, you will recall that the word is in its verb form means "ceased." Moses identified the 7th day as the day that separated God's period of creative activity from His subsequent inactivity in that regard.

We must keep in mind two key points about what Moses said in reference to this 7th day of Creation week: **(1)** He is telling his readers about what God did— not what Man should do. It was His celebration. **(2)** He left off the suffix phrase, "and the evening and the morning were the 7th day," after his account of the events of the 7th day. Cotto says that this omission is compensated for in other ways, but his argument is invalid. We Anti-Sabbatarians thank him for admitting that the non-inclusion of this meaning suffix is a serious danger to his position, but we can't "compensate" him in this regard. The blessing and hallowing does not substitute for the absence of the "evening and morning" suffix.

As we have discussed a number of times previously, the absence or presence of this after-clause (suffix) is a specific Hebrew literary modifier, and its absence or presence after a day, or *yom*, is designed to indicate whether its attributes are restricted to its boundaries or whether license exists to extend the implications of those events beyond it. There is no comparable meaning indicator in the English language because the two languages have fundamentally different structures. The blessing

and hallowing of this one 24-hour period of time has, by the use of this literary device, been indicated to have no boundaries. The *memory* of these attributes—not the day itself—continue forever. Because these attributes are already there, and will always be there, they cannot be specially placed or transferred to a 7-day interval thereafter, or to any other interval, or at ANY other time thereafter. The blessing and hallowing of that particular day is a “done deal.” In no way does this concept imply that God did not cease his creative activities on the literal 24-hour period of the 7th day of Creation, or the possibility that he rested in a literal way by celebrating the completion of His work with Adam and Eve.

The author of Genesis knew that his readers would not question the idea that God spent less than 24 literal hours refraining from creative activity, but he seemed to have “worried” that some of them might try to turn his story of one celebration day into an unlimited number of them. The Holy Spirit led the writer of Genesis to go out of his way to clarify this point. Sabbatarians represent a small minority of Christians who have chosen not to get this point.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT GOD BLESSED THE SABBATH DAY IN GENESIS 2 PROVES THAT THE SABBATH LASTS FOREVER BECAUSE THE BIBLE TEACHES THAT WHATEVER THE LORD BLESSES IS BLESSED FOREVER.

He then quotes a number of proof-texts to support this concept, including I Chronicles 17:27.)

God blessed Judas Iscariot in many ways when he was in the presence of Jesus. Just getting to be with Jesus—the Creator of the Universe—was a blessing, but the blessing did not last very long.

Adventists should be especially familiar with the fact that Bible writers often used the term “forever” in relative ways. For example, they seem to understand this fact when it comes to how they handle what they want the Bible to say about Hell fire lasting “forever.” They teach that the Hebrew word in these cases translated “forever” means something like “to keep going until the process reaches its completion.” Adventists do not want to believe that the wicked spend eternity in an unpleasant place because their critically important Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment would not work. There are a number of examples of the relativity of “forever” in Hebrew usage.

Meredith G. Kline discovered that the Mosaic Covenant was modeled after the covenant treaties of Israel’s neighbors. The language of these covenants featured pronouncements that their provisions would last “forever”, but these “forever” provisions were subject to revision as future circumstances would dictate. Quoting Kline, A. T. Lincoln, cited in the D.A. Carson (editor), ***From Sabbath to Lord’s Day***, in his chapter entitled, “From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: a Biblical Perspective,” pp. 352-353:

Kline has pointed out similarities in this aspect of permanence between ancient near eastern treaties and the biblical covenants. Such treaties often spoke of their term as being valid down through following generations “forever,” and yet these treaties were subject to the revision of the suzerain because of changing circumstances. Kline points out that the biblical covenants and these various aspects can similarly be said to be “forever” and yet subject to change according to God’s sovereign purposes in accomplishing redemption in the midst of the historical process. In later Judaism, with the increasing emphasis on Torah, any such notion of change was lost sight of and the law was held to be permanent and eternal, continuing into the age to come. But as part of the Mosaic covenant, and like the elements of the tabernacle, the priesthood, and the offerings, the Sabbath itself can be seen to be eternal and to have continuing validity through the fulfillment of the type. In particular, in Hebrews 4, the resting place of the land and the physical rest of the Sabbath are seen to be types of God’s eternal rest from the beginning.

COTTO: EVEN AFTER THE ENTRANCE OF SIN, THE SABBATH REMAINED BLESSED.

AUTHORS: This is another logical fallacy—circular reasoning—because it assumes that there was a Sabbath in existence at the time of Creation to be blessed. **We have PROOF from Hebrew linguistics that the Sabbath did not exist until the Exodus. We have EVIDENCE from Exodus 20 that this is the case, and we have the suggestion from the text of Genesis 2:2-3 that there is no Sabbath mentioned therein. The Abrahamic Covenant did not include it, and the Sabbath was not kept until the 38th day of the Exodus journey.** The Abrahamic Covenant was limited to circumcision and the promise that if his descendants were faithful to God, they would possess the Land of Canaan forever. Even after the Sabbath

ordinance was placed in the Mosaic Covenant, it remained subject to and dependent upon the observance of the Ordinance of Circumcision. The Law of Moses is a fully integrated whole. If you break one of the laws, you have broken them all. If for no other reason than this, there can be no Sabbath-keeping without circumcision. The Law of Moses contains 613 laws that many Jewish scholars view as fully equal in importance. Textual studies of both the Old Testament and New Testament prove the subordination of the Sabbath to the ordinance of circumcision— a fact which is one of the three key fatal flaws of the Sabbatarian belief model.

COTTO: ANOTHER CONNECTION BETWEEN THE SEVENTH-DAY OF GENESIS AND THE SABBATH COMMANDMENT OF EXODUS 20 IS THAT MOSES SAID IT WAS THE 7TH DAY THAT THE LORD “BLESSED” BECAUSE HE HAD RESTED ON THAT DAY. HOW IS IT THAT THE ANTI-SABBATARIANS CONTINUE TO SAY THAT THE SABBATH OF THE 10 COMMANDMENTS IS NOT THE 7TH DAY “SABBATH” OF CREATION WEEK WHEN THE WORD OF GOD ITSELF SHOWS THAT THE BLESSING OF THE 7TH DAY OF CREATION WEEK ENDURED TILL THE SABBATH COMMANDMENT WAS GIVEN? AS I HAVE POINTED OUT BEFORE, I CHRONICLES 17:24 SAYS THAT WHAT THE LORD BLESSES IS BLESSED FOREVER.

Cotto is still working from the false premise that every seventh day from Creation Week was a blessed Sabbath day. He now claims, based on this premise, that whatever God blesses remains blessed forever. There is no Bible text that says this. Cotto is implying this from the text:

Let it even be established, that thy name may be magnified forever, saying, The LORD of hosts is the God of Israel, even a God to Israel: and let the house of David thy servant be established before thee. ²⁵For thou, O my God, hast told thy servant that thou wilt build him an house: therefore thy servant hath found in his heart to pray before thee. ²⁶And now, LORD, thou art God, and hast promised this goodness unto thy servant: ²⁷Now therefore let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant-- that it may be before thee forever: for thou blessest, O LORD, and it shall be blessed forever. – 1 Chronicles 17:24-26

The blessing “forever” is a request in this prayer. We can ask the logical question that comes from this; in what way or manner was this house blessed “forever”? If it were blessed forever, would it not still be standing?

Cotto must find a credible biblical principle that indirectly supports his desired view. He goes to an unrelated text to acquire a general principle that he hopes will provide this INDIRECT support. The indirect support he attempts to use is the illogical principle that *everything* God blesses is blessed forever. For example, after the flood God blessed Noah and his three sons. Ham saw Noah’s nakedness while he was sleeping off being drunk with wine. Noah cursed Ham to be the slave to his brothers. Obviously Ham was not blessed by God forever unless being a slave to your brothers is a blessing!

Gen 9:24 - 27 (NIV) ²⁴When Noah awoke from his wine and found out what his youngest son had done to him, ²⁵he said, “Cursed be Canaan! The lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers.” ²⁶He also said, “Blessed be the LORD, the God of Shem! May Canaan be the slave of Shem. ²⁷May God extend the territory of Japheth; may Japheth live in the tents of Shem, and may Canaan be his slave.”

Cotto faces two barriers with his claim. **First**, as we have noted earlier, Moses’ purposeful non-inclusion of the phrase, “and the evening and the morning” after the 7th day, serves to give this one day attributes that were to be remembered (memorialized) forever. **Second**, Exodus 20 clarifies that the Sabbath commandment was only a model of Creation week. A model is not the thing itself. Even as a model, the Sabbath ordinance was not a full representation of the days of Creation Week. Genesis 2 says God simply ceased or stopped creating. Man could *not* create. God had worked/created for six days before the 7th day. Adam and Eve could only “work”, if at all, a small part of the week— perhaps not even a full day— but the 4th Commandment requires a full six days of work before any resting is permitted. Therefore, Adam and Eve could not have kept the Sabbath even if there had been one to keep.

Two different things got blessed between Genesis 2 and Exodus 20: **(1)** In Genesis 2 a single day to be remembered forever. In this regard, that seventh day was indeed blessed forever. **(2)** In Exodus 20, a “cultic” ordinance given by God to Israel, *modeled* after the structure of the days of Creation, designed to set them apart from every other nation on the face of the Earth. (The possible use of the literary principle of PROLEPSIS suggests that this seventh day may not even have been blessed until the 10 Commandments were given at Mt. Sinai.)

The concept that the Sabbath commandment is a MODEL is the key to understanding the relationship between Creation week and the Sabbath commandment. Moses used several Hebrew literary conventions in Exodus 20 to clarify that the Sabbath ordinance was a MODEL of the days of Creation. **A. T. Lincoln**, the author of Chapter 12, “From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical and Theological Perspective,” of D.A. Carson’s book, *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*, page 349, comments on the linguistic aspects of Moses’ account of the 4th Commandment in Exodus 20:

The last clause of Exodus 20:11 gives the reason for the Mosaic institution and takes up the terminology of blessing and hallowing from Genesis 2:2-3, now specifically applying these terms to the “Sabbath” rather than the seventh-day, and is not to be taken as implying that the seventh day of Genesis 2:3 was already the Sabbath set aside by God for humanity. As H.H.P. Dressler points out, the present commandment is based on a previous event, and the significance of the Hebrew construction translated as “therefore,” **לְכֵן**, is crucial to this interpretation, as it often functions to connect causally an event in the past with a situation some time later. [See first also R. Frankena, “Einige Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch des Adverbs ‘al-ken im Hebraischen,” *Studio Biblica et Semitica* (Wageningen, 1966, pp. 94-99)] In fact scholars often speak of an “etiology” when a present name or practice is explained on the basis of a previous event or story, and **לְכֵן** is one of the markers by which an etiology is recognized. Exodus 20:11 indeed contains in addition to this introductory formula a further feature typical of an etiology—the word play between “the seventh day” and “the Sabbath day.” Such etiological passages, after the introductory “therefore” or “consequently now,” can have the verb in the past tense without implying a strictly past meaning. The presence of the features in Exodus 20:11 suggest that it too is to be seen as providing an explanation of a present institution, the Mosaic Sabbath, by reference to a past event, God’s seventh-day rest after the creation, utilizing the terminology of Genesis 2:3 and a play on words to make its point.

Again, note that one source renders the Hebrew characters from right to left and the other from left to right. You will need to scroll down to the beginning of the next page since the image will not fit on the bottom of this page. It seems that the Hebrew characters are like a combination of two Hebrew words which would be literally translated “ON-SO:” **Strong’s #H5921** (used as a preposition (in the singular or plural, often with prefix, or as conjugation with a particle following); above, over, upon, or against (yet always in this last relation with a downward aspect) in a great variety of applications:—above, according to (-ly), after, (as) against, among, and, X as, at, because of, beside (the rest of), between, beyond the time, X both and, by (reason of), X had the charge of, concerning for, in (that), (forth, out) of, (from) (off), (up-) on, over, than, through (-out), to, touching, X with.), and **Strong’s #H3651** (From **H3559**; properly set upright; hence (figuratively as adjective) just; but usually (as adverb or conjugation) rightly or so (in various applications to manner, time and relation; often with other particles):— + after that (this, -ward, -wards), as . . . as, + [for-] as much as yet, + be (for which) cause, + following, howbeit, in (the) like (manner, -wise), X the more, right, (even) so, state, straightway, such (thing), surely, + there (where) -fore, this, thus, true, well, X you.) [Emphasis from the author, credit to Strong’s.]

The Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible posted at www.Scripture4All.org translates Exodus 20:11 literally to indicate that God commanded the Hebrews to rest on the Sabbath because He stopped on the 7th day of Creation:

All of which in them and·he-is-stopping in-the-day the·seventh on so He blessed Yahweh.

Exodus 20, therefore, does not provide any definite support for the claim that God actually reposed on the 7th day of Creation. God also told Israel to rest on the Sabbath to help them remember that He had rescued them from slavery. The Jews were required to rest every 7th day as much to help them remember their Exodus from Egypt as to remember that God stopped creating on the last day of Creation. **Unless we are presumptuous enough to step into God’s place and determine which reason was the most important for keeping the Sabbath, we must regard both reasons as equally important.** Christians, therefore, cannot remember the Sabbath for one of these reasons, so Sabbath-keeping cannot possibly apply to them.

In summary, Genesis 20 utilizes **four aspects** of the Ancient Hebrew language to clarify that the Sabbath commandment was merely *modeled* after Creation Week: **(1)** the word translated, "therefore," indicates that something in the present is about to be explained by something that happened in the past, **(2)** the explanation of a present event is accomplished by comparing it with an older event, and **(3)** the word play between the "seventh-day of Creation Week and the "Sabbath day" of the 4th commandment, which gives further evidence that an etiological explanation has just taken place. **(4)** As discussed in an earlier section, the form of the word translated "rest" is an irregular form of the verb, which is more closely related to the concept of CEASING rather than that of repose.

BRENDAN KNUDSON OBJECTIONS TO THE HEBREW LINGUISTICS THAT LINK GENESIS 2 WITH EXODUS 20 AS A MODEL

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: In regard to the "etiology" argument, note that the Hebrew word translated "therefore" is used 746 times in the Old Testament and is a variety of functions. No Hebrew grammar or lexicon I could find mentioned any etiological uses. Until additional evidence is supplied for this assertion, it should be treated as a convenient fabrication.

AUTHORS: In order for the word, "therefore," to signal an etiology, it has to come between something like an older thing that a newer thing that it is being compared to. The combination of the word, "therefore," with the fact that it comes between something that could serve as a model and something that could be modeled after it is what provides the word, "therefore," in this case with the ability to create an etiology. Brendan boldly discards the opinion of four highly regarded biblical scholars, whom A. T. Lincoln cites. Lincoln himself is an excellent biblical scholar.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Moses used the same word to say that God MADE the 7th day that he used to say that God MADE the things He made on each of the previous six days of Creation Week.

AUTHORS: What God made was a boundary day that separated the days of His creating Planet Earth from the days after it in which He would not be creating it any more. He made this one 24-hour period of time a day to be remembered forever as the day when the creation of Planet Earth was finished. By the absence of the evening and morning suffix after the account of the events of the 7th day, God imbued it with the unbounded qualities of being blessed and set aside as a memorial to be remembered forever. Once this one day has been blessed forever, it cannot be blessed again. Once it has been set aside to be remembered forever, it cannot be set aside again. Nothing is said about the memorialization of this one day repeating itself every seven days thereafter. At Mt. Sinai, God used the 7th day of Creation as a MODEL from which He designed a cultic ceremony, called the Sabbath, to help Israel remember Creation and the rescue from Egypt.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Because the noun, Sabbath, is not explicitly in Genesis 2 does not mean that it isn't there. It is not imperative that it be there because it is represented by the verbal form of the word.

AUTHORS: There are several reasons why the absence of the noun, Sabbath, is a problem for Sabbatarians. The Sabbath is a formal Hebrew cultic ritual with a specific set of rules and regulations. The Hebrew word means cessation of activity or rest. At its most favorable-to-Sabbatarian rendering, it can mean no more than generic rest. The Sabbatarian is obligated to demonstrate that there IS a Sabbath in Genesis 2. If God states that something is blessed forever, we should cautiously believe that it is blessed forever, considering context and other relevant factors. Israel was promised God's blessings only for as long as it was faithful to Him, but those blessings stopped when they crucified Jesus. Similarly, the Sabbath, since it was a sign of the 10 Commandment covenant between Israel and God, could not be blessed after Israel killed the other Party to the contract, just like God cannot continue to bless a marriage after the wife murders her husband.

In this debate the Anti-Sabbatarian needs only demonstrate that the Sabbath is NOT there. **The presence of the cultic Sabbath ritual is not created by the mere telling of the story of how God stopped creating on the 7th day and set it aside to be remembered forever.**

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: Because the author of Genesis had a choice of either the noun form of the word or the verb form of the word, and he chose to use the verbal form, this statement of action through it is not

only sufficient to stand in the place of the noun form of the word, but it confirms that the author was clarifying that God RESTED on this day, rather than merely CEASED on it.

AUTHORS: What rule of linguistics, English or Ancient Hebrew, enables a verb to “stand” in the place of a noun and mean the same thing as the noun? Think of the sentence, “I will gun you down.” The assailant might not have a gun at all. He might be using a water pistol or water cannon. A verb cannot reliably stand in the place of its associated noun. Recall from our Hebrew definitions from *Brown-Driver-Briggs* that REST is an alternate reading of a “secondary” meaning of this word. It is labeled “God’s rest” through context—not from its root meaning—since the context of the statement is labeled as being an action of God. The Qal primary meaning is CEASED:

Qal 27 Perfect³masculine singular שָׁבַח Genesis 2:3 +; 3 plural שָׁבְחוּ Lamentations 5:14, etc.; Imperfect³ masculine singular יִשְׁבֹּחַ Hosea 7:4; יִשְׁבֹּת Proverbs 22:10 2t.; 3 feminine singular תִּשְׁבֹּת Leviticus 26:35; תִּשְׁבֹּת Leviticus 26:34; Nehemiah 6:3 +, etc.; —

1 cease: (absolute 13 t.) of seasons Genesis 8:22 (J); manna Joshua 5:12 (P), etc., Isaiah 14:4 (twice in verse); Nehemiah 6:3 +; with מָן Hosea 7:4 3t. [Ed. Note: First, original meaning of the Qal form.]

2 desist from labour, rest: [Ed. Note: Second meaning of the Qal form.]

with מָן (of God) Genesis 2:2,3(P). [Ed. Note: The ceasing of God.]

The noun, "Sabbath," is the term for a cultic ritual characterized by a cycle of six days of work followed by one day of rest. The penalty for violation of this cultic ritual is death. Brendan is doing what every other Sabbatarian attempts to do, and that is to take a ritual that was given to Israel at the time of the Exodus and assumes it back into Genesis.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: We have proof from Exodus 20 that the writer of Genesis 2 intended to mean REST (that God rested on the 7th day of Creation) because the writer of Exodus quotes God using a very different word—*nuach*—to indicate that He had rested [or literally reposed] on the 7th day of Creation week. The word, *nuach*, does not have a wide enough meaning range to be extended to indicate STOPPING or CEASING. Instead, its Qal stem meanings include “to repose,” “to remain,” “to settle down,” and “to be quiet.” This fact deals a final blow to Anti-Sabbatarians who claim that the writer of Genesis 2 intended merely to say that God STOPPED or CEASED on the 7th day.

AUTHORS: A significant number of authorities disagree with Brendan. We have touched on this subject a little so far. Note that *The Hebrew-Interlinear Bible* at Scripture 4 All translates Exodus 20:11 word equivalent as follows:

That six of days he-made Yahweh the heavens and the earth the sea and all of which in them he-**is-stopping** in the day of the seventh on so he blessed Yahweh.

One possible reason why the secondary reading of CEASE is preferred by some scholars is that this word is of Late Hebrew derivation. The “original” text of Exodus 20 is in Ancient Hebrew. While this question can only be settled by a scholar who is truly an expert in Ancient Hebrew, we present this possibility for your consideration. Notice this entry from *Brown-Driver-Briggs* for *Strong’s* Hebrew word #5117, which can be located at: <http://biblesuite.com/hebrew/5117.htm>:

נָח verb rest (Late Hebrew id.; Aramaic נָחָה ; Phoenician נַחָה noun rest; possibly also verb יָנַח (Iph. Perfect), compare Levy cited CISi. 118 Lzb322; Assyrian nāhu, rest (inûh), and derivatives; Ethiopic: be extended, long, rarely rest; Arabic IV. is make camel lie down on his breast; resting-place of camel, compare Doughty Arab. Des. i, 397, ii, 63, 486, 642);

Elsewhere we provided two other sources which prefer the stopping/ceasing meaning to the repose meaning. The fact that several expert sources prefer the stopping/ceasing meaning suggests that there may be textual indicators that have led them to prefer the secondary meaning over the primary meaning in this context. Again whether God actually rested on the 7th day of Creation is not a pivotal issue because the Genesis passage in question tells us about what God did. As called to your attention so many times before, it does not even tell us that Adam and Eve rested with God or that they were supposed to do so on subsequent multiples of 7 days. Furthermore, God gave the Sun and Moon to help humans keep track of time. If there had been a Sabbath for them to keep, it would most likely have been kept according to the lunar calendar. All Sabbatarians

except for Lunar Sabbatarians would be keeping the wrong day by now, and would have no clue which day was an exact multiple of seven days to the 7th day of Creation.

APOLOGIST BRENDAN: We note a number of identical key terms when we compare the wording of Genesis 2:1-4 with that of Exodus 20:8-11. Why, then, did God break this pattern of using identical terms and use *nuah* in Exodus 20 instead of *sabbat* like He did in Genesis 2:2-3? If God had used the verb *sabat* in Exodus 20, He would have created a more natural link, via comparison, to the *sabat* in Genesis 2. However, by using the word *nuach* He made certain that the proper name for the Day in Exodus would be linked to His action in Genesis 2.

AUTHORS: There is a link between these terms, but it is not the kind of link Brendan needs. It links a model (the Sabbath commandment of Exodus 20) with the real thing (the 7 days of Creation). Since there are four textual concepts in Exodus 20 that provide solid evidence (but not absolute proof) that the cultic ordinance of the Sabbath commandment is merely MODELED after the pattern of Creation Week, the existence of a link from the proper name of the cultic ordinance—Sabbath—to God’s action of stopping/ceasing, or even “resting,” in Genesis 2 is reasonable. However, this link gets Sabbatarians nowhere because a verb cannot stand in place of its associated noun without assumptions that may or may not be warranted.

COTTO: IF THE SABBATH IS A TEMPORARY INSTITUTION, WHY DID GOD BLESS IT [THE SABBATH] TWICE-- ONCE AT CREATION AND THEN AGAIN AT MT. SINAI?

Again, circular reasoning! He didn’t. There was no Sabbath to bless until the Exodus, and God blessed it then, for the duration of the Old Covenant only.

AUTHORS: Consideration of the writer’s possible use of the literary device of prolepsis suggests that it might be that the 7th day of Creation was not even blessed or sanctified on the actual 7th day of Creation— that the author of Genesis 2:2-3 was looking at it from the perspective of when it was blessed at Mt. Sinai as he recalled his knowledge of both events. In any case, the blessing and hallowing were applied to one single day. By their very nature, these attributes would continue forever without boundaries. Once blessed by God FOREVER, always blessed by God forever. Once set aside to be remembered, always set aside to be remembered. **It is impossible to add these qualities to any day subsequent to it any more than a Hebrew birthright can be bestowed on the same eldest son every week by holding a self-invented ritual that Hebrew society had not mandated.**

At Creation, one single day was blessed and set aside to be remembered forever. At Mt. Sinai, a cultic ritual was established, based on the days of Creation as its model, and multiples of seven days were set aside and blessed.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT GOD BLESSED THE SABBATH IS SUFFICIENT TO PROVE IT LASTS FOREVER.

AUTHORS: We covered this one before. Don’t be ridiculous. However, it is interesting to note how incomplete the Ten Commandments are. It does not tell us it is a sin to abuse your wife or children, to own slaves, lose the family money gambling, not caring for the family needs, not helping people in dire need, kidnap people and hold them hostage, lie to others, hate those you do not agree with, drunkenness, gluttony, immodest dress, and the list can go on. Jesus gave a whole set of new “laws” on the Sermon on the Mount, and St. Paul listed 23 sins that would keep a believer out of Heaven. The 10 Commandments were not complete or flexible enough to meet the needs of His people forever.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT GOD SANCTIFIED THE 7TH DAY OF CREATION INDICATES THAT IT WAS SET ASIDE FOR SACRED SERVICES, WHICH REPRESENTS STILL MORE EVIDENCE THAT THE SABBATH ORDINANCE BEGAN AT CREATION. “THE REASON WHY HE BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY BUT DID NOT BLESS THE PREVIOUS SIX DAYS WAS BECAUSE HE HAD A SPECIAL PURPOSE FOR THE SEVENTH-DAY, AS WILL NOW BE SEEN BY HIS USE OF THE WORD, “SANCTIFIED.”

AUTHORS: To follow is a Hebrew word study that demonstrates conclusively that the Hebrew word here for “set aside” cannot mean “set aside for sacred services.” The special purpose is only in a manner of speaking. The day that God created Eve

was infinitely more special than the 7th day by almost any standard, human or divine. The 7th day of Creation did not become the focus of attention until the giving of the Sabbath commandment at Mt. Sinai called attention to it as its model.

Now is a good time to review the mechanical translation of the passage once more. Notice, again, that the passage merely reports what God did. There is no mention of a Sabbath ordinance, much less any indication that God gave man an institution involving sacred services at this time. When God did give the Sabbath to Israel at the time of the Exodus, the sacred services associated with it included animal sacrifices and circumcision as specified in the Law of Moses. Note also that God never set aside a day for sacred services for his New Covenant believers:

GENESIS 2:2 AND 2:3

And He will much-FINISH (verb) Elohiym in the Day the SEVENTH BUSINESS-him WHICH he did DO (verb) and he will CEASE (verb) in the DAY the SEVENTH from ALL BUSINESS-him WHICH he did DO (verb).

And he will much KNEEL (verb) Elohiym AT DAY the SEVENTH and he will much SET APART (verb) AT him GIVEN THAT in-him he did CEASE (verb) from-ALL BUSINESS-him WHICH he did-FATTEN (verb—in the sense of “to fill up”) Elohiym to DO (verb).

You may recall that Cotto references the *Miriam-Webster’s Dictionary’s* definition of the word, “sanctified,” noting that in English it can mean (a) made holy or consecrated, or (b) set apart for sacred services.

The word, “sanctified,” came into the English language thousands of years after humans began having sacred services. The English meaning of the word, “to set aside for sacred services,” is only a secondary meaning of it, and would only likely have come into English usage as a result of the Judeo-Christian culture that English speaking peoples adopted after the spread the Gospel throughout Europe. Therefore, the English definition means nothing to us in our quest for the answer to the meaning of the Ancient Hebrew word used in Genesis 2:3.

You may recall that he cites the *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Definitions* for the Hebrew word, *qadash*, which is translated as “sanctified,” to mean (a) to consecrate, sanctify, prepare, dedicate, be hallowed, be holy, be sanctified, be separate, to be set apart, be consecrated.

We can accept the meaning of “set aside for a holy purpose,” which is what consecration means, as long as we remember that what got consecrated was one single day. When the American astronauts returned safely from their mission to the Moon, there was a ticker-tape parade for them in New York City. That one and only day in the history of the United States was set aside to memorialize the great accomplishments of these brave men. It was likely the only parade ever given for them, and we don’t have parades to memorialize their accomplishments every week, or even every year.

Additionally he cites *Strong’s Hebrew-Greek Concordance’s* definition of the Hebrew word, *qadash*, as (a) a primitive root; to be (causatively make, pronounce, or observe as) clean.

As we mentioned before, Anti-Sabbatarians have no problem with this one day being made holy and set aside to be remembered forever.

Finally, recall that neither *Brown-Driver-Briggs* nor *Strong’s* reference defines Moses’ Hebrew word, *qadash*, as “to set apart for sacred services.” *Brown-Driver-Briggs* lists the secondary meaning of one of the forms of the word, *qadash*, to mean “to observe as holy, keep sacred,” but you can see from a review of this reference that this form of the word was not the one used in Genesis 2. Even if it was, it is only the secondary meaning of this form of the word that can be used in reference to the keeping of other kinds of religious services.

observe as holy, keep sacred: feasts, Sabbath [Exodus 20:8](#) = [Deuteronomy 5:12](#) (Decal.), [Jeremiah 17:22,24,27](#); [Ezekiel 20:20](#); [Ezekiel 44:24](#); [Nehemiah 13:22](#); fast [Joel 1:14](#); [Joel 2:15](#); year of Jubilee [Leviticus 25:10](#) (P); [עצרה לבעל סו](#) [2 Kings 10:20](#). [Ed. Note: Observe once more than Genesis 2:2-3 is not listed for this form of the word, but Exodus 20:8 is.]

COTTO: THERE ARE SEVERAL OLD TESTAMENT TEXTS THAT SUPPORT THE IDEA THAT “SANCTIFY” MEANS TO SET ASIDE FOR A HOLY PURPOSE, OR EVEN “SET ASIDE FOR SACRED SERVICES.”

AUTHORS: As we review these texts, keep in mind that the Hebrew definitions of the word *qadash* allow for “set apart” or even “set aside for a holy purpose.” But not “set aside for religious services.” A linguistic analysis of Genesis 2:2-3 allows for reading the passage that this one, single day was set aside for a holy purpose, but it does not allow for the Sabbatarian-friendly reading that the day was set aside perpetually for recurring sacred services. Sabbatarians like the idea of the sacred services reading because such a reading would make it a little easier to extend the idea of days with intervals of seven from the 7th day of Creation being set aside for sacred services also.

TEXT #1: And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, (2) Sanctify [*qadash*] unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine. — Exodus 13:1-2

Cotto says, “Notice the word here is used in the context of sanctifying, or dedicating “all” the firstborn. It was announced by God that all the children be sanctified unto Him, and this demanded “all” the people to be involved, for they had to obey the Lord and bring in their children for dedication. All were to know that God was the owner of every firstborn, whether of man or beast.”

Unfortunately, *qadash* is merely used here to mean only to “set apart.” The first born were to be set apart, but they were not set apart for ceremonial use. The first born had a special position in the family, but they were not required to serve in the Tabernacle for the remainder of their lives. They lived ordinary lives except that the first male child got the birthright inheritance— hardly an example of “holy use.” It is acceptable to render the meaning of *qadash* as set aside for holy use, but not as set aside for sacred services.

TEXT #2: And Jehu said, Proclaim [*qadash*] a solemn assembly for Baal. And they proclaimed it. — 2 Kings 10:20

Cotto says, “When used here in the context of proclaiming a solemn feast, “all” the Baal worshippers of Israel were to be informed of this event and to attend it.”

This is Cotto’s only observation about this text. What is his point? Both Sabbatarians and Anti-Sabbatarians agree that the 7th day of Creation Week was set apart from the others. By its very nature, it was different than the other days. It is clear, once again, that *qadash* fits its Hebrew meaning of simply “set aside.” The fact that the sentence conveys the idea that the day was set aside for a religious service is the result of the context in which the word was used and not a function of the specific meaning of the word, *qadash*, itself.

TEXT #3: And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed me not, to sanctify [*qadash*] me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them. — Numbers 20:12

Cotto comments further:

“According to this verse, Moses and Aaron were to sanctify God “in the eyes of the children of Israel.” So we see that when the word “qadash” is used, it is to publicly announce or proclaim that something is set apart for holy use. All those involved were to be made aware of this announcement.

Again, it is okay to interpret *qadash* as to set aside for holy use. The above passage means that Moses and Aaron were to set God apart for receiving the honor and glory that was due to Him. We maintain that this word cannot mean “set aside for sacred services.”

TEXT #4: Moses said to the Lord, “The people cannot come up Mount Sinai, because you yourself warned us, ‘Put limits around the mountain and set it apart as holy.’” — Exodus 19:23

A review of the Piel variation of the verb *qadash* is helpful in this case:

Pi`el – Perfect 3 masculine singular שָׁדַק Numbers 6:11; 1 Kings 8:64, etc.; Imperfect 3 masculine singular שָׁדֵק Genesis 2:3 +, etc.; Imperative masculine singular שָׁדֵק Joshua 7:13; שָׁדֵק Exodus 13:2, etc.; Infinitive construct שָׁדֵק Exodus 29:1 +, etc.; Participle שָׁדֵק Exodus 37:28; suffix שָׁדֵק Exodus 31:13 +, etc.; — [Note Genesis 2:3 uses this variant of the Pi`el form, which means, “be consecrated, dedicated, by]”

1. set apart as sacred, consecrate, dedicate:

a. places: Sinai **Exodus 19:23** (J), alter, etc., Exodus 29:36,37; Exodus 30:29 (P), tabernacle, etc. Exodus 40:9,10,11; Leviticus 8:10,11,15; Numbers 7:1 (twice in verse) (P); tent of meeting Exodus 29:44 (P); place of sacrifice 1 Kings 8:64 2 Chronicles 7:7; gate Nehemiah 3:1 (twice in verse); — Ezekiel 7:24 see שָׁדֵק below.

Here, Cotto attempts to draw a parallel between the setting aside of Mt. Sinai and the so-called setting aside of the 7th day of Creation for the Sabbath ordinance. The comparison works much better between the setting aside of Mt. Sinai for a one-time sacred event and the setting aside of the 7th day of Creation for a one-time sacred event. In regard to the 7th day of Creation, one and only one day was set aside—not multiples of it.

In Exodus 19:23, the word *qadash* is used only to mean “set aside.” In fact, in the Hebrew sentence, the “setting aside,” represented by the pi`el form of *qadash*, acquires its specific meaning of, to be SET ASIDE for a holy purpose, by a Hebrew word that follows it, and that modifies it, and conveys the concept of holiness—*u•qdashth•u*. Therefore, in this case the word *qadash* is dependent on the CONTEXT of the sentence to acquire any meaning that extends beyond simply “set aside.” Our reference here is available at the following link to this passage in the *Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible* at **Scripture4All**:

<http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/OTpdf/exo19.pdf>

COTTO: THE SIMILARITY OF THE HEBREW WORDS FOR “REST” IN GENESIS 2 AND EXODUS 20 PROVIDES EVIDENCE THAT THE WORD TRANSLATED “REST” IN GENESIS IMPLIES A SABBATH REST.

As we have pointed out previously, in Genesis 2, the word translated “rest” is the verb form of the word, and it likely does not mean “rest” in the form of repose. It simply means “cease” or “stop.” Also, as we have out-lined earlier, the form of the verb translated “rest” in Exodus 20 is the irregular form, which implies CEASING rather than REPOSE. Some authorities reject the idea that this passage in Exodus 20 means that God wanted the Israelites to rest on the Sabbath because He reposed on the 7th day of Creation.

What Cotto must do here, but cannot do, is to show that in Genesis 2:2-3, God told Adam and Eve to rest along with Him—impossible since the text does not even say that God Himself rested. Cotto comes up short again because the passage just says what God did. God had worked for six days, whereas Adam and Eve had existed and perhaps worked for one day. The 4th Commandment specifies that humans must work for six days, apparently just as God had worked for six days before He ceased working on the 7th day of Creation Week. Were the Sabbath commandment to have actually existed at the time of Creation, the six day work requirement would still have applied. There is no statement that Adam and Eve rested, ceased, or reposed on the 7th day of Creation as God did.

If there had been a Sabbath in Eden, and **if** God had rested on it, and **if** His resting had been intended as an example for man, the Hebrews would not have been directed by God to march across the desert without keeping every seventh-day as a Sabbath rest. **If** this were the case, God would have forced them to break a law that Sabbatarians claim represents an eternal, moral principle established at Creation.

Recall once more that in Exodus 20, the Ancient Hebrew word usually translated “rest” in the sense of repose can mean either to “cease” (as in stopping) OR “rest” (as in the sense of repose). *Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible* makes this comment about the nature of God’s “rest” in Exodus 20:11, and cites a text in Isaiah that points out that God never becomes weary:

and resteth the seventh day: which does not suppose labour, attended with weariness and fatigue; for the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary, Isaiah 40:28 nor ease and refreshment from it, but only a cessation from the works of creation, they being finished and completed, though not from the works of Providence, in which he is continually concerned: now this

circumstance, before recorded in the history of the creation, is wisely improved to engage an attention to this command, and to the observation of it; there being an analogy between the one and the other, that as God worked six days, and, having done his work completely, ceased from it and rested, so it was fit and proper, that as the Israelites had six days allowed them to labour in, and do all their work, they should rest on the seventh, they and all that belonged to them, or had any connection with them:

God is making an analogy in anthropomorphic terms His people can understand. The reality of the matter is that God never wearies or needs rest. What He could do, as the Great I AM, was to cease creating, and that is exactly what He did. The multiple literary devices Moses used in Exodus 20 to clarify that the Sabbath commandment was merely modeled after the seven days of Creation suggest that Moses was comparing the two events loosely and that the preferred “reading” of the word is “ceased.” The Children of Israel were to cease their daily labors and rest on the Sabbath day.

It is okay when God chooses to speak to humans in anthropomorphic terms, but it is not okay for humans to impose anthropomorphic limitations on God.

COTTO: THE HEBREW WORD FOR “SANCTIFY” IN GENESIS 2 CAN HAVE THE MEANING, “TO KEEP OR OBSERVE THE SABBATH.” THIS IS ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT WHEN GOD SANCTIFIED THE 7TH DAY OF CREATION, HE WAS INDICATING TO ADAM AND EVE HOW THEY WERE TO MAKE USE OF THAT HOLY DAY. "So while the Hebrew word "shabbath" is not found in Genesis, the Hebrew word "shabath" is, and its close connection and nearly same meaning is but more proof that a "Sabbath day" rest is what is intended in Genesis 2:1-3.”

We looked at this issue in a previous section. Cotto is attempting to use a secondary meaning of the word, and on top of that he twists it by trying to apply it specifically to Sabbath observance. The Hebrews used their word for “sanctify” in conjunction with other sacred days and events that were “observed.”

Secondary meanings evolve within a language as it develops a history. Eventually a word that meant “set aside for sacred use” would come to be associated with the term, Sabbath, but it is pure assumption to think that the word “Sabbath” became associated with this form of the word, “sanctify,” at any time prior to the Exodus. Proof– not just evidence– is found in Exodus 16 that there was no Sabbath prior to the giving of the Manna and the Exodus.

The first meaning of a word is always the earliest definition which was created by the earliest common use of the word. Here are the two definitions given for this Hebrew word by *Brown-Driver, and Briggs*. In this case, the word “shabbath” is in its “pi’el” form:

- 1) Set apart as sacred, consecrate, dedicate:
- 2) Observe as holy, keep sacred

Note that *Strong’s* does not list this secondary meaning for “shabbath” at all. Again, we have a problem with reading something back into Genesis 2 from later influences.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT THE LINGUISTIC SUFFIX, “THE EVENING AND THE MORNING,” IS MISSING FROM MOSES’ ACCOUNT OF THE EVENTS OF THE 7TH DAY DOES NOT INDICATE THAT SEVENTH DAY WAS MEANT TO CONTINUE FOREVER WITHOUT AN END. MOSES PUT THE MEANING OF THE EVENING AND MORNING INTO THIS PASSAGE IN TWO DIFFERENT WAYS, AND THIS PROVES THAT THE SABBATH REST TALKED ABOUT IN THIS PASSAGE DOESN’T SIMPLY MEAN ONLY THAT GOD’S REST WOULD LAST FOREVER LIKE THE ANTI-SABBATARIANS WOULD LIKE TO CLAIM: (1) “In other words, the phrase "evening and morning" and the word "sanctified" parallel each other, for both do the same thing. They "set apart." It would have been redundant for Moses to use the phrase, “evening and morning,” when this is already implied by his use of the word "sanctified." (2) The Hebrew word translated "day" is the Hebrew word "yom," and is "defined by evening and morning in Genesis 1," says *Brown-Driver-Briggs’* Hebrew definition. If the combination of the "evening and morning" makes up the "yom" or day, take note, that this same word "yom" is also used in reference to the seventh day.”

The lack of the evening and morning suffix memorializes the memory of this one single day forever by giving it the attributes of blessing and hallowing that can have no boundaries. The actions described by the narrative took place within a 24 hour period of time, but the memory of the blessing and setting aside of that one day would last forever. Once this one day has been blessed and set aside, it doesn't need a weekly cultic ritual to keep it blessed and set aside.

We thank Cotto for acknowledging that the problem of the missing “evening and the morning” suffix is dangerous to Sabbatarianism. He must convince us, therefore, that his effort to explain this problem away is credible, or he has lost the case. He has tacitly agreed to meet the Anti-Sabbatarians at this battle field and conceded that this territory is the key to winning the “war” over the question of whether there is a Sabbath in Genesis.

As we reviewed earlier, the Hebrew word translated as “sanctify” can mean “set apart,” but not “set apart for sacred services.” Therefore, the recognition that one 24-hour period of time in the history of Planet Earth included the concrete action of God setting down His creative “wand” and walking away from it, and kneeling down briefly on the day, does not imply the imposition of a weekly Sabbath ritual by any stretch of the prudent imagination. God’s assignment of unlimited blessing and the reservation of this one 24-hour period of time in the history of Planet Earth to be memorialized without boundaries prevents the possibility that this blessing and setting aside could be applied to any future date in the future, whether an exact interval of the 7th day of Creation or not. Even if the Hebrew word for “set aside” could have the meaning of “set aside for sacred services,” which would indicate that there was a sacred service on the 7th day of Creation, no linguistic justification would exist for reading it to mean that there were to be religious services every seventh day thereafter.

Cotto emphasizes that the Hebrew word, “yom,” is used in conjunction with a description of all the seven days of Creation since he is focused on demonstrating that the 7th day did not last forever. However, the word “yom” functions as a separator to differentiate 24 hour periods of time from one another. The non-inclusion of the suffix, “the evening and the morning” after the 7th day, does not function as a separator of 24-hour periods of time. Rather, it specifies that this time period of 24-hours has the abstract attributes of being blessed and set aside to be remembered forever and without boundaries. In doing so, it prevents the specific application of these attributes to any day beyond its 24-hour boundaries, whether recurring or not.

COTTO: ON THE FOURTH DAY OF CREATION; GOD CREATED THE SUN; MOON; AND STARS SO THAT MAN WOULD BE ABLE TO READ "DAYS:" GOD SAID IN GENESIS 1:14, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divine the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years."

Quoting Cotto:

“After man sinned, these time-telling elements did not cease to exist. If therefore they were established to tell "time" and "days," and their existence continued on through the creation of man until today, then obviously the Bible does not really have to mention "days" after man sinned, for the existence of "days" is already implied through the testimony of these elements. This shows that the seventh day could not possibly have been created to be an unending day of rest, and therefore must have always been a 24-hour day, for these heavenly elements, which were created to read "days," existed even while Adam was in perfect harmony with his Creator.”

Of course this celebration day was limited to 24-hours. It was the memory of its special significance that lasts forever.

William Hohmann points out that the author of Genesis explains what a day consists of as an EVENING and a morning, the evening listed first, which suggests that the movement of the moon, best visible at night, was used to indicate the starting boundary for each day.

We have examined the subject of the lunar calendar earlier in this book. We will expand on the subject now. Let us review the *New International Version's* translation of Moses' account of the events of the fourth day of Creation:

¹⁴And God said, “Let there be lights in the vault of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark sacred times, and days and years, ¹⁵and let them be lights in the vault of the sky to give light on the earth.” And it was so. ¹⁶God made two great lights—the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars. ¹⁷God set them in the vault of

the sky to give light on the earth, ¹⁸to govern the day and the night, and to separate light from darkness. And God saw that it was good. ¹⁹And there was evening, and there was morning—the fourth day.

The Hebrew word translated “as signs to mark sacred times” is “mow’ed,” *Strong’s* word #4150, which means an appointed place, time, or meeting. It would seem that if the Sabbath had been given to Adam and Eve, such a “sacred time” would have been synchronized to the Moon.

Once again by way of review, God gave the Sabbath to Israel from the Mountain of the Moon which borders the Wilderness of the Moon. The Semitic word for moon is “sin,” so both the wilderness and the mountain were named after the Moon. Here is the history of the word's derivation from the *Wikipedia* article on “Sin (Mythology). It is interesting to note that the association between the word “sin” and the moon originated in the Land of Ur, the place where Abraham was dwelling when God called him to be the father of His special people. It is also significant to note that one of the Hebrew words for “moon” is equivalent to the word “sin”:

The original meaning of the name *Nanna* is unknown. The earliest spelling found in Ur and [Uruk](#) is ^D[HYPER-LINK "file://vhadayclu4/wiki/Liste_der_archaischen_Keilschriftzeichen"LAK-32.NA](#) (where NA is to be understood as a [phonetic complement](#)). The name of Ur, spelled LAK-32.UNUGKI=URIM2KI, is itself derived from the theonym, and means "the abode (UNUG) of Nanna (LAK-32)".

The [pre-classical](#) sign LAK-32 later collapses with ŠEŠ (the ideogram for "brother"), and the classical Sumerian spelling is ^DŠEŠ.KI, with the phonetic reading *na-an-na*. The technical term for the crescent moon could also refer to the deity, ^DU₄.SAKAR. Later, the name is spelled logographically as ^DNANNA.

The Semitic moon god Su'en/Sin is in origin a separate deity from Sumerian Nanna, but from the [Akkadian Empire](#) period the two undergo syncretization and are identified. The occasional [Assyrian](#) spelling of ^DNANNA-*ar* ^D*Su'en-e* is due to association with Akkadian *na-an-na-ru* "illuminator, lamp", an epitheton of the moon god. The name of the Assyrian moon god Su'en/Sîn is usually spelled as ^DEN.ZU, or simply with the numeral [30](#), ^DXXX.

He is commonly designated as *En-zu*, which means "lord of wisdom". During the period (c.2600-2400 BC) that Ur exercised a large measure of supremacy over the Euphrates valley, Sin was naturally regarded as the head of the pantheon. It is to this period that we must trace such designations of Sin as "father of the gods", "chief of the gods", "creator of all things", and the like. The "wisdom" personified by the moon-god is likewise an expression of the science of astronomy or the practice of astrology, in which the observation of the moon's phases is an important factor.

Nomadic people, like the Children of Abraham, before migrating to Egypt would have had no other way to keep track of time than the Moon and solar year. It seems unreasonable to think that nomadic people would have the ability over thousands of years to keep track of an exact 7-day interval to the 7th day of Creation, although this is a remote possibility. Is it possible that God synchronized the Jewish Sabbath to the Moon as a way of giving Israel something they could relate to as part of their culture? Israel's neighbors kept track of time with lunar calendars, so far as we can tell. It would seem that virtually all ancient cultures did. If this is the case, it was similar to how God modeled the 10 Commandments after the treaties that were common to neighboring countries, by putting a ceremonial law in the middle of the operational laws.

Lunar Sabbatarians claim that there are 72 instances in Scripture where it can be reasonably deduced from near-by time indicators that these Sabbaths occurred on one of the fixed days of the lunar month upon which the lunar Sabbath days would fall. We could not verify the accuracy of this claim and remain skeptical of its reasonableness. However, as we mentioned before, the most respected Jewish authority, the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1906), states that the Hebrews used a lunar calendar for the largest part of their early history. The scholarly respect it enjoys adds credibility to its position that Israel most likely determined its weekly Sabbath days by the lunar calendar. A later Jewish encyclopedia, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (1943), strongly supports the fact that Israel determined its Sabbaths according to the lunar calendar until sometime after the building of the Second Temple. Additionally, these encyclopedia articles provide a number of Old Testament texts that provide evidence that Israel kept its Sabbaths according to a variable lunar calendar. These texts will be presented as parts of quotes from those encyclopedia articles. At the same time, just like unauthorized Catholic officials have claimed in error

that the Mother Church changed the Sabbath by ecclesiastical authority alone, so it is possible the find Jewish authorities who mistakenly claim that Israel always used a fixed calendar to determine its Sabbath days as a result of a lack of proper research and knowledge. Robert K. Sanders observes that one Catholic apologist he has communicated with had this to say when asked the name of the Pope that changed the Sabbath to Sunday. He said, "If the Sabbath was changed to Sunday it would have had to have been Peter as he is the first pope." Robert Sanders observes that it is impossible for any church or person to alter a covenant made by God. Thus, neither Peter nor a pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday. The Sabbath just ended with the Old Covenant.

The first volume of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* was published in 1901 with the remaining volumes published by 1906. It is an authority of the highest level, so I find it difficult to dismiss the possibility of a movable Sabbath in Israel:

The origin of the Sabbath, as well as the true meaning of the name, is uncertain. The earliest Biblical passages which mention it (Ex. xx. 10, xxxiv. 21; Deut. v. 14; Amos viii. 5) presuppose its previous existence and an analysis of all the references to it in the Canon makes it plain that its observance was neither general nor altogether spontaneous in either pre-exilic or post-exilic Israel. It was probably originally connected in some manner with the cult of the moon, as indeed is suggested by the frequent mention of Sabbath and New-Moon festivals in the same sentence (Isa. i. 13; Amos viii. 5; H Kings iv. 23). The old Semites worshiped the moon and the stars (Hommel, "*Der Gestirndienst der Alten Araber*"). Nomads and shepherds, they regarded the night as benevolent, the day with its withering heat as malevolent. In this way the moon ("Sinai" = "moon ["sin"] mountain") became central in their pantheon. The moon, however, has four phases in approximately 28 days, and it seemingly comes to a standstill every seven days. Days on which the deity rested were considered taboo, or ill-omened. New work could not be begun, nor unfinished work continued, on such days. The original meaning of "Shabbat" conveys this idea (the derivation from "sheba" is entirely untenable). If, as was done by Prof. Sayce (in his Hibbert Lectures) and by Jastrow (in *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1898), it can be identified in the form "shabbaton" with the "Shabattum" of the Assyrian list of foreign words, which is defined as "um nuḥ libbi" = "day of propitiation" (Jensen, in "Sabbath-School Times," 1892), it is a synonym for "Azeret" and means a day on which one's actions are restricted, because the deity has to be propitiated. If, with Toy (in *Journal of Biblical Literature* xviii. 194), it is assumed that the signification is "rest," or "season of rest" (from the verb "to rest," "to cease [from labor]"; though "divider" and "division of time" are likewise said to have been the original significations; comp. also Barth, "Nominalbildungen," and Lagarde, "Nominal-bildung"), the day is so designated because, being taboo, it demands abstinence from work and other occupations. The Sabbath depending, in Israel's nomadic period, upon the observation of the phases of the moon, it could not, according to this view, be a fixed day. When the Israelites settled in the land and became farmers, their new life would have made it desirable that the Sabbath should come at regular intervals, and the desired change would have been made all the more easily as they had abandoned the lunar religion.

The following quote from the article, "Festivals," in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* gives us further insight regarding the concept of the "movable" Sabbath in early Hebrew culture:

The moon was the beneficent deity of the shepherds in the region and climate where ancient Israel had its ancestral home. Hence the many traces of lunar institutions in even the latest Israelitish cult and its phraseology; e.g., the "horn" (crescent), the "face" (of YHWH) in the benedictions, etc. The Sabbath, as marking the end of the week, reveals its lunar origin; the phases of the moon having taught the shepherds, whose weal or woe depended so largely upon the benevolence or malevolence of the night season, to divide the period elapsing between two new moons into four equal groups (weeks), the last day of each—in imitation of the moon's coming to rest, as it were—becoming the day of rest. Indications are not wanting that at first the New Moon festival was not counted among the seven days of the week (see Week); but after $7 \times 4 (=28)$ days had elapsed, one

or two days were intercalated as New Moon days, whereupon a new cycle of four weeks began, so that the Sabbath was a movable festival. Later the week and the Sabbath became fixed; and this gradually resulted in taking away from the New Moon festival its popular importance.

As you will note from the emphasized content below, the 1906 *Jewish Encyclopedia* presents some Old Testament texts which appear to allude to the existence of a movable Sabbath. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* article, "Festivals," states:

Dissociated from the moon, the Sabbath developed into a day of rest for the workers and animals on the farm (Deut. v. 14; Ex. xx. 10). Traces of the old taboo are, however, still found. In Amos viii. 5 it is the fear of evil consequences that keeps the impatient merchants from plying their wicked trade. The multitude of sacrifices (Isa. i. 8; Hosea ii. 11) on Sabbath and New Moon indicates the anxiety on those particular days to propitiate the deity. Closer contact with Assyrians and Babylonians from the eighth to the sixth century BCE probably revitalized the older idea of taboo. The assumption that the Hebrews borrowed the institution from the Babylonians, which was first suggested by Lotz (*Quaestiones de Historia Sabbati*), is untenable; but that the Exile strengthened the awe in which the day was held cannot be denied. It having become a purely social institution, a day of rest for the farmers, the taboo element in course of time had lost its emphasis. The Assyrians and Babylonians may have had similar days of abstinence or propitiation (the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th of the month Elul), and contact with them may have served to lend the Jewish Sabbath a more austere character. **The Assyrian calendar seems to disclose an effort to get rid of the movable Sabbath in favor of the fixed. If after the twenty-eighth day two days are intercalated as new-moon days, the 19th day becomes the 49th from the beginning of the next preceding month, as in the Feast of Weeks, in connection with which the emphasis on "complete Sabbaths" ("sheba' Shabbot temimot"; Lev. xxiii. 15) is noteworthy.** At all events, in the Priestly Code, Sabbath violation is represented as entailing death (Num. xv. 32-36). The prohibition against kindling fire (Ex. xxxv. 3) probably refers to producing fire by the fire-drill or by rubbing two sticks together; this was the crime of the man put to death according to Num. xv. 32-36, the "mekoshesh" (see also Bezah iv. 7), the presence of fire being considered, if the analogy with superstitious practices elsewhere is decisive, a very grave sign of disrespect to the deity.

In the article, "Holidays," from the 1943 *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, the writer stated:

1. Sabbath and New Moon (Rosh Hodesh), both periodically recurring in the course of the year. **The New Moon is still, and the Sabbath originally was, dependent upon the lunar cycle. Both date back to the nomadic period of Israel.** Originally the New Moon was celebrated in the same way as the Sabbath; gradually it became less important, while the Sabbath became more and more a day of religion and humanity, of religious meditation and instruction, of peace and delight of the soul, and produced powerful and beneficent effects outside of Judaism.

(See *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia ...: an authoritative and popular presentation of Jews and Judaism since the earliest times*, Volume 9, page 410, Edited by Isaac Landman, 1943.)

In Landman's article, "Week," (*Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 10, page 482), he says this:

With the development of the importance of the Sabbath as a day of consecration and EMPHASIS laid upon the significant NUMBER SEVEN, the week became more and more divorced from its lunar connection, so that by the time of the second Temple it was merely a period of seven days and no longer depended on the new moon.

At the same time your authors concede that some Jewish authorities deny the concept of a lunar Sabbath, as in the following reference. Here, the historian states what is currently true about the way the Jews keep the Sabbath. He fails to tell his audience, however, that this was NOT the case prior to the building of the second temple:

“[The] Sabbath day does not depend on any calendar. It occurs every seventh day regardless of the lunar or lunar-solar calendars.”

שְׁלֹמֹה צֵיטְלִין – Solomon Zeitlin, 1952, Jewish Historian, cited from

<http://loudcry.org/sda/worlds-last-chance>

Thus, Brendan evidences only a partial understanding of the history of the lunar calendar in Jewish history.

Our research suggests that the affinity for a 7-day week among various early civilizations does not depend on a “dim” memory of the seven days of Creation as passed down through the earliest ages of human history, although such is possible. Since the moon seems to come to a standstill for 7 days at a time during its 28-29 day cycle, a seven-day week would be more likely to develop and/or maintain its widespread usage in ancient cultures for astronomical reasons. How else could nomadic people keep track of time? It is extremely unlikely that the nomadic Hebrews had a written calendar to follow prior to being enslaved by the Egyptians. The phases of the moon provided the only way these nomadic people could keep track of time. Quoted in the *Book of Jude*, *The Book of Enoch* discusses the four 7-day phases of the moon. Supposedly written by Enoch, the 7th from Adam, most scholars believe it was put together from a number of sources about 200 BCE.

Aside from its calendar implications, the *Book of Enoch* is interesting because it makes no reference to the Sabbath or the Mosaic Covenant. Whether it was recorded in writing from an oral history passed down from pre-Flood times, or whether it was put together around 200 BCE, it demonstrates, in either case, that the Jews did not see a Sabbath or a Decalogue in existence prior to Mt. Sinai.

The evidence from the history of the calendars used by ancient civilizations in South America, China, and the Middle East that a major solar system event caused the lunar and solar calendars to get out of sync with each other between the 8th and 7th century BCE reconciles everything we know about Israel's abandonment of the lunar calendar after the building of the Second Temple. Suddenly the lunar calendar didn't work. Israel's ancient neighbors developed fixed calendars as a result, and after one or another of them took Israel captive, they forced the Jews to use the fixed calendars they had devised. The Jews acquiesced to this imposition because their lunar calendar didn't work right any longer. The lunar sabbath feast days were out of sync with the weekly Sabbaths whereas in ancient times all the Sabbaths related to each other in 7-day intervals fixed to the new moon.

COTTO: "The most disturbing verse in the Bible for our critics is one they have no choice but to acknowledge. They have tried their very best; everywhere from saying it is all symbolic to saying that it is only applicable to the past. Some have gone to the extreme to, after finding no other way to escape this reality, accuse us of claiming or somehow supporting new moon observance."

Cotto refers to Isaiah 66:22-23.

Just saying the words doesn't change the reality of this text. Non-scholarly writers would refer to this claim as a “whopper.” To the contrary, this passage is one of the easiest Sabbatarian proof-texts to refute. Anti-Sabbatarians **do** demonstrate that **if** this passage is really about the Heaven of the Hereafter, it would unavoidably teach that both weekly and monthly Sabbath-keeping will be mandatory in Heaven. It would also teach that Levites will serve in the heavenly Temple, and that anyone who doesn't live to age 100 is an accursed sinner. It would not be Heaven in the sense of an eternal Paradise. Isaiah 65 and 66 transcend chapter boundaries in a discussion of the future of Jerusalem. For an increased understanding of this prophecy, please read both chapters together. The question is, which Jerusalem– the capital city of Israel or the Holy City of Heaven? Among other lapses of logic, Sabbatarians have ignored a key word in this proof-text example– the word -AS-. Something that is COMPARED TO something else cannot be the thing itself. And, would accursed sinners be in Heaven?

COTTO: Yet no matter what the claim might be, the following verse is clear even to the eyes of a child, and is piercing through the hearts of the Sabbath's most valiant opponents. These verses are found in the book of the ancient prophet Isaiah:

Isaiah 66:22-23

(22) For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

(23) And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD.

The argument is brought forth, that Isaiah uses common idioms to simply say that in the New Earth there will be constant worship, from week to week, and from month to month.

The key word, AS, makes Isaiah's statement into a comparison and signals the reader that the topic is NOT what happens in the new earth. Let us analyze the passage to find out what Isaiah was talking about.

COTTO: "Little do they realize that by such a claim they actually debunk their own reasoning of the seventh day of Genesis 2:2-3. Let me explain. If the "Sabbath to Sabbath" reference in Isaiah 66:23 is merely to show how worship will be "from week to week" one has to admit that a week necessitates the seventh day, for without the seventh day, there could not logically be a "week." A week consists of "seven" days, and as much as there has to be a first day to begin a week, there must also be a seventh day to end it." Now, our opponents tell us that God will restore the "eternal rest" that our first parents experienced in the Garden, which means there will be no "weekly cycle," for, every day will be an eternal day of rest.

William Hohmann responds: What is happening here is that Cotto is engaging in some obfuscation, which unfortunately we find Sabbatarians doing historically as a matter of habit. Sabbatarians, such as Cotto, cite Isaiah 66 as being situationally, the time frame of the New Heavens and New Earth; a time after all else has happened in relation to physical mankind. Cotto is also saying that the position of the "Anti-Sabbatarian" is based on their time frame, which it is not!

If the case could be made that "people" even after the culmination of all things are keeping the Sabbath, then what excuse could there possibly be for not keeping it now? But Isaiah 66 is not about the time extant after the establishment of the New Heavens and Earth. The reference here uses the future event as something sure to occur; something well established prophetically that without doubt will come about. What then is sure to occur? First, God's people and their offspring will endure in the same way; their "names" will endure.

Now, whether what follows also relates to v. 22 is irrelevant. The statements stand firm as declarations of what God will do, without question. All mankind; all "flesh" will come before God to worship Him. Where? When? The context would indicate this is shortly after the return of Christ and His battle with those nations assembled to oppose Him. Reference is made to "My holy mountain, Jerusalem" in v. 20. Those who opposed Him at his return are there, lying dead for all to see.

Finally, Cotto claims the validation of the Sabbath as a result of the weekly cycle being referenced in the passage. In order for there to be a week, there must be a Sabbath at the end of it. Taking this line of logic out to its logical conclusion, Cotto has validated the observance of New Moon observances. Regardless, a seven day week without the seventh day being a sanctified day, and a seven day week with a sanctified seventh day still results in a seven day week. What Cotto apparently cannot fathom is a seven day week where the seventh day is not, and was not, a holy day to be observed by all mankind. His paradigm forces him to see no other possibilities other than his own.

Kerry Wynne responds: The structure of a 7-day week is self-evident. The problem is that the Book of Revelation tells us in relation to the New Heavens and Earth that there will be no night "there." If there is no night, there are no "days," because a day consists of both a period of daylight and a period of night time— an "evening" and a "morning." Isaiah could not be talking about the Heaven of the Hereafter. Back on Earth, in the Jerusalem of Israel, there are real 24-hour days.

The "eternal rest" we are told will exist in Heaven is the rest from the nightmare of sin—not from activity, enjoyable labor, and adventure. Cotto is thinking about rest as a cessation of labor. It does not follow that a cosmic rescue from sin through redemption would have anything to do with a weekly cycle.

COTTO: However, if Isaiah tells us we will have a week to week worship experience, how can you have an eternal day, while at the same time you have a weekly cycle where one 24 day follows the next? It's impossible and illogical! You can't have on the one hand an eternal rest where the rest-day will never end, and in the other hand a "week to week" where by definition you must have each consecutive day end at the same time!"

Kerry Wynne responds: No such conflict exists. The 7th day of Creation marked the beginning of God's eternal rest from creating Planet Earth. Since there is no night in Heaven, there can't be "days" as we think of them; so there can be no "weeks" as we think of them now. For the purpose of analysis, note that God's rest from creating Planet Earth is eternal whether our perspective is the Jerusalem of Israel or the Heaven of the Hereafter.

William Hohmann responds: The impossible and illogical situation is the creation of the SDA to begin with. It is a classic straw-man argument. It is the Sabbatarian that insists this is a post- New Heavens/ New Earth premise. The temptation here is to chide Cotto for being unable to comprehend something spiritual in nature. The author of Hebrews speaks of God's rest that God entered into on that seventh day of Creation Week, and associates this "day" as "another day" in chapter 4 besides the weekly sabbath, which day is designated as: "To day". "To day" (today) one can enter into God's rest. Tomorrow becomes "To day" when we are in that day, and the same condition remains extant regarding God's rest and entering into it. God will still be in His Rest tomorrow. People will still have the opportunity to enter into His Rest, through faith, tomorrow, when it is known then as "To day". This concept is irrelevant to any association regarding a seven day week and worship of God during that week. Perhaps the problem with Cotto's comprehension is the association his church makes between "rest" and "worship", having historically blurred the concepts together so much so that they no longer see a distinction, having redefined the sabbath in this manner.

COTTO: "No doubt we will enter into the rest of the true heavenly Canaan, as taught in Hebrews 3 and 24, but the weekly rest, the memorial of God's Creation, will continue from week to week, only this time it will be a memorial of God's "new" creation of the heavens and earth, for, says the apostle, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth... I make all things new." Revelation 21:1-5.

We are hoping Cotto is not trying to get any support for Sabbatarianism from Hebrews 3 and 4. The author of Hebrews is comparing the rest of the saints from the agony of sin and a vain life to the rest from physical labor the Jews enjoyed on the Sabbath day. Heaven provides a wonderful rest from sin and its consequences, but this passage in the Book of Hebrews has nothing to do with a cultic Sabbath ritual requirement for Christians.

Isaiah and St. John are using the term "new heavens and earth" in different ways. Isaiah is using it as a COMPARISON to demonstrate how long the memory of the valiant and faithful Israelites will last—forever. St. John is referring to the thing itself—a REFERENCE.

Is Cotto using Revelation 21:1-5 as evidence that the Sabbath, which he refers to as the "weekly rest," will be observed in the New Earth? If so, this point of view betrays a very primitive view of the cosmos. If God is going to make both a new "heavens" and a new "earth," He might make them in a different dimension, or in a different galaxy. He might make them in some way that we have no capacity to understand now. Our sun has a limited lifespan, and so does Planet Earth. Our solar system will eventually burn out during our unlimited lifetime in Heaven. Perhaps Heaven is in a dimension that does not have much in common with the way we perceive things now. God is probably chuckling at our own ideas about the cosmos and thinking to Himself what a big surprise we will be in for later. When you read the description of the New Jerusalem, it is difficult to conclude the New Earth it resides upon is an actual physical planet.

Additionally, where is the biblical authority to declare that the significance of the Sabbath will be expanded to represent something far beyond its original purpose? The Sabbath was given only to Israel and to distinguish the Jews from all other nations on the face of the Earth. It was a "shadow" of Christ which lost its meaning entirely when Christ appeared. Apart from the Nation of Israel, the Sabbath has no meaning. The Sabbath is a sign of the Old Covenant—a contract between God and Israel—which was broken when the Jews rejected Christ and crucified Him. Just like a marriage contract is null and void if a wife murders her husband, so the Old Covenant ceased to exist when Jesus was nailed to the cross. Sabbatarians however must expand and increase the overall concept of the Sabbath in order to continue justifying its observance. They must make it out to be much more than it really is. Imagine the results should the SDA Church, for example, admit the Sabbath was of no consequence in Christianity. No, their collective egos cannot accept the possibility. Therefore, the Sabbath will be defended and promoted at all costs and by any means, including unscrupulous ones.

COTTO: Isaiah 66:23 is very difficult for Anti-Sabbatarians to deal with. If Isaiah is depicting an event not too far from his time, but before the time of Christ, then why does he reference the same "new heaven and new earth" that John the Revelator cites?

When you are using something as a COMPARISON, any time or distance works. Both writers mention the same Heaven of the Hereafter, but Isaiah is using as a COMPARISON, whereas John is referencing the place itself. John does not compare it with anything.

Read this passage again and again notice the word, AS.

(22) For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

COTTO: And if that is symbolic, John's must also be symbolic, and there will not really be a new heaven or new earth."

John makes no claim to be using his reference to the new heavens and the new earth as a comparison. Isaiah warns his readers that a COMPARISON is about to follow by prefacing his phrase with the word "AS". By contrast, Isaiah used his reference to the New Heaven and the New Earth to compare the length of time that Israel's faithful heroes **would be remembered to how long the new heaven and new earth would exist**. A COMPARISON is not like a SYMBOL.

If we take the prophecies of Isaiah 65 and 66 and relate them to what things would be like for the Jerusalem of Israel, everything he said makes sense **whether the prophecy is symbolic or literal**. On the other hand, if we try to apply these chapters to the New Jerusalem in Heaven, **nothing seems to work whether the thing is taken symbolically or literally**. The Old Covenant provided for days of rest governed by the appearance of each new moon. However, by the time of Christ the importance of the reckoning of the new moon for Sabbath-keeping had virtually disappeared from mainstream Judaism. Not even Israel was keeping the biblical Sabbath. By contrast, the New Covenant provided for no rest days whatsoever, and certainly not ones determined by the movements of the sun and moon. Thus, no reckoning of the movements of the Sun and Moon, no Sabbath-keeping!

COTTO: "The accusation is hurled at us, that if it is all literal (and we don't subscribe to the entire chapter being literal), then there will be carcasses in the New Earth according to verse 24. But this does not move us, for the verse says that they "will go forth, and look upon the carcasses..." and we know that this will literally take place, for as New Jerusalem descends from heaven, God destroys the wicked (Revelation 20:9) and those inside the city walls will obviously be able to look outward at the transpiring event. This does not mean that their dead bodies will abide there forever, for the very word "carcasses" implies a "decaying body" that will soon disappear, as Malachi alludes to, "ye shall tread down the wicked, and they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet." Malachi 4:3.

Nothing is said about the New Earth other than to use it as a COMPARISON to demonstrate how long the memory of the faithful of Israel would be remembered. It is not obvious that in the Holy City of the Hereafter there would be any dead bodies lying around to observe from the city walls. In Revelation 20 John says that fire comes down and burns the wicked up. Fire destroys things quickly. There would be no dead bodies left to see for more than a few seconds after the destruction of the wicked. The application to the Heaven of the Hereafter doesn't fit. If we are talking about the Jerusalem of Israel on Earth, it is easy to visualize Israel's neighbors attacking Jerusalem and losing the battle. In this case it is easy to visualize dead bodies lying around outside the city wall and people looking down on the sordid scene.

COTTO: Both the "it is all literal" and the "it is all symbolic" positions are faulty, which is why we take up the "double application" position of this chapter, explained in more detail at another web page at this site titled: Isaiah 66:23: New Moon observance.

The primary symbolism of this passage is Isaiah's use of the enduring qualities of Heaven to **represent** how long those true to God would be remembered. There is nothing in the text or the context of Isaiah's statement that requires a double application. There is no possible way to link Isaiah's statement to Sabbath-keeping in Heaven or a New Earth. There is no harm done in thinking about this passage as a symbol of God's eternal victory as long as we keep in mind that almost any noble victory can be stretched to be used as a symbol of God's final victory over sin.

Biblical scholars tend to view Isaiah as a Messianic prophet. Many of his prophecies about the life of Christ were amazingly detailed. Theologian James Burton Coffman sums up the work of various biblical scholars in regard to chapters 65 and 66:

A summary of this chapter must be especially heeded in the interpretation of it. Adam Clarke declared that, "These last two chapters relate to the calling of the Gentiles, the establishment of the Christian church, the reprobation of the apostate Jews, and their destruction executed by the Romans." (*Adam Clarke's Commentary*, Vol. IV, p. 244.) Lowth concurred in this analysis. (*Robert Lowth's Commentary*, p. 402). "This final chapter points to the final days of Judah and the coming glory of Zion in the new dispensation." (Homer Hailey, *A Commentary on Isaiah: With Emphasis on the Messianic Hope*, p. 521)

<http://www.studylight.org/com/bcc/view.cgi?book=isa>
["http://www.studylight.org/com/bcc/view.cgi?book=isa&chapter=066"](http://www.studylight.org/com/bcc/view.cgi?book=isa&chapter=066)
["http://www.studylight.org/com/bcc/view.cgi?book=isa&chapter=066"](http://www.studylight.org/com/bcc/view.cgi?book=isa&chapter=066)

As we mentioned before, it is entirely possible that all these things would take place somewhere else in the universe, perhaps in a different dimension, where there is no night. Since it takes both nighttime and daytime to equal a "yom" day, there would be no days there. The idea of having a moon that rotates around Heaven just like the one that revolves around Planet Earth is unlikely. An interpretation like Cotto's does not follow the accepted principles of literary interpretation.

COTTO: Adam and Eve essentially broke the Sabbath commandments. ... Let us face the facts and see clearly that when James said that when we break even one of the commandments we have in essence broken them all (James 2:10), he was not lying. Now the Law of God, says the Psalmist, is "perfect" -Psalm 19:7. It is also "holy" and perfectly "just" -Romans 7:12. Paul also says that where ever there is sin, there must also be a law, for "where no law is, there is no transgression" - Romans 4:15. He clearly said that, "by the law is the knowledge of sin" -Romans 3:20. So, when Adam and Eve sinned in the Garden of Eden, how did they know they actually sinned? Paul answer's that we have knowledge of sin by "the law." There must have therefore been a law in place when Adam and Eve sinned, for they clearly acknowledged their sin (Genesis 3:2, 3, 7).

Authors: There was only one formal law in the Garden of Eden, and they knew EXACTLY what it was. They were not to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. It seems incredible that our first parents could not even "keep" one law.

The burden of proof is on Cotto to demonstrate from Genesis 2:2-3 alone that there were other formal laws imposed upon them, including Sabbath-keeping. Adam and Eve were not fallen beings in the beginning. They had no innate tendency toward evil. It is only speculation that pre-Fall beings or angels would need formal laws. No one can escape natural law, however, and it would seem that Adam and Eve would have a native understanding of cause and effect relationships which create the difference between right and wrong. Cotto speaks a certain kind of spiritual truth, but the application of it leads him to circular reasoning and dangerous assumptions.

The Adventist understanding of the concept of the LAW is simplistic. It ignores the multifaceted view of the term LAW held by the Jews. **Since the Bible was written by Jews, a failure to understand the way its Jewish authors thought about the LAW leads to a comedy of errors.**

William Hohmann responds: Cotto has just made a lot of claims, proof-texting his way through his claims. I'm going to break it all down, and address the individual points:

"Adam and Eve essentially broke the Sabbath commandments. ...Let us face the facts and see clearly that when James said that when we break even one of the commandments we have in essence broken them all (James 2:10), he was not lying."

James is referring to the Old "Covenant" Law. In a covenant, all conditions/requirements must be complied with or fulfilled, or the covenant is violated. Covenants also have legal parties to them, and the legal parties of that covenant were God and the Israelites. Cotto carelessly (?) slips the "we" in as parties to that covenant. He also implies Adam and Eve were party to that covenant! That covenant law required one not born of Israel to undergo circumcision in order to enter into that covenant with Israelites and God. Were Gentile converts to Christianity required to undergo circumcision and keep the law? Not according to Acts 15. Was Adam circumcised? These facts of the law does not deter Sabbatarians. They simply redefine what the Law is for Christians, as well as Adam and Eve on the fly, here insisting that this law is the Ten Commandments, they being a

separate law of sorts; a second or separate covenant, thereby chopping up the Law into the “Law of Moses” and the “Law of God” being the “Big Ten.” What gets conveniently overlooked is James statement from James Chapter Two that relates to the “whole” law that Cotto words as “them all” above. “Them all” refers to the entire Law—at least to the 613 laws of Moses, or the Torah, and perhaps the whole of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. It appears Cotto just violated the biblical admonition against adding to or taking away from Scripture! He has added Christians as well as Adam and Eve to that covenant law, and took away a lot of that law in this process also so as to leave standing the Ten Commandments for all mankind for all eternity. When James was speaking about breaking one point in the law he was not only quoting from the Big Ten but also a point from the rest of the law of the Old Covenant (**James 2:8 - “Love your neighbor as yourself.”**) James was speaking to Jewish converts who prided themselves for keeping the law while they were actually breaking major portions of it, including the spirit of the Law, in a similar manner to many Seventh-day Adventists and other Sabbatarians.

Then there is the matter of what was actually ratified as the Old Covenant. It was the Book of the Law that was sprinkled with blood, along with the people, that made up the Old Covenant. There is nothing in either the Old Testament writings or the New Testament writings that treats the law as being two laws, or the Ten Commandments as a separate law. Again, it demonstrates the carelessness Sabbatarians resort to in order to hold to a false theology and belief system.

The “whole” Law is just that; the whole law – circumcision to sacrifices – 613 points of law of which only a fraction do Sabbatarians attempt to keep. I say “attempt” because even when it comes to just the Ten Commandments, especially the Sabbath commandment, they do not truly keep or comply with it according to Scripture.

Cotto cites part of Psalm 19:7 –

“The law of the Lord is “perfect.”

By omitting the rest of the sentence (an example of “taking away”) a desired interpretation and claim is made other than what the sentence actually supports.

The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.

If one is careless, working from assumptions, they may well assume this is referring to the Old Covenant law, or perhaps as Sabbatarians would prefer, the Ten Commandments. But it begs a logical question. When did the Old Covenant law, or the Ten Commandments, ever “convert” a soul? Never! Conversion is the process by which one receives the Holy Spirit. They are “converted” into a son or daughter of God. Their minds are converted to conform to the will of God. God's Spirit is referred to in Scripture as a “law” which God places within the true believer who believes the true gospel. Sabbatarians, by the very fact they are Sabbatarians, buy into a false gospel of works, and as a result, refuse to acknowledge God's Holy Spirit as possibly being a guiding force and light in their lives, opting instead on the Old Covenant letter of the law, where they try to find justification for “keeping” the Sabbath. The distinctions made between the Old Covenant ministration of death and condemnation are blurred with the New Covenant law of faith; law of Christ; law of liberty; law that leads to life. The Holy Spirit is relegated to being merely a force of God, and not literally God. God in the form of the Holy Spirit must be diminished in order to magnify the Old Covenant law and Sabbath. The Sabbath is elevated above God.

The following text is a favorite of Sabbatarians:

Romans 7:12 (NIV) - So then, the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, righteous and good.

I would simply point out that the sacrifices were holy, and the Law indeed was perfectly “just”, justly condemning those who broke the law to death. If you want justice, the Old Covenant law is for you. Personally, I prefer the grace, mercy and pardon from condemnation available in the “new” law of the Spirit, made possible by the substitutionary death and sacrifice of Christ.

The apostle Paul points out another quality of that Old Covenant law in II Corinthians Chapter 3. That law had a glory to it; but its glory was seen as waning; fading away and when contrasted to the New Covenant Law of the Spirit, which has a glory far superior to that glory of the Old Covenant engraven in stones. The glory of the new does not fade away, and when compared to the glory of the Old Covenant Ten Commandments possessed it hardly had any glory at all. He also says that where ever there is sin, there must also be a law, for “where no law is, there is no transgression” - Romans 4:15.”

What accompanies transgression? Condemnation! A remembrance of sin. Paul, in Romans 8, informs us that there is no longer condemnation for the believer. Why? How? Because the believer is removed from the Law that was associated with sin and condemnation! Christians are not under the Law; freed from the law; dead to the Law. Sabbatarians work very hard at resurrecting Christians back to the Law, putting them under the Law; chaining them to the Law, all so that they can justify once more their adherence to the Sabbath. Christian Liberty under the Law of Christ and the Holy Spirit is perceived as an unreachable Orwellian utopia from which they are forever barred. To them there is no true freedom in Christ.

Cotto: "He clearly said that, "by the law is the knowledge of sin" -Romans 3:20. So, when Adam and Eve sinned in the Garden of Eden, how did they know they actually sinned? Paul answer's that we have knowledge of sin by "the law." There must have therefore been a law in place when Adam and Eve sinned, for they clearly acknowledged their sin (Genesis 3:2, 3, 7)."

After eating from the forbidden tree Adam and Eve's "eyes were opened". They then knew that they sinned by breaking God's command not to eat from the forbidden tree. Cotto in his haste twists the scriptures to defend the old covenant law. He attempts to "stuff " it back into the Garden of Eden so as to establish the sabbath ordinance:

Gen 3:7 (NIV) - Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.

Whereas before, Cotto tried to establish the Law as extant and in force after Christ's sacrifice ended it, he now tries to establish it as extant and in force before Moses even gave it, all for the sake of trying to help establish the Sabbath as a Creation ordinance. There indeed was a law to transgress for Adam and Eve, but not the law Cotto desires. It was, and is, the same law that has always existed as the base law to the Old Covenant law; a law of faith and the spirit.

Galatians 3:19 (KJV) - Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. – Galatians 3:19

Sabbatarians insist this "law" that was added "couldn't possibly be the Ten Commandments", so "law" gets redefined on the fly, as need sees fit. Yet, we never see examples of Israel, or Jesus in the New Testament writings make any mention or reference to there being but one Law.

This law of faith and the spirit deals with the heart and intent of heart. Here then, as they say in a mystery novel, the plot thickens. Adam was commanded not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and that should he do so, in that day, he would die. He and Eve decided to eat of that fruit anyway, and the rest, as they say, is history. But WHY did they eat of that tree, even after being told it would result in death? The answer is of great importance, and addresses a LAW much greater in every way than the Ten Commandments and Sabbath. That law of FAITH. Adam and Eve, first and foremost, violated the law of faith. They did not believe God. They doubted God regarding what He said about that fruit and that tree.

Cotto makes mention of the Law making known good and evil; being a source of knowledge in this regard, but does not put two and two together, due to his Sabbatarian bias. The law of the Old Covenant is representative of that tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Like that tree, the fruit of the law is death. That law was given to faithless Israelites. It was, according to Moses, to be a witness against them, proving them to be faithless. But here's the "rub". Keeping the Law does not prove one faithful, or righteous. You can refrain from murdering someone, yet still have hatred in the heart, therefore being in violation still of the law of faith and love. It is God's Spirit within the believer that makes all the difference here. Only with God's Spirit are we capable of living a life of love and faith; true faith, in God. All else is a shadow, or a counterfeit, including the Ten Commandments. Why would Christians, with the very Spirit of God in them, need to be told not to have other gods besides God, and be told – commanded – not to worship other gods? Why would they need to be commanded not to murder – an act of hatred? And why, WHY therefore, having this knowledge and understanding, would we need to be told to keep the Sabbath? The Sabbatarian puts the Ten Commandments above all else solely for the purpose of justifying Sabbath observance. But if you understand the above, and understand the "law" of faith and the Spirit, which necessitates love, then you can see why the apostle Paul refers to the law engraven in stone as being obsolete. It was a law for the faithless, and not the faithful.

Cotto might as well have gone one step further and claimed the devil sinned by transgressing that law also, which would back the Sabbath commandment up to even before that seventh day of Creation Week, but then he would have to deal with the

obvious absurdity of the conflict of having the Law, with the Sabbath extant before that seventh day they claim instituted the Sabbath. Yet the devil did sin.

This law is the law of faith-- the New Covenant law of faith that is associated directly with Christ, for you see, there were two trees in the Garden of Eden, and not just that tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There was that tree of life, representative of Christ and His law of faith-- His law that leads to life; whose fruit is life, and not death.

"GARDEN OF EDEN" LAW

The last few verses of the last book of the Bible forbid us to add or take away words from it. In two places of the old covenant writings, the same prohibition is given regarding God's inspired Word, the Scriptures. One can make the Bible appear to teach anything by adding or taking away words to Scripture. We only know of one command God gave to Adam and Eve at Creation. They were forbidden to eat the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Since there was no sin and no tendency toward evil, it is not productive to read back into the Garden of Eden the same set of rules and regulations that God needed to keep the stubborn and degenerate Hebrews under control. Take the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Adam and Eve had only themselves, so there was no one else to tempt them. Also, think of the absurdity of trying to apply the command, "Thou shalt not covet" in relation to the property of others? What about the commandment to honor your father and mother? God was the Father of Adam and Eve. Did God have a wife, like the Mormons teach?

The Ten Commandments, with the exception of the Sabbath commandment, are explanations of natural cause and effect. It would be absurd to say that Adam and Eve were not subject to natural law. If you steal something that belongs to someone else, that person may fight you to get the item back, and one or both of you might die. St. John says that everyone who is born into this world is enlightened by the Holy Spirit. A Heathen born in the middle of the jungles of Africa has an innate sense that killing, stealing are wrong, and may even have a dim sense that sex outside of a committed relationship is wrong. However that same person will never conclude on his own that he or she must rest one day out of seven, much less figure out which one of those seven days is the "right one."

Recall that about a month prior to reaching that camp, the Hebrews had left Egypt on a Thursday night around 5 pm. They traveled on Friday night and Saturday, and then for the next month, marching across the wilderness, camping along the way with no thought of Sabbath observance. About a month into their journey, they marched from a camp at the Red Sea until they arrived, about 5 pm, at the edge of the Wilderness of Sin, on a Saturday evening. They had marched on Friday, Friday night, and most of the daylight hours of Saturday at God's express command. That Saturday evening, God gave the Israelites the rules and regulations governing the collection of the Manna, but there was no mention of the Sabbath at that time. The manna fell the next morning and every morning. What we would think of as Friday night of the week that followed their arrival at the Wilderness of Sin, God introduced the Sabbath to them. Now the reason for gathering a double portion the day before became apparent. They were to gather an extra supply for the Sabbath, as there would be none found on that day. Unlike the other days of the week, where any that was left overnight rotted and bred worms, this would not happen overnight when the Sabbath was the next day.

Among other things that indicate that the Hebrews knew nothing about the Sabbath until that Friday night, if they had been familiar with the Sabbath, they would not need to be told not to gather Manna on the Sabbath day.

As we have pointed out several times before, Genesis 2 tells us what God did in regard to resting on the 7th day of Creation, and the telling of what God did says nothing about what Adam and Eve were to do. Just because God did something doesn't mean He was setting an example for Adam and Eve. For example, we are not instructed to follow the example of Jesus by refraining from marriage. None of us would be here if we did!

The people before the flood were guided in their morals by the laws that were a matter of conscience. God told Noah His Spirit would not always strive with man:

Genesis 6:3 (NIV) - 3 Then the Lord said, "My Spirit will not contend with humans forever, for they are mortal; their days will be a hundred and twenty years." (Bible Gateway)

God never sent a prophet to threaten the pouring out of God's wrath on a Heathen nation or city for Sabbath breaking. And also as we mentioned earlier, the **Book of Enoch**, which purports to have been written before the Flood, makes no mention

of the Sabbath or the Decalogue, and whether it was written before the Flood or just a few hundred years before the birth of Christ, this fact still provides evidence that the Jews understood that there was no Sabbath prior to Exodus 16.

ISRAEL'S TORAH

When you study the Bible and consider the topic of the LAW, you have to understand how the Jews thought about Natural Law versus Torah Law before you can grasp what they meant when they mentioned The Law in their writings. **If you want to understand the Bible properly, it is a good idea to understand how the Bible writers thought about things, as well as the culture in which they wrote.**

The Jews taught that the LAW consisted of 613 equally important commandments, which included the 10 Commandments. It was the book of the law that was ratified as the old covenant, which book contained the Ten Commandments. If the 10 Commandments had been a morally complete set of laws, God would not have given Israel 603 additional laws which included moral laws that are not found in the 10 Commandments. If the 10 Commandments had been complete, St. Paul would not have given us several extensive lists of sins that will keep a person out of Heaven without ever mentioning Sabbath-breaking. In the Torah, Jewish tradition, and Jewish culture the term “adultery” is very specific and cannot be generalized to be equated with other sexual sins such as fornication and homosexual activity. Evidence that this is true is that God chose to add prohibitions and additional sexual sins in the Law of Moses.

Cotto is attempting to apply a meaningful principle to the wrong situation. He demonstrates that Adam and Eve broke law, but he misses the mark in that there was no letter-of-the-law Sabbath at the time to break.

COTTO: JESUS' STATEMENT IN MARK 2:27-28 THAT THE SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN AND NOT MAN FOR THE SABBATH PROVES THAT THE SABBATH WAS GIVEN TO EVERYONE.

So far, we have witnessed Cotto make a number of claims of proof for Sabbath keeping that relied on dubious rationalizations and logical fallacies. Here, Cotto avails himself to a classic case of eisegesis [an improper textual study method] and insists it also is proof. Let us examine his claim critically.

We have already discussed the historical and cultural aspects of this passage, that Gentiles were considered to be “dogs” and as such, subhuman as compared to the Jews. If Jesus were indeed claiming the Sabbath was made for all mankind, such a declaration would have elicited an angry response from those present. Along with this, we have the understanding of how “man” is used in regards to the Greek word man is translated from: *Anthropos*. Cotto attempts to assign “all mankind” as the interpretation of the word in that context, when in fact the word *anthropos*, even elsewhere in the same narrative of Mark, shows how this word can mean anything from one man, as with the man with a withered hand whom Jesus healed, to any subset of men, to all mankind. Sabbatarians opt for all mankind, not based on any proper examination of the text, the text's context, or the culture that determined the connotative meanings connected with the term's use in the Israel of Jesus' day, but simply and only because it dovetails into their theology. This is a good example of how anyone can treat a passage of Scripture eisegetically instead of using proper methods of textual exegesis.

The word "made" takes us back to Creation Week. In Exodus 16 the Sabbath was not "made." It was revealed and given as a commandment:

This ploy is just playing with semantics. We find some logical problems with this concept:

1. If Cotto concedes that God waited till Exodus 16 to “reveal” the Sabbath to the Hebrews, he also concedes that under God's direction His people broke the Sabbath for the first 38 days of their journey. Why didn't God reveal it to them before they left Egypt and promise to help them keep it faithfully during their travels? If He is right, we have some serious questions about God's character and the importance of the Sabbath commandment. It appears we don't have to keep the Sabbath unless it is convenient to do so.
2. If the Hebrews didn't know about the Sabbath until Exodus 16, it is unlikely that they ever knew about it. It is unlikely that they would forget completely about the Sabbath evening during 400 years of slavery in Egypt. Moses told the story of the Exodus with the Jewish calendar, and his dates for different events of the Exodus

that prove that the Hebrews didn't keep the Sabbath until several weeks after their journey out of Egypt. This possibility by itself creates doubt about a Creation origin for the Sabbath.

3. If the Hebrews didn't know about the Sabbath till Exodus 16, and God gave Adam and Eve the Sabbath, at what point did mankind forget completely about it? Had it been forgotten about by the time of Abraham? Moses makes no mention of Sabbath-keeping by any party from Genesis 1 to Exodus 16.
4. Pioneer SDA Sabbath scholar, J. N. Andrews, explained what he thought the evidence was that the Hebrew people were familiar with the Sabbath when it was "reinforced" to them in Exodus 16. If Andrews is wrong, questions 1-3 continue to nag at us. (We evaluated his arguments earlier in this paper.)
5. If something has to be REVEALED, by the very way the word is used in the English language, those to whom it is revealed must know nothing about it. If it was revealed to Israel at the time of the Exodus, they could not have known about it before. In the particular case of the Sabbath, even if by some incomprehensible provision the Sabbath had existed previously, and God hadn't yet told anyone about it, it would be meaningless for the sake of this argument. If they didn't know about it, regardless of why they didn't know about it, they couldn't be expected to keep it and they couldn't be held responsible for not keeping it.

Only important things are generally spoken of in terms of revelation, and the expectation is that when something is revealed to someone, that person will respond with a certain amount of awe and reaction. For example, if I reveal to a friend that his wife has been cheating on him, I would expect him to act with surprise, wonder, and anger— something that would not be genuinely possible if he already knew about her affair.

THE DEFINITE-INDEFINITE ARTICLE PROBLEM

It is when one gets into the original Hebrew that Cotto runs into a formidable barrier when he tries to make the Sabbath exist prior to Exodus 16. When the Old Testament is read in Hebrew, every time God reveals a new festival or ordinance to Israel, it is introduced with an indefinite article, but each subsequent mention is introduced with a definite article. English translations are not always consistent in maintaining this usage designation, but the original Hebrew is virtually always consistent. I say virtually always because I have not found any report of exceptions in the original Hebrew. Notice that Moses introduces the first mention ever of the Sabbath in the Bible with the indefinite article, "a" Sabbath. The following is from the King James Version:

(25) And Moses said, Eat that today; for today is a sabbath unto the LORD: to day ye shall not find it in the field.

(26) Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none.

(27) And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none.

(28) And the LORD said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?

(29) See, for that the LORD hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. (King James Version)

Notice that in Exodus 20:8-10 in the NIV version, the definite article is used, signaling the reader that the Sabbath has existed previously. There is no textual license in the Pentateuch to take this pre-existence any further back than Exodus 16. The passage is quoted in the NIV:

Exodus 20:8-10 (NIV) - Remember THE Sabbath day by keeping it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is A sabbath to the Lord your God.

Notice also that the indefinite article before the second reference to "a sabbath" is not in the indefinite form to signal the reader that it is a subsequent mention of the Sabbath. Instead, the second word, sabbath, in this passage is equivalent to the generic word for rest. It means something that could be compared to saying, "The Sabbath is a rest to the Lord your God."

COTTO: In Exodus 20 it [the Sabbath] was not "made" either. There it was also "given," but this time as part of the Ten Commandments. The only place we are left with is Genesis 2:1-3.

Cotto's logic, or lack of it, seems to go like this. *The Sabbaths mentioned in Exodus 20 and Exodus 16 were "given."—not MADE. The Sabbath had to have been MADE somewhere, and the only place left for it to have been MADE is Genesis 2.* This assumption represents a concession that it is not easy to find a Sabbath in Genesis 2, so the only way you can get one into it is to declare that it is the only place left for it to have originated. The Sabbath is not something that one would talk about in terms of coming into existence through being made. I can see God in the process of sculpturing Eve. However, in thinking of the words to describe how the Sabbath ordinance came into existence, one would tend to think of it in terms that it was "initiated" by Him or "implemented" by Him. It is unreasonable to think that you can get a Sabbath into Genesis 2 by the process of elimination. Regardless, the theological sleight of hand here does not eliminate the fact that the Sabbath indeed was "given", and it was given to the children of Israel, via a covenant no others being a legal party among men.

In taking this line of logic out a bit further, we wonder about the commands that revolved around sacrifices. Were they "given" and "made" also? Unlike the sabbath commandment, we find evidence from the beginnings of Genesis up to Exodus 16 of people practicing and partaking of sacrifices, before they were incorporated into the law. God sacrificed animals to provide Adam and Eve with coverings after they sinned, and sacrificed continued as a representation of Christ and His sacrifice for all mankind. Cotto would no doubt insist Christ's sacrifice signaled an end to animal sacrifices, seeing as they pointed to Christ's sacrifice. But, when confronted with the concept of the sabbath as a shadow of Christ and the rest found in Him, there is a logical disconnect.

COTTO: SINCE I HAVE JUST PROVED THAT THE SABBATH WAS MADE IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN, JESUS LINKED THE MAKING OF THE SABBATH IN GENESIS TWO TO THE PRESENT WEEKLY SABBATH OF HIS DAY BY SAYING THAT THE SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN AND NOT MAN FOR THE SABBATH.

The word Jesus used, man, to the great disappointment of our opponents, does not mean "Jew." Thayer's Greek New Testament definition tells us what this word means: *anthropos* (man): a human being, whether male or female, generically, to include all human individuals, in the plural, people. The word "Jews" or "Israel," are not included in the definition of the word, "man," translated from the Greek word, *anthropos*. The word simply means "mankind." This provides more evidence that the Sabbath existed in Genesis. Not only does Jesus direct our minds towards Creation Week, but He tells us that it was made for "man."

Then Cotto waxes eloquently, and I quote:

Who was the "man" back then, in Creation Week? You guessed it, Adam and Eve! Jesus was clear enough on this issue. Want to find the Sabbath in the book of Genesis? See what Jesus says! I'm sure our critics won't disagree with Him. Or would they?

A study of Jewish culture and thought, gathered from the Four Gospels, rabbinical writings, and Jewish historical sources makes it clear that Jesus went out of His way to clarify to his Jewish audience that the Sabbath was only for Jews by excluding the Gentile "dogs" at the same time he said that the Sabbath was made for the Jewish humans. To the Jew, the Heathen were dogs. The Heathen who lived amongst the Jews were painfully aware of this attitude. The Jews thought about them as dogs, spoke about them as dogs, and wrote about them as dogs.

Since Jesus did not wish to start a riot when he sought to explain the true nature of their Sabbath to them, He excluded the Heathen "dogs" from the Sabbath requirement. If Jesus had not excluded the Heathen "dogs" from the Sabbath ordinance, the Jews would have attempted to stone Him for blasphemy. Whether Jew or Gentile proselyte, neither could keep the Sabbath without first being circumcised. This fact clearly illustrates the subservience of the Sabbath ordinance to the Ordinance of Circumcision. The heathen "dogs" were referred to as the "uncircumcised" by the Jews, which was another way of saying that they were excluded from Sabbath-keeping and other aspects of Torah Law.

Please study Matthew's account of the healing of the Canaanite woman's daughter in the NIV translation, Chapter 15:

21 Leaving that place, Jesus withdrew to the region of Tyre and Sidon.

22 A Canaanite woman from that vicinity came to him, crying out, "Lord, Son of David, have mercy on me! My daughter is demon-possessed and suffering terribly."

23 Jesus did not answer a word. So his disciples came to him and urged him, "Send her away, for she keeps crying out after us."

24 He answered, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel."

25 The woman came and knelt before him. "Lord, help me!" she said.

26 He replied, "It is not right to take the children's bread and toss it to the dogs."

27 "Yes it is, Lord," she said. "Even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table."

28 Then Jesus said to her, "Woman, you have great faith! Your request is granted." And her daughter was healed at that moment.

Note that Jesus Himself tested her faith by referring to her as a "dog." Her reply indicates that she understood that the Jews thought of non-Jews as dogs.

Further, Cotto claims *anthropos* means "mankind". If this were true, then Scripture should reflect it as such, however:

Mark 3:1-3 (KJV) - And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. 2And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. 3And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth.

The Greek word here translated "man" is *anthropos*. Was all mankind standing there before Christ with withered hands? No? How can this be, when Cotto just claimed above that *anthropos* means all mankind?

COTTO: ABRAHAM ALSO KEPT THE SABBATH. HE QUOTES GENESIS 26:5: Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.

Let us examine Cotto's claims to support this notion.

The covenant God made with Abraham is the same covenant that God made with Israel.

He quotes 1 Chronicles 16: 15-17:

1 Chronicles 16:15-17(15) - Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; (16) Even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; (17) And hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant. (King James Version)

First we must ask ourselves the question, is the reference to "Israel" in this passage a reference to the nation of Israel during and after the Exodus, or is it Hebrew parallelism that refers to Jacob's alternate name of Israel:

Genesis 35:10 (NIV) - God said to him, "Your name is Jacob, but you will no longer be called Jacob; your name will be Israel." So he named him Israel. Genesis 35:10 (NIV)

Moses does not need much of an excuse to throw in a poetic parallelism in the passage that Cotto quotes. There are two possible excuses for doing so— (1) general parallelism for the covenant and oath similarity, and (2) God's blessings to Jacob in the life he had before his name change and God's blessings to him after his name change. All appearances suggest the author of Chronicles is talking about various laws and covenants God has given to the Children of Abraham over thousands of years. The parallelism between the LAW for Jacob and the COVENANT for Israel is unmistakable; even a covenant with Isaac gets honorable mention. Again, we have the parallelism of the COVENANT with Abraham and the OATH with Isaac. What a hodgepodge of information here! But let us say for both the sake of argument that the reference is, indeed, to the Nation of Israel which came out of Egypt. We concede that such is a likely reading. However, the Abrahamic Covenant and the Mosaic Covenant SHARED only two components— (1) the promise that if His people were faithful to Him, He would give them and their descendants the Land of Canaan to dwell in forever, and (2) the Ordinance of Circumcision.

Cotto quotes Genesis 17:7-11, but the simple meaning of the passage seems to have evaded him:

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. ⁸And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting

possession; and I will be their God. ⁹And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. ¹⁰This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. ¹¹And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.

There is no license within this text or its context to see the Sabbath as a component of the Abrahamic Covenant. The Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants share the promise that their faithfulness will give them the land of Canaan forever, but not the Sabbath ordinance. **Abraham had natural law. He had the Law of the Spirit, but he did not have the 10 Commandments. Nor did he have the sign of the Mosaic Covenant—the Sabbath.**

There is one other item that Cotto's declaration forces as a conclusion if he were correct, and that is we would also, as a result of them having the same covenant sharing the Sabbath, be required to share in circumcision.

COTTO: THE FACT THAT MOSES USED THE TERM, “DECLARED,” IN DEUTERONOMY 4:13 TO DESCRIBE THE COVENANT AS BEING THE 10 COMMANDMENTS IS EVIDENCE THAT IT WAS NOT GIVEN FOR THE FIRST TIME, BUT RATHER HAD BEEN IN EXISTENCE PRIOR TO THE GIVING OF THE 10 COMMANDMENTS ON SINAI. THE HEBREW WORD, “NAGAD,” TRANSLATED “DECLARED” IN THIS PASSAGE, IS USED THROUGHOUT THE OLD TESTAMENT IN MOST CASES IN THE CONTEXT OF DECLARING OR MAKING SOMETHING KNOWN THAT HAS ALREADY EXISTED.

Deuteronomy 4:13 (KJV) - And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.

Quoting Cotto: “Take note, dear reader, that Moses said God “declared” His covenant. The word “declared” implies it was not given “for the first time,” but rather, as it has already existed, it was “declared” to them for their benefit. This is made more evident by the Hebrew word “nagad,” which in the majority of times throughout the Old Testament is used in the context of declaring or making known something that already existed.

This claim would be labeled a “whopper” in common circles. A careful study of the linguistics of this word tells a very different story.

Here is the definition of the Hebrew word, “nagad:”

Brown-Driver-Briggs' Hebrew Definitions

נָגַד

1. to be conspicuous, tell, make known
 - a. (Hiphil) to tell, declare
 1. to tell, announce, report
 2. to declare, make known, expound
 3. to inform of
 4. to publish, declare, proclaim
 5. to avow, acknowledge, confess 1a
 - b. messenger (participle)
 - c. (Hophal) to be told, be announced, be reported

Origin: a primitive root

TWOT: 1289

Parts of Speech: Verb

Our research indicates that Cotto is not correct in stating that the Hebrew word, “nagad,” is frequently used to refer to something that previously existed. In fact, Moses used a FORM of this word that never seems to be used in connection with the revealing of mysterious things not known.

We studied an exhaustive listing of the use of this word with the help of *The Englishman's Concordance* at **Bible Suite.Com**—via its Hebrew-English translation. It suggests that a better rendering of it would be that “nagad” is used when someone is telling someone about an interesting **event** that happened in the past. The idea of that thing being mysterious, concealed, or not understood is foreign to the use of this word. Since the past begins the very instant the present is over, this word is used when things happened all the way from moments ago to many years ago. The use of this word in this passage is not significant and is of no use to Cotto's argument.

The form of this verb, “nagad,” that is often used to make known something from the past that is not understood, has been concealed, or is mysterious, is the Hiph'il [328] form.

Please note that even **if** the Hebrew word in Deuteronomy 4:13 had been Hiph'il [328], it is only its **second** meaning that is often used to make known something mysterious that existed in the past. Here is a complete listing of all the places in the Old Testament where **Hiph'il**₃₂₈ is used, and note that Deuteronomy 4:13 is **not** included in either list. It would have to appear in the second list to be of any help to Cotto's argument.

1. tell, announce, report, usually human subject: Genesis 9:22; Genesis 24:23; Genesis 32:6; Leviticus 14:35; Judges 13:6; 1 Samuel 3:18; 1 Kings 1:23; Nehemiah 2:12; Esther 2:10 (twice in verse); Job 12:7; Psalm 142:3; Isaiah 19:12; Jeremiah 5:20; Ezekiel 24:19 +.

2. declare, make known, expound, especially of something before not understood, concealed or mysterious: Genesis 3:11; Genesis 12:18, etc.; 1 Kings 10:3 2Chronicles 9:2; a riddle Judges 14:12,15,16 (3 t. in verse); Judges 14:19; dream Daniel 2:2; secret Job 11:6, etc.; of " as revealing, Genesis 41:25; 2 Samuel 7:11; 2 Kings 4:27; Micah 6:8; Jeremiah 42:3; Psalm 147:19; of declaring by "s agents Deuteronomy 5:5; Micah 3:8; 1 Samuel 15:16; 2 Samuel 24:13; Jeremiah 50:28; Isaiah 58:1; by divine. Hosea 4:12.

<http://biblesuite.com/hebrew/5046.htm> [iHYPERLINK](http://biblesuite.com/hebrew/5046.htm) ["http://biblesuite.com/hebrew/5046.htm"](http://biblesuite.com/hebrew/5046.htm)

At the above source you can find a list of over 300 references to the word, “nagad,” and its meaning always seems to be that someone is telling someone else about an interesting but non mysterious event that happened in the past— even minutes ago, hours ago, or days ago. It appears that there are serious problems with Cotto's effort to extract a Sabbatarian-friendly interpretation of Deuteronomy 4:13.

COTTO: IN THIS TEXT GOD REFERS TO THE COVENANT THAT MOSES IDENTIFIES AS THE TEN COMMANDMENTS AS “HIS COVENANT” RATHER THAN “THEIR COVENANT.” THIS DISTINCTION IS EVIDENCE THAT THIS REFERENCE WAS THE COVENANT GOD HAD MADE WITH ABRAHAM.

Quoting Cotto:

Then notice that it reads, "His covenant." God made known "His" covenant to them. It is not "their" covenant, as our opponents would have us believe. No, it was "His" covenant, because this covenant of His was His before he declared it to the children of Israel, it was first a covenant between Him and Abraham!

It is also possible that “their” covenant” could have gone back to the past. A covenant is a formal agreement between two parties. Here is an example. Bill Gates and Steve Jobs had an agreement a couple of decades ago that Bill would loan Apple Computer millions of dollars and allow Apple to have a Mac version of Microsoft Office. Their agreement way back then set the stage for something no one would have predicted at the time. Who could have ever guessed that Apple Computer, which was nearly bankrupt when Bill lent Steve a hand, would eventually pass up Microsoft and become many times larger? His agreement would cost Bill more than he ever could have guessed at the time.

Cotto's manipulation of Scripture is highly imaginative, but there is no way he can make this argument credible. All the covenants were His. He tailor-made them for the benefit of each party He offered them to at various times. There is no basis in

logic to make this leap of application other than Cotto's need to make it happen—that is, to somehow get a Sabbath to appear before the Exodus. “His” and “Theirs” are not terms that are designed, either in Hebrew or English, to establish a time relationship between events.

Furthermore, Deuteronomy 4:13 is not a good text for Sabbatarians to mention under any circumstance. It is the Achilles Heel of the Pro-Sabbatarian teaching that the Old and New Covenants are essentially the same. This text equates the 10 Commandments with the Old Covenant. Scripture says that the Old Covenant was to be done away with, that it was faulty, and that it would be replaced with a new covenant that would not be like the old one. The Old Covenant did get replaced with the New Covenant, and the Sabbath is conspicuously missing from the new contract between God and His Christian believers. Even St. Paul's list of 23 sins that he said would be certain to keep someone out of Heaven does not include Sabbath breaking. Sanders observes that it was the same God (Jesus) who gave His people, in one dispensation, the Old Covenant, which included the Sabbath, and the New Covenant, which did not. He reasons that Jesus was not exhibiting forgetfulness when He failed to place the Sabbath commandment in the New Covenant. If Jesus had wanted His followers in the New Covenant dispensation to keep the Sabbath, He would have given them a clear command to do so, just like He did to Israel. In that case, the apostles would have expounded on it and preached its importance. Instead, we find, in the New Covenant dispensation, the apostles telling the Gentiles that they did not have to keep the Law of Moses and St. Paul commanding the church not to require the Gentiles to keep the Sabbath.

Where there is no law there is no sin. The fact is obvious that there is no Sabbath keeping command in the New Covenant. Sabbatarians by preaching a dead law are preaching a false gospel—a “gospel” that is not taught by the Apostles. We challenge any student of the Bible to provide a “thus saith the Lord” text to support a New Covenant Sabbath Commandment!

COTTO: WHEN GOD SAID THAT THE MOSAIC COVENANT WAS NOT MADE WITH THE FATHERS OF THE HEBREWS, HE ONLY MEANT THAT IT WAS NOT MADE WITH THEIR ANCESTORS WHO LIVED DURING THE 400 YEARS OF SLAVERY IN EGYPT. THIS WOULD CONTRADICT I CHRONICLES 16:15-17, WHICH SAYS THAT THE SAME COVENANT THAT WAS MADE WITH ABRAHAM WAS MADE WITH ISRAEL ON MT. SINAI.— IN OTHER WORDS, THE 10 COMMANDMENTS.

He quotes Deuteronomy 5:3 (KJV):

The LORD made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day.

Common sense tells us that Moses knew that God had made various covenants with his people previous to the one He made with Israel at Mt. Sinai. If it was the same covenant that God had made with Abraham, by the process of elimination, there is no other reason to explain why Moses would explain to the people that the covenant they had with God was not the same covenant that was made with their ancestors. One only need read the context of I Chronicles 16 to see what covenant is being referenced— the one that related to the promises revolving around the land Israel would eventually inhabit. See especially verses 18 and 19.

Again, the covenant made with Abraham and the covenant made with Israel at Sinai shared two components, but neither one was the Sabbath. What license does Cotto have to limit the “fathers” back only as far as 400 years? There is nothing in the text itself and nothing in its context to suggest that any provision of the Hebrew or the English translations of this passage would permit such a thing. You might as well invoke magic to intervene wherever you need it to bring about your desired result. Nothing is said about limiting it to a certain number of generations,” much less to the generations of four hundred years. This mistake is the result of his assumption that there was a Sabbath prior to their enslavement by the Egyptians. It is an error of logic created by circular reasoning. It is adding words to Scripture that are not there. Robert Sanders observes that Moses knew good and well who the Fathers of the Israelites were and these “fathers” started with Adam. If Moses intended to refer only to the Fathers starting with those who entered into Egypt, he would have said so and identified them as such. Furthermore, Moses knew The Law started with the Israelites.

We have seen that 1 Chronicles 16:15-17 talks about the fundamental covenant God made with both Abraham and Israel. If they were faithful to Him, He would give them the land of Canaan for a possession forever. Cotto's limitation to 400 years is

unacceptable because it demands a high degree of interpretive imagination. If Anti-Sabbatarians used similar license in interpreting a far-fetched idea like this to their advantage, the Sabbatarians would be howling. Unfortunately, Cotto is adding words to Scripture that are just not there. "Not with our Fathers" means exactly that. There is no biblical record of any person or nation having the Ten Commandment covenant before they were given through Moses to the Israelites.

SECTION II

ELLEN G. WHITE

AND

HER ENABLERS

PART II HAS BEEN RESEARCHED & WRITTEN BY:

KERRY B. WYNNE

B.A. ENGLISH AND HISTORY, PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE (1970)
M.A., EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, ANDREWS UNIVERSITY (1978)

WILLIAM H. HOHMANN

B.A., THEOLOGY, AMBASSADOR COLLEGE (1976)

ROBERT K. SANDERS

FOUNDER, TRUTH OF FABLES WEBSITE
INDEPENDENT BIBLE RESEARCHER AND AUTHOR

CHAPTER ONE
The Unmasking Of Ellen White, Part I

By Kerry B. Wynne

"We put on a sort of holy mask, and say things that we ourselves know were not exactly, true; and the brethren look soberly in our faces, and know that we are not saying it exactly as it is, and we keep looking soberly at one another, and saying things that we know are not exactly right; and the chairman makes explanations that he knows are not exactly true; but it would hardly do to say it exactly as it is, and so the smiling is up the sleeve, and not on the countenance, and we go on with it."---- General Conference vice president, W. W. Prescott, quoted speaking at a General Conference session and reported in *The White Elephant of Adventism?*, published by Vowless in 1933.

For the Seventh-day Adventist Sabbatarian, there is no way to separate the Sabbath-Sunday Question from Ellen G. White, the Church's prophetess and one of its three primary founders. Her "Halo Vision" bonds the issue of Sabbath-keeping with the question of her prophetic inspiration:

EGW wrote a letter to Joseph Bates April 7, 1847 the following.

"In the holiest I saw an ark; on the top and sides of it was purest gold. On each end of the ark was a lovely cherub, with its wings spread out over it. Their faces were turned toward each other, and they looked downward. Between the angels was a golden censer. Above the ark, where the angels stood, was an exceeding bright glory, that appeared like a throne where God dwelt. Jesus stood by the ark, and as the saints' prayers came up to Him, the incense in the censer would smoke, and He would offer up their prayers with the smoke of the incense to His Father. In the ark was the golden pot of manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone which folded together like a book. Jesus opened them, and I saw the ten commandments written on them with the finger of God. On one table were four, and on the other six. The four on the first table shone brighter than the other six. But the fourth, the Sabbath commandment, shone above them all; for the Sabbath was set apart to be kept in honor of God's holy name. The holy Sabbath looked glorious—a halo of glory was all around it. I saw that the Sabbath commandment was not nailed to the cross. If it was, the other nine commandments were; and we are at liberty to break them all, as well as to break the fourth. I saw that God had not changed the Sabbath, for He never changes. But the pope had changed it from the seventh to the first day of the week; for he was to change times and laws." --- *A Word to the Little Flock*, p. 18- *Spirit of Prophecy* Vol. 1, p. 349.

As Robert K. Sanders points out, there are definite problems with this so-called "vision." Exodus 32:15-24 says the two tablets were inscribed on both sides. What she "saw" contradicts the Bible's description of them. When Jesus was asked which commandment was the most important, He taught that it was the one that instructed Israel to love God supremely and their neighbors as themselves. Colossians 2:14-17 teaches that the Law was, indeed, nailed to the Cross. Her statement that the pope was the one responsible for changing the Sabbath was both historically impossible and conceptually irrelevant since the original Bible Sabbath-- the lunar Sabbath-- was a moving target that wandered through the days of any fixed week calendar scheme. With these problems as starters, it is remarkable that Adventism escaped any significant challenge to its Sabbath doctrine until the 1980's-- with the single exception of the largely ineffective efforts of D. M. Canright, who apostatized in 1887.

The blame for the existence of the highly articulate anti-Sabbatarian, anti-Ellen White movement of today lands squarely on the shoulders of one Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholar, the late Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi. In his 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, Bacchiocchi tried to explain away the most threatening anti-Sabbatarian passages in the entire Bible-- Colossians 2:14-17. This passage labels the Jewish sabbath system as an obsolete "shadow" and indicates that it received

this status when Christ died on the Cross. Bacchiocchi astonished both Seventh-day Adventists and Evangelicals by claiming that these “shadows” merely represented the extra man-made rules and regulations the Judaizers had added to the requirements for observing these ordinances. By doing so, he turned this dangerous anti-Sabbatarian “gun” around and pointed it back into the face of the opponents of the Sabbath. In an attempted feat of theological gymnastics he proposed that by condemning the ABUSE of these ordinances, Paul actually validated the continuance of these Jewish institutions into the Christian disposition. This ploy back-fired on him because this concept flatly contradicted at least two of Ellen White’s “inspired” statements. First, he conceded that the sabbath in the third position was, indeed, a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue and that it could not possibly refer to anything else (*From Sabbath to Sunday*, page 360). Ellen White cited direct, divine inspiration for claiming that it represented only one of the “ceremonial” sabbaths. Second, he conceded that Sabbath could not possibly have been changed by the Roman Catholic Church because it happened too early. Ellen White, again citing inspiration, had taught that the papacy had “changed” it.

The up-shot of all this was a focus on the Sabbath-Sunday Question the likes of which had not been seen since England during the reign of Charles I. This book tells the fascinating story of this pivotal development in the history of the Christian Faith.

Although Dr. Bacchiocchi lived long enough to have to fight the “fire” that he himself inadvertently started, he never abandoned these views, although he refined them a time or two. In the later years of his distinguished career as a Seventh-day Adventist theologian, he published a series of books that offered instruction to Christians on which of the Jewish festivals should be kept and how to keep them. Here is a representative statement from one of them:

“A fourth surprise was to discover that I was wrong in assuming that the annual Feasts came to an end with the sacrifice of Christ, simply because they were connected with the sacrificial system of the Temple. I came to realize that the continuity or discontinuity of the Feasts is determined not by their connection with the sacrificial system, but by the scope of their typology. If the Feasts had typified only the redemptive accomplishments of Christ’s first Advent, then obviously their function would have terminated at the Cross. But, if the Feasts foreshadow also the consummation of redemption to be accomplished by Christ at His Second Advent, then their function continues in the Christian church, though with a new meaning and manner of observance.” (From the book, *God’s Festivals in Scripture and History, Volume I: The Spring Festivals*, from the chapter, “Preview of the Book,” by Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi)

http://www.biblicalperspectives.com/books/festivals_1/

By 1995, with the publication of *The Sabbath in the New Testament*, he seemed have opened to the possibility that the Sabbath in the third position might be a reference to a ceremonial sabbath feast day, perhaps an annual one, thus returning more closely to the traditional SDA interpretation. Several years later He added the possibility that it might represent a reference to ceremonial events that lasted an entire week (*Sabbath Under Crossfire*, 1998).

Fatefully, Bacchiocchi decided to aggressively market his 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, to the clergy and religious leaders of the Christian world. Bacchiocchi’s outstanding credentials gained him an audience for this old controversy. (He was the first Protestant scholar to graduate from the Gregorian Pontifical University at the Vatican in a thousand years, and his doctorate was in church history.) Eventually his book landed in the hands of Evangelical scholar, D. A. Carson.

It so came to pass that some years prior to 1977, Carson and some of his colleagues had been working on a research project to get to the bottom of the Sabbath-Sunday Question. Their interest in this subject must have resulted from general theological curiosity because there was little interest in this subject in the early 1970’s. The attack of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s book release kicked Carson into action. He and his associates quickly turned their efforts into a “Manhattan Project” like operation, and their research efforts were kicked into high gear. By 1982, their work was ready for publication, and it was released in a book with a title that was named to indicate that it was a rebuttal to Dr. Bacchiocchi’s 1977 book-- *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*. Each chapter was written by an Evangelical scholar who had specialized knowledge in each respective area of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s work. The advanced Hebrew linguistics work was definitive, and his various Sabbath abandonment conspiracy theories were refuted with elements from the better understanding of the history of the early church that had come to light by the late 1960’s.

One of the Seventh-day Adventist theologians to consider the implications of Bacchiocchi's teaching for Adventism was the independent and controversial Australian Adventist theologian, Robert D. Brinsmead. A man of means, Brinsmead was afforded the leisure time to pursue his own research projects. Four years later he published his landmark 1981 essay, "**Sabbatarianism Re-examined**," and in his 1982 sequel, "**A Digest of the Sabbath Question**." Both papers were extensively researched and well-documented anti-Sabbatarian documents, and they were widely circulated among Adventist leadership. Despite the fact that Brinsmead drew from relatively recent developments in the historical understanding of the Early Church Era and Hebrew linguistics, Adventist leaders ignored his work, continuing on with their business-as-usual determination.

In a very big way, then, the Seventh-day Adventist Church had a strong moral obligation to implement fundamental doctrinal reform by no later than 1983. Not only was the Sabbath-Sunday Question settled by Carson, but also in 1982 an SDA researcher, **Dr. Walter Rea**, proved that Ellen White had copied large volumes of information from other writers while claiming that she got that information from God. He stumbled across this sensitive information while doing research in her personal library, which had been preserved after her death by the Church. Rea published findings in his New York Times best-seller, **The White Lie**. The church fired Dr. Rea, who was on the verge of retirement age, and took away his retirement benefits. He took the Church to court and got his pension back by threatening to publish his next book, *Pirates of Privilege*, which exposed Adventist financial corruption in conjunction with the **Davenport Scandal**-- a Ponzi scheme which had bilked mega millions of dollars from various SDA organizations and the leaders who made privileged private investments in Dr. Davenport's program. That book was not published until the statues of limits expired, but it is now available to read on the Internet.

Also, in **1983**, a crazy set of circumstances came together which placed, into the hands of key Adventist leaders all over the world, an astonishing document that provided incredibly powerful evidence that Ellen White was a fraud. The source of this unsavory information was none other than the associate secretary of the White Estate, **Ron Graybill**. Graybill had spent nearly a dozen years at the White Estate with unbridled access to every word-- including many of the stupid words-- that Ellen White had written. Perhaps no one else alive at the time knew more about the fraudulent prophetic claims of Ellen White than he did. He had been working on a doctoral dissertation at a non-Seventh-day Adventist University. He secured an agreement with that university to seal that document up and make it inaccessible to anyone for a period of five years after his graduation. The dissertation included a vast wealth of evidence that Ellen White was a fraud. Unfortunately, someone acquired a copy of it, duplicated it, and sent it to key SDA leaders all over the world without his knowledge or consent. After being presented with proof that Ellen White was a deceiver from a top official at the White Estate, one would expect a subsequent repudiation of her by the Church. No such thing happened. Graybill had documented the evidence for these problems:

1. She made fraudulent claims.
2. Her personal character was seriously flawed.
3. She appeared to have produced her so-called "visions" when necessary to defeat her opposition.

Nearly a decade earlier, the 1974 theft and later unauthorized publication of the secret transcript of the minutes of the **1919 Bible Conference** proved that the delegates clearly understood that Ellen White's was a fraud. For example, the transcript exposes them discussing how to keep the truth about her from the seminary students. Equally interesting is their tacit admission that her claim that God showed her that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath did not square with the facts of history or the specifications of the prophecies of Daniel. In fact these delegates conceded that the specifications of the prophecies made it impossible for the Catholic Church to be the culprit. Later we will take you right into the midst of this top-secret meeting via the stenographer's transcript and you will learn for yourself what the delegates to the conference knew about these problems no later than 1919. It is easy to reason from probable cause to likely effect that this sordid revelation may have influenced Graybill to take advantage of his access to the writings of Ellen White, unreleased to the public, which betrayed the fact that she lied to cover-up earlier blunders.

It is not surprising, then, knowing the determination of Adventists to protect the institution of Adventist at all costs, that no Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath apologist has ever, to our knowledge, even acknowledge the existence of Carson's Hebrew linguistics arguments, much less attempted to refute them. Some decades ago a well-respected Seventh-day Adventist Hebrew professor, **Dr. Jerry Gladson**, left the Church and began to teach against Sabbatarianism. Two Sabbatarian apologists have challenged our presentation of the Hebrew linguistics problem. We have asked them to bring forth a Hebrew language expert to refute our findings, but years have passed by and no one has come forth.

ELLEN WHITE AND THE OCCULT CONNECTION

With these facts in mind, what do we make of Ellen White's outlandish claim, made a century and a half ago, that God showed her a vision that the Sabbath was given to Adam and Eve? We can take it with a grain of salt! She also told us that England would come over and fight with the South against the North in the American Civil War and that the main-line Protestant churches would soon be promoting Spiritualism and having séances! A prophet whose predictions fail is a false prophet. Moses wrote in such a manner as to prevent his Hebrew readers from concluding that the Sabbath ordinance was instituted at Creation, and his wording of these Sabbath-related passages was directly inspired by God. Therefore, Ellen White's Sabbath visions could not possibly have come from God. But if she didn't get these non-biblical ideas about the Sabbath ordinance from God, where did she get them?

A critical review of the 7th Edition of *Lying for God* chastised us for continuing to label Ellen White a false prophet after conceding that a wide range of both her supporters and opposers acknowledged the supernatural nature of many of her visions.. If God were the only source of supernatural phenomena, the reviewer's objections would be determinate. However, this argument ignores the fact that Satan can also produce supernatural phenomenon. Here are the possibilities for your consideration:

- (1) While she may have created in her own mind the things she attributed to visions—and she probably did—the evidence is that many of her visions had an undeniable supernatural element.
- (2) Since many of her visions were conceded by her contemporary supporters and critics alike, we must conclude that her visions came from the Dark Side because so many of the prophecies she obtained in this way turned out to be false and/or taught ideas that contradicted the Gospel teachings of the Bible. She claimed that she got a lot of her information from her “angel” guide who had presented himself to her in the guise of a young man for over 26 years. An eye-witness account of the phenomenon of table-tipping at one of her public visions is about all the evidence anyone would need to conclude that her visions were from Satan. At the time, table-tipping was synonymous with Spiritualism. (There will be more about the table-tipping later.) A later chapter will amplify her occult connections.

If Ellen White hadn't had public visions that were accompanied by supernatural phenomena, and if she hadn't had a so-called angel guide, we could dismiss her error as the result of either poor Bible study methods or an over-stimulated visual cortex caused by her childhood head injury. But Ellen White claimed that her angel companion showed her that the Sabbath Commandment was the most important one of all and that Christians would be keeping it in Heaven. (Recall that she documented this claim in her “Halo Vision”, which is recorded her early publication, *A Word To The Little Flock*.) At the same time her “angel” guide sometimes gave her information that only a supernatural being could have known, such as knowledge of the secret sins of Church members, while at the same time feeding her information and predictions that turned out to be highly inaccurate. In fact, her “angel” companion exhibited all the characteristics of a spirit guide who enjoyed playing her for a fool.

The biblical standard for a prophet is 100% accuracy. The standard for Spiritualist mediums is considerably lower. Mediums have to be right a great deal of the time to be considered a gift Spiritualist. How many times has a medium been able to help the police find a missing body under humanly impossible circumstances only to have his or her next prediction turn out to be a ruse?

We have discovered a substantial body of evidence that demonstrates that Ellen White met all the standards of a Spiritualist medium. At the same time she failed six of the seven tests of a biblical prophet. We have also observed that what Ellen White taught about the process of salvation, known to theologians as *Progressive Sanctification*, is remarkably like what Spiritualists teach about the progression of the reincarnated soul to higher levels. Both are based on human effort. Only the players are different. With Ellen White's “Christian” version of salvation by *Progressive Sanctification*, the players are God, angels, and humans. In the Spiritualist version,, the players are Satan, fallen spirits, and humans.

Our Seventh-day Adventist readers have been taught the idea of Progressive Sanctification all of their church lives, so our criticism is thought to be in error. However, while Progressive Sanctification is a good way to explain the natural progression of the Christian life, it represents a false gospel (“another gospel,” as St. Paul would say), when it is used to describe the process of salvation.)

All the evidence we discovered suggests that Ellen White was a Spiritualistic medium who thought she was a Christian. It is

also interesting to note that Ellen White copied portions of the writings of the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith, and claimed God as her source for this information. To read about her copying of the visions of Joseph Smith, do an Internet search for “Joseph Smith+Ellen White+Plagiarism.”

The Mormon Temple has many Masonic and occult symbols on its edifice. By the early 1840's the Latter Day Saints were deeply involved in Freemasonry. Joseph Smith and his brother, Hyrum, became members. At its height, there were 1,500 L.D.S. members practicing Freemasonry in the city of Nauvoo, Illinois where Joseph Smith grew Mormonism into a mighty cult. (See *Wikipedia* article, “Mormonism and Freemasonry.”) This question should burn in the mind of inquiring Adventists: Why, if Ellen White knew she had a direct line to God, was she snooping around in the writings of a rival prophet, looking for information she could adopt, re-word, and present to her own flock as words she received directly from the throne of God?

We will demonstrate that despite the increasing lip service she gave to the concept of *Righteousness by Faith* in her later writings, it appears that she believed that it was mustered up faith that saved a person rather than unmitigated Grace taught by St. Paul and widely understood by Evangelicals. As if she had no clue about what she really was teaching, she once wrote that all religious systems that are based on human effort are from the Devil. She condemned herself with those words.

Let us recall an important chapter of SDA history. When the topic of *Righteousness by Faith* was introduced to Adventism for the first time by Jones and Waggoner in 1888, church leaders rejected their message, despite Ellen White's “testimony” that these men spoke the truth. They rejected the message of *Righteousness by Faith* because what Waggoner and Jones taught appeared to disagree with her earlier “inspired” writings! It is also noteworthy that even Waggoner and Jones fell painfully short when it came to teaching the full Gospel as articulated by St. Paul, although they were definitely headed away from the legalism of historic, early Adventism.

A string of prophetic blunders, such as her prediction that England would come over and fight with the South against the North, combined with the prominent supernatural features of her public visions, appear to have influenced several of her prominent followers to leave the Christian faith and join the ranks of the Spiritualists. In fact there is good reason to believe that during the decades that she was having public visions that featured paranormal activity, hundreds of her followers may have flocked to the ranks of the Spiritualists. Moses Hull may have been one of them, as we will explained shortly.

During these years of public visions she continued to reveal remarkable secret knowledge, such as the private sins of individuals, along with predictions that turned out to be impossibly wrong. (At the same time she used human detective work to find out about the secret sins of Church members and then pawned off this knowledge as something God “showed” her.) A well-known Adventist preacher, Moses Hull, was the most prominent Adventist leader to become a Spiritualist. In the camp of the Spiritualists He became so notorious for his wickedness that he was shunned even by the movement he joined. Ellen White predicted that God would catch up with him very soon and that he would come to an untimely death. Mocking her prophecy, he lived to a ripe old age and squeezed every possible ounce of sinful delight from his earthly life before he died.

In an uncanny comparison, a Battle Creek physician and former devoted follower of Ellen White, Dr. William S. Sadler, left Adventism after her bizarre Chicago Buildings Vision and started a Spiritualist “church,” the Urantia Movement, which he modeled after Adventism in two striking ways. The Urantians have a body of writings which they claim were imparted to them by spirits through a sleeping medium, very much like Ellen White's voluminous writings that were largely imparted to her by a young-appearing male “angel” who gave thousands of pages of information to Ellen White through visions. Adventism has its White Estate, which controls the release of her writings to the public. Similarly, the Urantians have their Urantia Foundation which controls the release of these thousands of pages of spirit-dictated writings to the public. Additionally, the Urantians have a “Bible” developed from these writings, *The Urantia Book*, which begs to be compared with the new Adventist “bible,” the *Clear Word*, which mixes the spirit-dictated writings of Ellen White with the words of the Holy Bible together, confusing readers, at times, in regard to whether a Bible writer wrote it or whether it originated in the thoughts of Ellen White.

ELLEN WHITE AND FREEMASONRY

Amazingly, an obscene obelisk violates the virgin sky above the grave of James and Ellen White. This obelisk, which now forces its way skyward in a lewd gesture of phallic power above their grave, was erected during the lifetime of Ellen White after James' untimely death. The obelisk is a key symbol in Freemasonry and numerous heathen religious systems that

utilized sexual orgies to “worship” their deities. It was first used by Nimrod, who is symbolized by the constellation Orion. There is little possibility that the Whites didn’t know this. Both William Miller and Captain Joseph Bates had been deep into Freemasonry at least during the earlier years of their lives, and these men had a profound influence over Ellen. Her own husband, James White, was a Mason, and one of their sons became a Mason as well. As a result, she had an intimate knowledge of practices of Freemasonry. Later we will tell you the story about how she used this knowledge to fool a Church leader who was involved with Freemasonry into thinking that God showed her what happened in a high order meeting in the Masonic temple that he had recently attended.

She used New Age terminology in her writings, such as “vital force,” almost before there was an organized New Age movement. She quoted poets who used terminology such as “Mother Earth,” without a word of condemnation, and her spirit guide (angel guide?) showed her that God would speak through a special opening in the constellation of Orion and send the Holy City down from Heaven through it at the Second Coming. Again, we are faced with the occult connection, as Orion-Nimrod became the enemy of God and established the use of fertility rites in false systems of worship. It was Nimrod who first utilized the obelisk as a symbol of this rebellion. The connection between the obelisk and Orion is a firmly established link in occult tradition. We are also faced with the stark reality that since Ellen White had no significant body of New Age sources at the time from which to borrow, her New Age concepts must have come from the spirit guide who appeared to her as a young, male angel.

Not only did Ellen White have an “angel” spirit guide, but she writes about how her dead husband, James, appeared to her. They went for a carriage ride together after his death, and he gave her counsel for the future. While she presented this account of her contact with James as a vivid dream or vision, she put credence in what he told her, accepting the prophecy of her dead husband as valid. As a result of his counsel, she altered her plans for the future.

In Chapter 16 we will document how Freemasonry influenced Adventism from the beginning and played an important part in shaping it for more than half of its first century. Once more we find that Adventist leaders have always known about this dark side of the Church’s history but have deliberately kept this fact hidden. Since Freemasonry is based on Jewish mysticism and the subsequent cult of Gnosticism that grew out of it, the fact that Adventism was shaped by it explains much about the denomination’s emphasis on Sabbath-keeping and works-oriented law-keeping. We document these shocking facts largely from the biographies of William Miller, other contemporaries of James and Ellen White, and Adventist historical writings. Please save your judgment until you see the compelling evidence for yourself. Imagine this! One of James and Ellen White’s sons was a Freemason. If the son joined the society in his early 20’s, logic tells us that his father must have been involved with the society for a good while.

CHAPTER TWO

The Unmasking Of Ellen White, Part II

“She [the Eastern Church] is the Mother and Rome the daughter (page 66).” All the first founders of theology were Easterners. Till the time of Augustine (355-430) no divine had arisen in the West; till the time of Gregory the Great (596-604) none had filled the papal chair. The doctrine of Athanasius [the Trinity]

was received, not originated, by Rome" (pages 71, 72). This indicates how dependent Rome was for centuries on the East and how far behind the East Rome was in learning and influence." – D. M. Canright (*The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-Day Adventism on This Subject*) quoting Dean Stanley [1815-1881], Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford, in his *History of the Eastern Church*.

ELLEN WHITE UNMASKED BY THE CHICAGO BUILDINGS VISION FIASCO

Earlier we covered the subject of how SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, in his 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, tacitly contradicted several statements Ellen White had made for which she claimed direct, divine revelation from God. He became the first Adventist theologian to do this without losing his job. The courage to contradict her did not likely come "out of the blue." As a top SDA theologian, he was in a good place to be privy to developments within the Denomination that would be withheld from almost everyone else. We theorize that he learned of the 1974 discovery of the transcripts of the 1919 Bible Conference. In these stolen documents, which were published by an independent source several years later, the delegates were shown to have agonized over the extreme difficulties of reconciling Ellen White's claims about the role of the papacy in Sabbath abandonment with the facts of history and the specifications of the prophecies of Daniel. The transcripts also revealed that the delegates discussed her fraudulent prophetic claims and how they were going to keep the truth about her from their theology students. Additionally, the *Minutes* revealed the delegates' determination to keep the truth about the impossibilities about her prophetic 1844 interpretations of Daniel's key prophecies a secret.

The delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference had lost their belief in Ellen White for good reasons. Tracing from cause to effect, we have to go back to the turn of the twentieth century and examine Adventism's Battle Creek Crisis, which came to a head as a result of her Chicago Buildings Vision. At the time, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was located in Battle Creek, and Ellen White was in residence there. She claimed to have had a vision from God which showed her that a prominent physician at the Battle Creek Sanitarium, Dr. Harvey Kellogg, had diverted funds intended to be used at the "San" to construct some buildings in Chicago. All of these accusations turned out to be untrue. It was this bizarre "vision" that would have destroyed Adventism during the Battle Creek Crisis near the turn of the nineteenth century had it not been for the skillful damage control techniques of the General Conference and Ellen White herself. Unfortunately, she had rebuked Kellogg in the form of a testimony she had sent to him in 1899. She was wrong about her accusations, and many individuals knew it was a farce! The knowledge of this fiasco somehow got suppressed to a great degree over time until attention was re-focused on it by the troublesome revelations of the problems of Adventism that developed during the 1970's and 1980's.

As more and more revelations of her prophetic blunders surfaced and needed more and more explaining away, Ellen White prophesied that a sword of judgment hung over Battle Creek because her followers were straying from her counsels. A set of suspicious fires began which, over a course of nearly two decades, burned down all most all the major buildings associated with the Adventist "work" in Battle Creek one by one. Perceptive Adventists would have to ask whether or not God would burn these buildings down in punishment, or would Satan be allowed to do it? Or was it simply a mentally disturbed follower of Ellen White who wanted to make sure that her predictions would be fulfilled and acted on his "own?" If it was her spirit guide rather than just her own vivid imagination that gave her the Chicago Buildings Vision, that spirit guide played her for a fool.

The Battle Creek Crisis was multi-faceted, but the single most important contributing factor was her Chicago Buildings Vision. Between the Battle Creek Crisis at the turn of the century and her death in 1915, a string of prophetic blunders continued unabated. Our historical time-line tells this story. Thus, the stage was set to force the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference to address what should be done, if anything, about her fraudulent prophetic claims.

The confusion ensued in Battle Creek in 1899 when she accused the CEO of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, Dr. John H. Kellogg, of constructing buildings in the Chicago Area to serve the unworthy poor with funds he had supposedly diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium. The accusation came in the form of a "testimony," which was understood by the followers of Ellen White to mean that the information had come to her by direct, divine revelation. The accusation was bizarre, inappropriate, and baffling, not only to the staff of Adventist physicians who were associated with Dr. Kellogg at the Sanitarium, but to other Adventists who were involved with the "Work" in Battle Creek, and to Ellen White herself, who stated in the heat of the fallout

from the trouble she created by saying that she did not understand the vision herself when it was given. Also, Battle Creek was the denominational headquarters for the Seventh-day Adventist Church at that time. Ellen White possessed Clintonian intellect and evasiveness, and she had managed to get herself out of many a tight spot. However, as smart as she was, she was no match for the genius IQ levels of this group of world-class physicians. As we noted in Chapter I, they had no trouble figuring out that the whole thing was a sham. She met her Waterloo at Battle Creek in the form of this group of very smart physicians and professionals whose incomes were not dependent on the Church and whose IQ's exceeded even the brilliance of Ellen White's.

This bizarre incident could not exactly be characterized as the straw that broke the camel's back. It was more like the elephant that leaned against the side of a dilapidated shack and caused the whole thing to collapse. Her blunder made her the laughing stock of Battle Creek. For over a decade prior to the crisis, the Battle Creek physicians had been identifying a lot of areas where Ellen White failed to meet the tests of a biblical prophet, and they had been bombarding her with requests that she explain herself— requests that went unanswered. It was the 1899 letter from White to Kellogg about the Chicago Buildings Vision that caused the Battle Creek physicians to step up their campaign to get answers from her. At first Ellen claimed she received a vision from God that she should answer their questions, and she invited all who had such questions to submit them to her in writing. After the questions started rolling in, she was “shown” that she was *not* supposed to answer questions related to her prophetic claims. By 1907, **Dr. Charles E. Stewart**, frustrated with her refusal to answer their questions, put them together in booklet form and published it for what he intended to be for a very small audience. Demand for copies of the little publication grew, and it received a much wider circulation than he had envisioned.

http://www.truthorfables.com/A_Response_to_Urgent_Testimony.htm

These were some of his concerns: **(1)** the influence of others in writing her books when she claimed that God helped her choose the very words she wrote, **(2)** the Chicago Buildings Vision, **(3)** plagiarism in regard to her wholesale copying from the book by British authors Conybeare and Howson on the life of St. Paul— ***Sketches From the Life of Paul***, **(4)** her copying of the health writings of Dr. Cole while presenting the information as having come to her from God in vision, **(5)** continuing to eat meat and unclean meats like oysters for decades after she began to preach the importance of a vegetarian diet, and **(6)** her crazy statements about medicine. The fact that she had opened herself up to these kinds of questions is, in itself, a condemnation of her prophetic claims. She lied about where she got the information for her book on the life of Paul. It was clear to the Battle Creek physicians that the main issue was not the plagiarism itself— which was bad enough— but the lying.

The timing of her Chicago Buildings Vision could not have been worse. Not only were the Adventists in Battle Creek finding a variety of reasons to question her prophetic claims, but the “vision” came at a time of political up-roar that was already threatening to destroy Adventism. The General Conference had been working to break the power of Dr. Kellogg, who had already succeeded in wresting control of the newly re-built Battle Creek Sanitarium from the Church and minimizing its control over the American Medical Missionary College in Chicago. Sensing that her credibility as a prophetess was sinking quickly— even before the Chicago Buildings Vision— she had begun agitating to get the Battle Creek College moved to a rural location and the General Conference headquarters moved somewhere else. As you may recall, she had claimed that God showed her that a “sword of judgment” hung over the “Work” in Battle Creek, and a series of tragic fires had already destroyed a number of key Adventist institutions, including the old Battle Creek Sanitarium building. By 1922, when fire destroyed the Battle Creek Tabernacle Church, there were no significant Adventist buildings left standing that had been associated with the Adventist Work when Ellen White and the General Conference were there. It did not take any special revelation from God to understand that she and Adventism were doomed if its main hub remained in Battle Creek.

Interestingly, Ellen White continued to assert that these fires represented judgments from God until Pacific Press, a California Adventist publishing house, burned to the ground some years later. In this fire she lost many thousands of dollars of printing plates and precious art work that she had purchased from New York artists to illustrate her books.

Ellen White's Blunders “Launch” The Spiritualist Movement Of The Urantians

So far as we can tell, all of the Adventist doctors and business associates of Dr. Harvey John Kellogg, perhaps with the exception of Dr. David Paulsen, who pioneered the Hinsdale Sanitarium for Dr. Kellogg in Chicago, left Adventism because they finally grasped the fact that she was a fraud. Dr. Paulsen seemed to have decided that her prophetic claims were not genuine, but he remained in the Adventist fold by keeping his views of Ellen White to himself. In a key letter to Ellen White he expressed his doubts about her prophetic gifts and told her that he no longer believed her claim that she was inspired by God at the verbal level. Since she claimed inspiration at the verbal level, and since she never answered him on this point, we have to understand that he was, indeed, accusing her of lying about her gifts. **Wilfred Custer Kellogg**, a relative of J. H. Kellogg and a successful Battle Creek businessman, joined **Dr. William S. Sadler** in a journey into spirit channeling, founding a new religion modeled after Adventism, based, supposedly on thousands of pages of information written by “channeled” spirits who were on their way from one universe to another. **Dr. Charles E. Stewart**, the author of *A Response To An Urgent Testimony*, or the “**Blue Book**,” as it is now called, is listed by ex-SDA, **Monica Vowless**, of New Zealand, as a prominent former SDA physician who had either left Adventism or had been expelled by the Church (See “My Defense,” by Monica Vowless, who passed away in 1935, available at www.ex-sda.com.)

Information available from the Urantia organization indicates that Dr. Sadler never gave up his belief that Ellen White's visions were supernatural in origin. He maintained that she was a spirit medium. Earlier in Ellen White's ministry, another Adventist leader, **Moses Hull**, who was familiar with the supernatural component of her visions, also had joined the ranks of the Spiritualists. There is a strong suggestion here that these men understood that spirit guides can appear to be good, can be thoroughly bad, and that some of them seem to enjoy playing tricks on their human mediums. Apparently Dr. Sadler, understanding that spirit mediums did not have to meet a 100% accuracy rating, simply made an “adjustment” to his thinking about the prophetic gifts of Ellen White.

Ellen White claimed that God showed her that Dr. Kellogg was a Pantheist. She based this claim on some of the statements he made about the power of God being in living things in his book on healthful living, *The Living Temple*. Our research shows that his statements about the power of God being in living things are not particularly different from statements that Ellen White made in her own books on nature and healing. By its very definition, Kellogg was never a Pantheist, and Ellen White's accusation was ridiculous. A Pantheist does not believe in a personal God and believes that Nature is god and god is Nature. Kellogg taught that it was a personal God— in fact Jesus Christ— Who imbued living things with the energy of life. Later we will have more to say about Ellen White's quoting of New Age authors, including the concept of Mother Earth, and language that is characteristic of Freemasonry. To the total discrediting of Ellen White's prophetic claims, Dr. Kellogg remained a Christian and a Sabbath-keeper until the day he died.

SDA Church leader and historian, **Alonzo L. Baker**, was closely associated with **John Harvey Kellogg** from September 1939 to June 1942, serving in the dual capacity of field secretary for his eugenics and genetics organization, the Race Betterment Foundation, and associate editor of his monthly journal, *Good Health*. Baker's SDA denominational career included the shared editorship of the SDA publication, *Health*, a monthly publication of Pacific Press, with Percy T. Magan, one-time president of the College of Medical Evangelists (now Loma Linda University School of Medicine), who was a graduate of Dr. Kellogg's American Medical Missionary College. In an article published in the autumn, 1972 edition of *Spectrum*, an ultra-liberal independent journal that reviews issues related to Adventism and is barely tolerated by the Church, Baker said:

Kellogg kept the Sabbath right up to the last Sabbath of his life. His two institutions, one in Michigan and one in Florida, always observe the seventh-day Sabbath. When I was in his employ, he would ask almost every Sunday, “Baker did you go to church yesterday? What did the preacher talk about? Did you get a blessing from the service?”

One Sunday morning in Battle Creek after his usual inquiry about my attendance at church on Sabbath, I asked, “And just what did you do all day yesterday, Doctor, if I may ask?”

“In the morning,” he replied, “I read from my Bible in John's story of the life of Christ. John, as you know, Baker, was closer to Christ than any other of the twelve.” In the afternoon I had Freddie [his masseur and chauffeur] drive me out to the cemetery, for I wanted to pray beside Mrs. White's grave there. After I read from the book of John in the morning, I took down *The Desire of Ages*

and read a chapter there which dilates on what I had read from John. You know, don't you, Baker, that Mrs. White's book on the life of Jesus is the greatest ever written?"

In Kerry Wynne's book, *The Chicago Buildings Vision Fiasco*, which is devoted exclusively to the Chicago Buildings Vision, he cites Alonzo L. Baker's statement that Dr. Kellogg showed him the actual testimony (letter) that Ellen White sent to him in which she told him that God had showed her that he was constructing buildings in Chicago with funds that he had siphoned from the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

So between the Chicago Buildings Vision at the turn of the century and the 1919 Bible Conference, Adventist leaders were forced to contemplate the effects of the aftermath of the Battle Creek Crisis that her prophetic blunders had created. They saw almost all of the SDA doctors at the Battle Creek Sanitarium leave Adventism as a result of a constant string of indicators that the prophetic claims of Ellen White were fraudulent—the Chicago Buildings Vision having been the elephant that collapsed the shack. They saw a number of important Adventists from the Battle Creek scene turn to Spiritualism because they concluded that Ellen White's supernatural visions did not come from God, and they were confronted with growing evidence that she had been plagiarizing the writings of other authors for her books while leading her readers to believe that the information came straight from God. By 1911, just four years before her death in 1915, the Church was forced to spend \$3,000 to revise her book, *The Great Controversy*, because widely-read individuals were finding more and more examples of sources where she copied from other authors without giving proper credit. Alonzo Baker, as we will mention later, says that Ellen White got a lot of her medical information from Dr. Kellogg and passed it along to her readers as “inspired” information.

Ellen White's explanation of the Chicago Buildings Vision was that God showed her a fully constructed building and that the interpretation of what that meant was hers. She argued that the vision served its purpose by actually preventing the construction of the building. Here is some interesting documentation:

The Chicago Work

Ellen G. White

April 2, 1906 MS 33, 1906

Copied from Dr. Steward's MSS June 5, '06

Sanitarium, California, March 20, 1906

Paragraph 3: Shortly after the meetings closed, Judge Arthur and his wife spent part of a day at my home. We had much pleasant and profitable conversation. Among other things discussed was the matter **of the representation that had been given me of an expensive building in the city of Chicago**, used for various lines of medical missionary work. I related how that when I was in Australia, **I was shown a large building in Chicago, which, in its erection and equipment, cost a large amount of money.** And I was shown the error of investing means in any such buildings in our cities.

Paragraph 6: Sometime after this, **I was shown that the vision of buildings in Chicago**, and the draft upon the means of our people to erect them, and their destruction, was an object lesson for our people, warning them not to invest largely of their means in property in Chicago, or any city....

A simple time-line of events easily exposes the comic elements of this rationalization. Prevented the construction of what building? One for serving the unworthy poor of Chicago, as she had stated in her testimony, or the new building for the American Medical College which she and her son had both voted for earlier in a meeting of the trustees of the San? Here are the elements of the Fiasco:

1. Ellen White shouldn't have needed any vision to tell her what Dr. Kellogg was doing in Chicago because he corresponded with her regularly about his work there.

2. No supernatural intervention was necessary to motivate her to look into his Chicago activities more closely because the old American newspaper article she read while in Australia, while inaccurate on certain points, painted a very good picture of what Dr. Kellogg was doing in Chicago. She didn't need a dream.
3. Kellogg never planned to build a building in Chicago for serving the poor. He learned about the work of a planning committee to build it when he returned from an extended trip of several months to Europe.
4. It was common knowledge in Battle Creek that there was a strong need to build a new building for the American Medical College, and this project was being widely discussed in the Church at the time when Ellen White had her Chicago Buildings Vision. In the 1901 General Conference session, Ellen G. White and her son, Willie C. White, had strongly supported the project to build this particular building. The Adventists involved with the project, upon hearing about Ellen White's testimony against building a building in Chicago, did not pay any attention to her message because they thought she was talking about some other project.
5. Ellen didn't know what building she was talking about, but if it was the one for the American Medical College, she should have rebuked each member of the planning committee that worked on it while he was away in Europe.
6. Those involved with planning the new building for the American Medical College did not think that her testimony against Dr. Kellogg had anything to do with their planning for this proposed building, since Ellen White had been all in favor of the project. In the confusion, they continued to plan for the building because they thought she was unhappy about Dr. Kellogg's plan to construct some other kind of building for a different purpose.

When someone claims he or she has experienced a supernatural event, the first thing we look for is evidence that there is no natural explanation that is better. The many letters that transpired between White and Kellogg in the years before 1899, alone, would explain her fear that he might be constructing a building in Chicago, and reading the old American newspaper article explained everything without any need for divine intervention. She didn't need any vision from God to tell her that Kellogg might be up to something in Chicago. Furthermore, the idea that God cared more about building an expensive sanitarium in Australia more than He cared about the men and women who were perishing of starvation and disease in Chicago does not square with what we know about the character of God as exemplified in the life of Jesus.

The set of influences that we have traced from the Chicago Buildings Vision through D. M. Canright's apostasy to the 1919 Bible Conference to the discovery of the transcripts in 1974 of those secret meetings seems to have prepared Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi to challenge, in writing, several "inspired" statements of Ellen G. White.

THE SAD STORY OF FRANK M. WILCOX AND THE 1919 BIBLE CONFERENCE MINUTES

By Kerry Wynne

I was stunned when I realized the significance of what I had just found in my library of SDA books! Could the author of this unabashed defense of Ellen G. White's prophetic gift really be F. M. Wilcox? Was not Frank M. Wilcox unequivocal in his assertion that her claim to be an inspired prophet was fraudulent as recorded in the "leaked" stenographer's transcript of the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes**? Soon my amazement turned to anger! How could such a thing be possible? How could anyone do such a thing? What could possibly justify such whopping perfidy on the part of a man whose appearance of piety earned him the honor of serving as the editor of the official church paper of Seventh-day Adventists, *The Review and Herald*, from 1911 to 1944?

The book in my hands was his *The Testimony of Jesus*, published in 1934— just 15 years after he stated that he did not believe her writings were any more inspired than those of any other author. Had it not been for the 1974 discovery, theft, and later unauthorized publication (*Spectrum* magazine, 1979) of this "bomb shell" stenographer's transcript of the secret 1919 meeting— one convened to decide what should be done about Ellen White's fraudulent prophetic claims— we could look back on Frank Wilcox as an Adventist leader of the highest integrity. General Conference President, A. G. Daniells, who conducted

the meeting, understood the danger to Adventism that this transcript represented, so he ordered it to be sealed for a minimum of 50 years. He put it in a plain paper bag and banished it to the furthest depths of the huge vault at the General Conference Headquarters in Washington, DC, where **Dr. F. Donald Yost** found it in 1974.

This smoking gun transcript shows the meeting's participants agonizing over the Ellen White problem. Should they repudiate her and deal with the havoc that would ensue, or should they continue trying to cover-up her prophetic blunders? If they decided to continue the present cover-up, how would they keep the truth about her from the Church's seminary students? They discuss her prophetic blunders, biblical and historical errors, and blatant plagiarism in cautious terms. Each participant seems aware that saying too much could finish his or her denominational career. Yet, despite this fear, the hard facts spill out into the open and are addressed with painful caution. That even one of the participants was willing to risk his or her career to speak out on this explosive issue is, in itself, evidence that the Ellen White problem had become impossible to ignore.

Indeed, the transcript reveals that Wilcox was one of the most vocal participants in denouncing Ellen White's prophetic claims. He declares his opinion that her writings are not any more inspired than those of anyone else:

I would like to ask, Brother Daniells, if it could be accepted as a sort of rule that Sister White might be mistaken in details, but in the general policy and instruction she was an authority. . . It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing. Either the Lord has spoken through her or he has not spoken through her; and if it is a matter of deciding in my own judgment whether he has or has not, then I regard her books the same as every other book published. I think it is one thing for a man to stultify his conscience, and it is another thing to stultify his judgment. It is one thing for me to lay aside my conscience, and it is another thing for me to change my judgment over some view that I hold.

Could he have changed his mind during those 15 years that followed?

We now turn to a consideration of how the problems with Ellen White as revealed by the 1974 discovery of the transcript of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* might have influenced Dr. Bacchiocchi to challenge her prophetic claims with the publication of his 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*.

EDITOR'S NOTE: End of section authored only by Kerry Wynne.

ELLEN WHITE'S HISTORY-DEFYING INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL'S PROPHECIES

Since 1914 Adventism had been reeling from the publication of former Swedish SDA leader **Aaron Nyman** entitled ***Astounding Errors***. This 419 page book demonstrated to the point of over-kill the comical, self-contradictory impossibilities of the SDA interpretations of the major prophecies of Daniel. Aaron was not only a former Adventist, but he was a brilliantly successful businessman who had amassed a small fortune. His book shows a solid command of the facts of ancient history. After he studied his way out of Adventism he challenged Chicago Area SDA leaders to public debates about these prophecies. This tactic garnered a lot of publicity, but the debates never took place. The Conference leaders backed down in the face of his evident command of biblical and historical knowledge, and they made a wise decision not to allow him to make fools of themselves. In a stunning move he offered his personal home, valued at over \$5,000, to any Adventist who could prove that the 2,300 days began in 497 BC and that the 2,300 days began at the same time as the 70 weeks. He also challenged them to prove that the 2,300 day prophecy can be successfully utilized to make a day stand for a year to get it to 1844, which would mean they would have to disprove his interpretation that the prophetic period was 2,300 literal evening and morning sacrifices and that this period of literal days represented the number of days that Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the temple in Jerusalem. By 1919 the delegates to the Bible conference at the General Conference headquarters in Washington DC had every possible reason to understand that their prophetess suffered from extreme historical ignorance.

Since early Christian times many biblical scholars have understood that the little horn of Daniel 7 referred to the Roman Emperor, Nero. Nero persecuted Christians for exactly 1,260 days. Down through time, biblical scholars have also applied this prophecy to the persecuting activities of the papacy but without any need to link its persecuting behavior to the so-called “change” of the Sabbath as Adventists have done. Similarly, for a very long time scholars have known that the 2,300 evenings and mornings of the little horn of Daniel 8 work out to the exact number of days that Antiochus Epiphanes polluted the Jewish Temple before 161 BC. These prophecies have been so remarkable in their actual “a-day-stands-for-a-day” historical fulfillment, that higher critics of the Bible claimed they had to have been written after these events took place. Within a few years of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, the early authorship of Daniel was firmly established, refuting the skeptics. It is likely that at least a number of honest-at-heart unbelievers had their faith in the Bible established by the spectacular fulfillment of these prophecies regarding Antiochus Epiphanes and Nero. Ellen White’s interpretation of the 2,300 “year” and 1,260 “year” prophecies, therefore, destroys two remarkably accurate Bible prophecies and twists them it into ones that are highly imaginative and unprovable. If the thought has not already occurred to you, Ellen White’s false use of these prophecies gives skeptics two more reasons to excuse themselves from believing in the Bible.

The entire concept of Adventism rests on the “foundation” of the 2,300 day prophecy of Daniel 8:14. If this “foundation” can be shown to be non-existent, then there is no *Investigative Judgment* that began in Heaven in 1844 and the Sabbath is not a “seal.” These two key points of SDA doctrine would be false even if Sabbatarianism were to be generally true. Nor would God have called Adventists after 1844 to take the Sabbath and *Investigative Judgment* doctrines to the world to rescue them from receiving the Mark of the Beast on their foreheads! Without the validity of the 1844 SDA prophetic time period, the SDA concept of 1844 would be nothing more than a huge theological joke played on the Christian world by none other than Ellen G. White herself, whose theological trickery shamelessly rescued the Millerite debacle of 1844 from the jaws of defeat.

The Investigative Judgment doctrine affects, to one degree or another, almost every aspect of the Church’s teachings. Robert K. Sanders points out that God does not need to have some kind of formal judgment to know who will be saved and who will not. The doctrine of soul sleep is necessitated by the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. This doctrine also requires the unbiblical doctrine of annihilation—the concept that after the judgment the wicked will cease to exist.

It would seem that if God threatens to destroy the very existence of anyone who might dare to challenge His authority, there is no real freedom of choice in the Universe. In the Story of the Rich Man And Lazarus, Jesus taught that after death the wicked find themselves in a less-than-ideal existence of their own creation where they enjoy the results of their own choices. If the wicked are annihilated, they have essentially been told by God, “Do things My way, or I will blast you out of existence.” Orthodox Christianity has widely taught a picture of life after death that exonerates God’s commitment to genuine freedom of choice. Adventists, therefore, place themselves at odds with most Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox communities when it comes to these doctrines, and they seriously error when they try to excuse Jesus’ Story of the Rich Man And Lazarus by claiming that it was merely a parable. It seems unreasonable to think that Jesus would use a “parable” that taught long-term theological error as a “cheap” way to make a quick point at the moment, and there is textual evidence that the story was not presented in the form of a parable.

The Adventists of 1919 seemed greatly confused about these prophecies. The transcript of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* suggests that Wilcox and the other delegates had mistakenly applied the 1,260 days of the little horn of Daniel 7 to Antiochus and were struggling to find solid ground upon which to base the 1844 date on the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices of the little horn of Daniel 8 and 11. It is not surprising there was considerable confusion among SDA scholars regarding the 2,300 days of the little horn of Daniel 8, since they were trying incorrectly to apply the year-for-a-day concept where there was no scriptural warrant to do so in order to arrive at the desperately needed date of 1844. We will discuss this prophecy in detail later. The key point for now is that the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference believed that the little horn of Daniel 7 related to a much earlier historical event that happened over 2,000 years before 1844; that they knew that this knowledge was dangerous to the foundation of Adventism, and that they wanted to withhold this damaging information from the Church. “Watch” the delegates in this revealing passage from the *Minutes*:

PROF. LACEY: In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn—extremely alike, and I do not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekiel expresses

it— a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of Daniel 7 can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the 11th down the line, three were plucked up in his place [names were mentioned], he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the law of the Most High; things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years. And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, supposed you and I had been living in that day we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfillment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great anti-Christ, of which Antiochus was here the personal representative. (Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted.)

ELDER DANIELLS: You would not want to say that that you have just said now to a class of students, would you?

The above section is taken from the July 8, 1919 transcript as posted at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist archives.

The portion of the transcript from the July 3, 1919 *Bible Conference Minutes* you are about to review is one of the most important keys to understanding what and when Adventists knew about this thorny problem. Older Seventh-day Adventist readers will immediately recognize that the Church made no attempt to correct these errant teachings in the Bible text books at any educational level. It is also important to understanding the problems with the “Resting Theory” of SDA Sabbath apologist, **Bob Pickle**, who seeks to rescue Ellen White’s blunder with a highly creative theory. He rationalizes that the Sabbath was not actually “changed” until resting became associated with Sunday observance, even though it took several additional centuries of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking to arrive at that point. According to Pickle, it matters not that Christians “kept” Sunday and broke the Sabbath from the first century onward. Instead, the Sabbath was not really “changed” until a series of edicts was successful in requiring a civil cessation of labor on Sundays. Nor does it seem to matter that this legislated “resting” was optional under many circumstances and was purely civil in its concept— not linked to the concept of day sacredness, as in the case of the Jewish Sabbath. You will see that the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference did not attempt to excuse Ellen White’s misstatement on this basis. We will analyze Bob Pickle’s “Resting Theory” later.

Notice how the participants finally conclude that the only way Ellen White’s claim can be reconciled with the facts of history is to consider her statement to be a vaguely like a type of symbolism called a **prolepsis** (the representation or assumption of a future act or development as if presently existing or accomplished— *Merriam-Webster’s On-Line Dictionary*)— but only in reverse. The use of “reverse prolepsis,” which would be the presentation of a past act or development as if it existed in the past, is not a known or accepted literary device.

FROM THE 1919 BIBLE CONFERENCE MINUTES – JULY 3, 1919

Begins on manuscript page 48 and ends on page 57.

Archives stamped page 149 for beginning page. [Note that the Archives page numbering system is different from the manuscript page numbering system.]

C.P. BOLLMAN: I was asked about these things we attribute to the papacy before that date [533 AD as discussed in the previous paragraph]. I would answer that in this way. I have used the expression in the paper that the papacy at this time, emerging from its nonage or minority, proceeded to do certain things. Before that date the papacy was a boy, and at that time it became a man. And it is true that many things a boy does follow him all through his life, but he does a number of things afterward, and there comes a time when he really enters upon life. The graduating exercises are called commencement exercises, too, because that is the time when the student goes forth to engage in the activities of life.

W.W. PRESCOTT: *I think this does not meet the point because the prophecy says it is the horn that changes the law. Now if you do not get the horn up in 533 you can't say the horn changed the Sabbath before that date. It was another kingdom.*

H.A. WASHBURN: Was there a monarchical power in the church until Justinian declared the pope to be head? This eleventh horn is a kingdom just as truly as the tenth. It is a kingdom a monarchical power, and it began in 533.

W.W. PRESCOTT: *If that is the power that changed the law, we can't say the law was changed in the middle of the fourth century.*

H.A. WASHBURN: Brother Lacey told us of a woman who said she had spanked Emperor William. It was the same person, but he did not have a title. The apostasy changed God's law, and it was responsible for all the acts against the Sabbath. There came a time when it was organized under one man.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Here is what I would like to say. Hold to the text. The horn power was a kingdom. That kingdom did not rise till 533. *The prophecy says it is the horn that changes the Sabbath, the law, and I did not think we can put that back before the horn appears and say the horn did it, because the horn was not there. I would like to have that specifically met. What shall we do with that proposition that the horn power rose in 533 and changed the law? How can we say that the horn power did it in the middle of the fourth century?*

L.L. CAVINESS: We meet that same dilemma in the Spirit of Prophecy when it says the pope changed the Sabbath. Please tell me the name of the pope that made the change.

A.G. DANIELS: That use of the word pope was intended for the papacy. It was not a specific term. It was the power that did it, but before it came to that special stage marked by Justinian.

E.R. PALMER: It appears to me that if we were to tie down all of the fulfillments of the prophecies to the span of the 1260 days of continuance spoken of in the prophecy, we are involved in serious difficulty at both ends, at the beginning, before 533, and since 1793 and 1798. It seems to me that in view of the fact that this evil principle began back in Paul's day, that it embodied all these things that were powers that were exercised later as a horn, but that they all began back there. I think we have gone astray many times in our explanation by trying to put the change arbitrarily at a date in connection with the papacy at a certain time, but really that time began its work of changing the Sabbath way back in the first century. I think this is true. I think there came a time also when that period closes, and yet much of the most mighty work of that power has been exercised and is being exercised, after the termination of the period. It seems to me that to bring that too definitely within the 1260 year period, it involves us in serious difficulty at both ends, and I think we have a good deal of phrase adjusting and work adjusting in our literature relative to the Sabbath and the papacy to make the thing consistent with what actually took place before the 1260 years and afterwards.

A.G. DANIELS: Now then the horn power represents the papacy from its earlier embryonic condition to its destruction, does it not? Now then, it is necessary to place the rise of the establishment of that horn in 533 at the time we say it became a monarchical power? That is the question to me. Is that our position? Is that a right position? Is it a necessary position? Wasn't it a horn power long before then?

E.R. PALMER: That is a serious question. If the thing was not developing, if it was not growing for much more than 1260 years, then there were certain developments that marked off the 1260 years in a definite way.

A.G. DANIELS: As a living, acting power, the beast, through various steps and at various times

did various things. Now one of the things that the little horn did was to attack Jesus through His law and His Sabbath. It certainly did it before ever that decree of Justinian came. It is safe to not recognize it as a horn power before that decree was made? If that is not necessary, then where is the wrong in recognizing that fulfillment of the prophecy when it was broken up into the ten parts?

W.W. PRESCOTT: Here is another difficulty, and that is, we set the Council of Laodicea at the latest date, earlier than we set the breaking up of the empire, so that you have got that action. If we make much of the Council of Laodicea, it was before the breaking up of the empire began.

M.C. WILCOX: Shall we take up the beginning of that horn power, the assumption of the power itself, or the recognition of that assumption by the state?

W.W. PRESCOTT: You take it clear back when Constantine reached Rome, when Attila appeared against Rome. Was the pope the leading power then? Didn't he turn back Attila? Yes! Then can't we go back even to that time? What was a great step in the assumption of that power? When Constantine reached Rome and the pope appeared? That was in the early part of the fourth century. Now as Brother Palmer suggested, the 1260 years mark a special phase of that Rome power, and there it sort of comes into that prophecy under that theme but I don't see how we can shut him off back of that, because there are things that appear back there that are very vital.

H.C. LACEY: I have been face to face with this for some little time, too, and I try to adhere to our traditional view. Our book says 538. We have changed that to 533, and it continues 126 years. I believe there is a great measure of truth in that. It appears that the Sabbath was changed before that. The church turned to the observance of Sunday before 533 or 538.

A.G. DANIELLS: You said our traditional view that the papacy arose in 538. You mean that that is when it received supreme power?

H.C. LACEY: Could we say that the papacy did something in days anterior to that special time when perhaps the papacy arose in that way to which we generally refer? I have used this little incident that was referred to, about the woman spanking the emperor. An old woman went around boasting that she had spanked the emperor, because she took him upon her knee and walloped him. (C.P. BOLLMAN: She ought to have kept it up [Laughter]) It was not the emperor she spanked. It was the same person who by and by became the emperor. I find the Bible treats in this way the birth of Jesus Christ. He did not become the Christ until A. D. 27, but it speaks of Him as being born in A. D. 5. That is an exactly analogous figure. The papacy can come up in 538, and yet the apostate church was developed before, and by and by it changed the Sabbath.

Can we not have a figure of prolepsis? Some take the sign for the thing signified, as when Sister White says the pope changed the Sabbath. She took the pope to represent that system. She didn't mean to identify a particular pope, but just as a general term. We say this is the home of the King, of the council. "The king" simply stands for the government, and the pope stands for the papacy. The apostate church changed the Sabbath. Step by step the change developed, and then the pope laid hands upon the Sunday institute and boosted it.

And so, as it stands today, the great sponsor of Sunday observance is the papacy.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Is it not true, as a fact of history, that the papacy exercised greater political power in the fourth and fifth centuries than it did under Justinian?

LACEY: Certainly.

C. M. SORENSON: We all recognize that a correct explanation includes all the facts in the case. Of course that is the only explanation that takes recognition of all the facts in the case, and that is the idea[l] explanation toward which we strive.

We have been speaking about reading things into the Bible, and of course that is wrong. But there is another practice that is bad, and that is reading things into history. That is one of the evil legacies left us by A. T. Jones' leadership. His books are full of that practice, and we have consigned them to the scrap heap. They contain some facts, but the facts are biased by a preconceived notion.

Now here is another point: There is no connection between the plucking up of the three horns and the giving of the saints into his hands for a time, times, and the dividing of time. If we will keep those two lines absolutely separate, it will be better.

There was no tremendous change that took place in 533, so far as the status of the papacy is concerned. There is that question of supremacy. Do we use that understandingly? There was a time when the papacy was the supreme power in Europe-- from 1100 to 1300. The papacy was not supreme in any ordinary sense of the term during the 1260 years, but he did exercise domination over God's people.

M.C. WILCOX: I have been trying to get a term that is suitable. What do you suggest?

C.M. SORENSON: The word "domination."

M.C. WILCOX: That is the word I have been using-- papal domination.

C.M. SORENSON: During those two hundred years the papacy did exercise actual political supremacy over all the rest of Europe and civilization. King John, right in the climax of that period, signed over his kingdom to the pope.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Can you say, Brother Sorenson, that the papal domination began in 533?

C.M. SORENSON: There was a legal enactment by Justinian at that time. But the actual domination over God's people was tapered off at the beginning and at the end for the elect's sake. It seems to have been lessened somewhat at the beginning, but more especially at the close of that period.

W.W. PRESCOTT: I know, Brother Chairman, it was a great surprise to me after I had read our books when I actually read history and found that the papal supremacy was only from 1100 to 1300, and gradually rose to that climax, and then gradually faded out. I think we have used that term "supremacy" very carelessly. *We have heard and we have read how that in 538 the pope became supreme, but it was in that very year that he was absolutely humbled.*

C.M. SORENSON: That was one of the worst years he ever had.

W.W. PRESCOTT: And yet you read in our books and hear in our sermons that in 538 the pope became supreme. If there is any way of correcting these statements, I wish it might be done.

W.L. BIRD: The Dark Ages should be considered in the same way.

C.P. BOLLMAN: I would just like to ready the prophecy. "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns."

That is a picture of 478.

"I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of [a] man, and a mouth speaking great things."

When did this little horn come up?—then, or two or three hundred years before? It says, “I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them.” And the term “another” conveys to my mind that the ten horns were there when it came up. It came up “among them.” They must have been there or it could not have come up among them, and they must have been there or it could not have been “another” one. It seems to me that we shall have to solve it along the lines suggested by Professor Lacey. I think we attribute to this power some things that were actually done before.

A.G. DANIELLS: This is very interesting and very profitable, and what has been said here shows a need of careful study, and comparison of views and teaching.

Details: Canright's Influence On Bacchiocchi

Dudley M. Canright was the most prominent Seventh-day Adventist leader to apostatize. In earlier years he was a constant companion of James and Ellen White. They even went on an extended camping trip together in Colorado. Few of the pioneer leaders of Adventism had such a close relationship. Unfortunately for the Whites, this relationship afforded Canright an opportunity to get a first-hand look at Ellen White's prophetic blunders. Apparently when he had accumulated enough evidence to see that she was a fraud, he began to revisit her teachings. He began to study the Sabbath doctrine in depth, but secretly so. By 1887 he was ready to make his break. He stunned SDA leaders not only by his apostasy but with a body of scholarly research proved that unless the church could come up with better biblical and historical support for its Sabbath doctrine, the (then) present status of it was that it could not possibly be true. He proved, for example, that it was impossible that the Catholic Church could have “changed” the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

Fast-forward to 1974. Samuele Bacchiocchi had been preparing his doctoral dissertation for years to present to committee of scholars who would review his research. His degree will be in church history, and he has chosen to write about the history of the Sabbath. We conjecture that the prospects of facing this committee caused him to realize that his approach to Colossians 2:14-17, a known barrier to Sabbatarianism in Catholicism, would have to appear to be based on principles of good scholarship. This is another way of saying that he knew he could not use the traditional defenses that his Seventh-day Adventist up-bringing had provided. We believe that this realization is what led to his bizarre theory that the “shadows” referred to the extra rules and regulations imposed on the observance of the Jewish dietary laws and sabbaths rather than to the ordinances themselves. It had a nice ring to it, was entirely new in concept, and was not a simple matter to refute the concept.

A suppressed chapter out of Seventh-day Adventist history helps to put all of this into perspective. The pioneer Adventist leaders of the 1880's did not appear good answers to Canright's attacks on their belief system, so they launched a campaign to smear his personal character. He was accused of apostatizing because he was jealous of Ellen White's power and wanted a higher position in the Church. Somewhat later the rumor was started that Canright had recanted his apostasy on his death-bed and affirmed his belief in Ellen White and the Sabbath. One such account has him weeping because he had forfeited his eternal life. Interestingly, Canright had anticipated that the Church would likely start such rumors after his death, and in every book he published he included a section entitled “My Present Standing” to make it more difficult for such rumors to attain credibility. This idea we credit to an article by former Adventist, “Wiredog,” on his blog at:

<https://outofadventism.wordpress.com/2011/04/08/canright-be-wrong-give-it-a-rest/>

Also, on March 8, 1916, Canright signed an affidavit attesting to the fact that he had not recanted Adventism. (He died May 18, 1919.) You can see a photocopy of this affidavit at this Internet link, and you can see the text of it by going to our historical time-line to 1916. <http://outofadventism.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/affadavit2.jpg>

Also, see our historical time-line for 1916 for the text of the affidavit.

Courtesy of the Robert K. Sanders' collection of Adventist-related documents, we are able to present evidence that he did not recant between 1916 and his death in 1919. In 1939, the pastor of the Belden Avenue Baptist Church, Howard C. Fulton, responded to an inquiry by a certain Brother Keithly regarding whether Canright had ever recanted. Fulton responds, as you will see in a photocopy of this letter (See the historical time-line for 1939.) that he has a statement from Canright's niece, put in writing by Canright's daughter, Mrs. Genevieve C. Day [Some sources list her last name as "Dey"], that there was no truth to these rumors. The niece was a Seventh-day Adventist, and she had taken care of him while he was in the hospital where he died. The probable connection here was that Canright had pastored a Baptist church in Grand Rapids Area some time after leaving the Adventist Church.

In 1888, Adventist leaders published the Church's first anti-Canright book, *Replies to Elder Canright*, anticipating that he would release a full-length anti-Adventist book shortly. Canright did publish such a book, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, a year later in 1889. Thanks to the Church jumping the gun, Canright was able to reference his refutations of their rebuttals to the page numbers of *Replies to Elder Canright*. Because early Adventist leaders liked to put everything in writing, we have a record of exactly what Church leaders knew and when they knew it regarding the serious problems with their Sabbath doctrine. Subsequently the Church published a full-length version of its anti-Canright book, *Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists* (Review and Herald), in 1895. Canright revised his book several times between 1889 and 1914 (See the 1914 edition of *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*). We have a wealth of evidence, therefore, of the exchange of arguments for and against the Sabbath between Canright and the Church leaders of his day, including his rebuke to those leaders for knowing that for forty years they had been unable to explain away the fatal-to-Sabbatarianism implications of Colossians 2:14-17. He knew a lot about the Church's struggle to defend its Sabbath doctrine since he had preached in favor of the Sabbath for decades as a high-profile SDA leader. We can see that after reviewing Canright's research on this key passage, Bacchiocchi had no choice but to develop his new theory that the "shadows" that Paul labeled "obsolete" represented the man-made rules of the Judaizers, rather than the ordinances themselves. At the same time we can easily see why he could not, in his dissertation, follow critical analysis of the theory that the Catholic Church "changed" the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. He would have been the laughing stock of the dissertation committee because those scholars knew that this explanation of Sabbath abandonment was historically impossible. (While a few irresponsible officials of the Catholic Church have boasted that the Church "changed the day," the Church's official position has nearly always been that Sabbath abandonment took place during the time of the apostles and during the life-time of the "first pope," or St. Peter.)

Well before Canright's apostasy, and way before Bacchiocchi's day, J. N. Andrews, the earliest real Sabbath scholar of the Advent Movement, cited historical sources that stated that Sunday observance was already pervasive by the end of the second century (or 200 AD). In his 1873 revised edition of *History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week*, he quotes a respected very early historian, **Joachim Meander** (1650–1680), who said this:

Now let us read what Neander, the most distinguished of church historians, says of this apostolic authority for Sunday observance:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin. (Emphasis by authors)

The absurdity of Ellen White's Roman Catholic Church Theory is self-evident. Andrews could not possibly have failed to see that White's theory was contrary to all the facts available to him at the time. Canright had not discovered anything new, and Bacchiocchi had not stumbled onto very much that Andrews and Canright had not already known. Bacchiocchi's research merely gave additional clarification to the process of Sabbath "abandonment" and put a more exact date on when the process had fully matured-- 140 AD. Certainly, the process had come to its full development, since by 200 AD it was considered to be a sin to work on Sunday.

It is important for our readers to understand that Andrews, Canright, Bacchiocchi and the four of us who wrote this book, concede that Sunday observance was “universal” by the end of the second century as well as that there have always been small pockets of Sabbath-keeping believers. When we side with Dr. Bacchiocchi on the 140 date, we mean that by this time the vast majority of Christians throughout the world were not keeping the Jewish Sabbath, that the primary recognition of the Sabbath concept was to celebrate it as a festival day at certain points of the liturgical calendar, and that they were worshipping on Sunday. Additionally we know that the Greek Orthodox churches never kept the Sabbath because their well-kept records prove this, and we believe that all the evidence points to the fact that the Church at Rome got its doctrines and practices from the East long before there was such a thing as the papacy or Roman Catholic Church.

Even though Dr. Bacchiocchi was either ignorant of the overwhelming supremacy of the Eastern Church during these early centuries or chose to ignore this fact, he tacitly conceded that Ellen White had lied about her Sabbath visions, and he was forced to develop a set of alternative theories to maintain his personal agenda– to demonstrate, somehow, that the Western Church was never-the-less responsible for the so-called “change of day.” The replacement theory he developed to explain the phenomenon of Sabbath “abandonment” in the West– the Jewish Persecution Theory– was not accepted by biblical scholars because it contrasted badly with the facts of secular and ecclesiastical history. It didn't help, either, that Bacchiocchi was forced to concede that he could not prove any link between sun worship and the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians. We will discuss this key concession of his in a subsequent chapter.

The Key To The Sabbath-Sunday Question: Hebrew Linguistics

Until Dr. Bacchiocchi's iconoclastic approach to defending the Sabbath came along, Evangelical and orthodox scholars had no particular interest in the question of whether Christians should be Sabbath-keepers. Apparently it was generally felt that Peter Heylyn had exhausted that subject during the Sabbath crisis in England during the reign of Charles I and that the matter was settled at that time. D. M. Canright does not seem to have understood the implication of the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, but his command of the subject was otherwise very complete. Unfortunately he did not have the resources to share his extensive research with the clergy and religious leaders of the world. His anti-Sabbath, anti-Ellen White books enjoyed only limited printings and circulation. All of this changed when D. A. Carson and his team began researching the Sabbath in earnest in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

This relatively new thrust of this knowledge of Hebrew linguistics helps us understand now why the Jews have always believed that the Sabbath was given for the first time at the time of the Exodus and why they believe that the Sabbath was given to Israel only. The Hebrew people understand their own language. Later we will look at the problems with Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory that the Jews came to teach that the Sabbath was given only to them because of political expediency that developed several hundred years before the birth of Christ.

Since it has been known with certainty since the publication of *From Sabbath to Lord's Day* in 1982 that the Sabbath did not originate at Creation, it is surprising that any scholar writing on the Sabbath would not account for Carson's work before lifting up the pen to write. In fact it is remarkable that any subsequent scholar would seek to write a book in favor of the Sabbath at all since then. It would seem that any subsequent book written on the subject would have to develop credible theories that would support the thesis that God intended all the peoples of the world to teach the NEW Sabbath that was given to Israel during the Exodus from Egypt.

OTHER CARSON FINDINGS

The Carson team re-discovered the principle that observance of the Ordinance of Circumcision is a prerequisite for Sabbath-keeping, whether that person is a Jew or a proselyte. This fact has been known to Christians from the very beginning. The founders of Christianity were Jews themselves, and Jews understood the principle that the Sabbath is dependent on the ordinance of circumcision. It is worth saying several times in one book that since the first Christians were Jews, they

understood that the Council of Jerusalem officially put the Sabbath Question to rest when it voted to not require the new Gentile converts to be circumcised. This is why there is no record of any apostolic discussion of Sabbath-keeping in the context of Christian practice thereafter. What the Carson team accomplished, then, was to prove (provide evidence beyond any reasonable doubt) that the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath defies what the Bible clearly teaches when it is studied with the purpose of understanding its major themes, principles, and dispensations.

The Carson team also discovered the significance of the Easter Controversy. As support for the principle that Christian doctrine and practice was determined by the Eastern Church, they observed that the bishop of Rome could not even persuade the other bishoprics to adopt the day of the year he wanted to designate as Easter. The Easter controversy was settled at the First Council of Nicaea, held in the East in 325 AD, and it did not choose the day urged by the bishop of Rome. The Roman emperor wrote letters to the other bishops throughout the Empire urging that they cooperate by unanimously adopting the Council's choice. We will provide the Carson reference later in context of a fuller discussion of this subject. See also the on-line *Catholic Encyclopedia* article, "Easter Controversy.") If the bishop of the Church at Rome could not get the other churches of the Christian world to adopt his choice of day for Easter, how could he persuade them to adopt a different universal day of worship?

Adventist Leaders React To The Unflattering Revelations

Seventh-day Adventist leaders pretended the twin disaster of Bacchiocchi's insult to Ellen White on Colossians 2:14-17 and the pope changing the Sabbath never happened. He became the first Adventist theologian to avoid losing his job as a result of challenging Ellen White on things that she credited to visions from God. Conservative Adventists were appalled. Adventism dared not acknowledge the existence of some of the newer anti-Sabbatarian arguments, much less try to refute them, because even the mention them could sow seeds of doubt that might cause a perceptive follower of Ellen White to start questioning things that would be "better left alone." Instead, the Church continued to pay Dr. Bacchiocchi's seminary salary, and he continued to write books to defend his work from the growing storm of criticism from both Adventists and Evangelical sources that the publication of ***From Sabbath to Sunday*** had created. By **1995 Dr. Bacchiocchi was forced to respond to his critics by publishing *The Sabbath in the New Testament***. In this new book he appears to have opened to the possibility that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-17 was a reference to a ceremonial sabbath feast day-- perhaps an annual one-- in essence, returning to the traditional SDA position on this text. He seems to have traded the difficulties of his iconoclastic views for the impossibilities of the traditional Adventist interpretation of this passage. In **1998** he published ***Sabbath under Crossfire*** which was designed to answer the charges leveled at him by his anti-Sabbatarian opponents during the previous two decades. It also modified his position on what exactly was nailed to the cross in Colossians 2:14-17. (See the historical time-line section for 1995 and 1998.) His effort to calm the controversy he stirred up was futile. The anti-Sabbatarian movement continued to strengthen. During the later years of his career he published a set of three books that instruct Christians in how to keep the Jewish sacred days that he believed still have relevance which extends into the Christian dispensation-- thus still maintaining his unavoidable corollary teaching that Christians must keep all of the Jewish ordinances mentioned along with the weekly Sabbath in this passage.

Thirty years after Dr. Bacchiocchi published his troublesome defense of the Sabbath doctrine, the Church commissioned **Dr. Skip MacCarty** of Andrews University Pioneer Memorial Church to write another full-length apology for the Church's Sabbath doctrine. One would think that Adventist leaders would want to bury the memory of the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco forever, but such was not the case. Unfortunately, MacCarty's steering committee appears to have guided him in the preparation of a book that would merely sugar-coat Dr. Bacchiocchi's ideas. (You can read a complete analysis of his teachings in our book, *Doctors Bacchiocchi, MacCarty, and du Preez Wreak Havoc with the Sabbath and Ellen White*.)

In the aftermath of the Bacchiocchi fiasco, the Church paid the salaries of other Adventist theologians to develop alternative theories that could explain both Sabbath abandonment and Colossians 2:14-17 in ways that did not conflict with Ellen White. Later we will look at the **Out of Easter Theory** as articulated by **Kenneth A. Strand** and the **Animal Sacrifices Theory**, developed by **Dr. Ronald du Preez**, entitled ***Judging the Sabbath: Discovering What Can't Be Found In Colossians 2:16***. Additionally we will look at the "**Dual Day Theory**" developed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists as an alternative to Dr. Bacchiocchi's failed **Jewish Persecution Theory**.

Dr. Bacchiocchi proved Ellen White's claim that God had shown her that the Roman Catholic Church had changed the Sabbath was factually incorrect. If Christianity is supposed to be rational, the rules of logic demand that she be classified as a false prophet. However, this *modus operandi* was nothing new for Adventist leaders. Just three years after the Seventh-day Adventist Church officially organized in **1866**, Iowa Conference leaders, **Snook** and **Brinkerhoff**, documented her lying cover-ups and failed prophecies in their **1863** book, ***The Visions of E. G. White Not of God***. They did not even know about her habit of claiming that God had directly inspired material that she copied from other writers. However Church officials were not impressed. Ellen White herself was one of the primary founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In **1867**, just four years after the Church organized, Thomas J. Preble left Adventism after just four years of membership and published his devastating book, ***The First Day Sabbath Proved***. Preble, clearly a brilliant biblical scholar and historian, presented most of the arguments against Sabbatarian that modern anti-Sabbatarians use today. Additionally he used the facts of ecclesiastical history to prove that the Catholic church could not possibly have "changed" the Sabbath," and demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that SDA biblical "scholar," J. N. Andrews, would have to have deliberately twisted historical facts to teach that Sabbath abandonment was the result of some kind of sinister apostasy. Specifically he disassembled Andrews' claim that the Waldenses had kept the Sabbath during the Dark Ages. There is no doubt that Andrews was forced to face his errors, since he and Preble carried out an extensive written debate about these matters, yet Andrews did not withdraw his error-ridden book, *History of the Sabbath*. From 1887 until his death in the early 1900's, D. M. Canright continued his anti-Sabbatarian, anti-Ellen White research.

Also in the year **1974**, Andrews University history professor, **Donald R. McAdams**, found extensive evidence that Ellen White got her concepts, most of her material, and her theology for her book, ***The Great Controversy***, from a book written much earlier by an early First Day Advent writer by the name of **H. L. Hastings**, entitled ***The Great Controversy Between God and Man— Its Origin Progress and End***. He notes that even her chapter titles have similar names and are almost identical in order. (Cited in **Douglas Hackleman's**, "***Ellen White's Habit***," referencing McAdams, ***Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians***, 1974.) Problems with ***The Great Controversy*** were not new. In **1911** the Church was forced to spend \$3,000 to revise this book due to anger over the fact that she had plagiarized extensively. \$3,000 was a lot of money back in 1911. The revisions were demanded by Church leaders because she had copied from so many sources without giving credit to the original authors while she claimed that her work was directly inspired by God. The trouble in 1911 began when Battle Creek Sanitarium physician, **Dr. Charles E. Stewart**, stumbled across evidence that she was plagiarizing and took the time to do some research to find out how extensive her copying was. In a booklet, ***A Response to An Urgent Testimony*** he published in 1907, he placed her plagiarisms alongside of the original sources she had not credited.

In **1976** **Dr. Ronald Numbers**, then a professor at the Church's medical school, Loma Linda University, published his book, ***Prophetess of Health***, in which he demonstrated that Ellen White got her ideas about health reform from other authors who had preceded her by as much as 20 years— in particular a certain Dr. Jackson. As usual, the problem of her copying was minor compared to her lying about where that information came from. Her actions embarrassed God because much of her health teachings turned out to be dead wrong. For example, benefits of drinking coffee and tea have been thoroughly established by science just within the last 10 years. Ellen White said that God showed her that it was a sin to drink these beverages.

Recall that In 1982 SDA pastor, **Dr. Walter Rea**, published his devastating book, ***The White Lie***, which became a *New York Times* best seller. Dr. Rea was granted special access to the personal library of Ellen White for a project he was doing, and while he was looking through her books he discovered that she had copied freely, nearly word for word, from these other authors, while claiming that God had shown her these things in vision. In his book, Dr. Rea demonstrated her copying to the point of over-kill. Then in 1990, an eight-year, exhaustive study conducted by SDA theologian, **Dr. Fred Veltman**, concluded that over 80% of the material in ***The Desire of Ages*** was "borrowed" from other writers. Despite all of this, the Church still showed no interest in repudiating its false prophet.

As the decades have passed since Dr. Bacchiocchi proved that Ellen White lied about the source of her information for her claim that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath, one SDA theologian after another has attempted to develop a satisfactory theory to replace her impossible claim. Not one of them has succeeded. If Ellen White had met the biblical tests of a true prophet, no replacement theories would be necessary.

Also, in recent decades researchers uncovered problems with the claims of Ellen White in regard to her statements about the direct, divine instructions she received in regard to the tithing system. At first, James White rejected the 10% of income concept. In 1861 he said, "**We do not urge the Israelitish tithing system** as embracing the whole duty of the believers in the third [angel's] message....**That system was necessary in God's plan of the Levitical priesthood**; but in the closing message [it] presents a far greater call for something of the kind." (*R&H, April 9, 1861*, p.164). (Editor's note: This "closing message" was a reference to an article about giving that appeared in an early and obscure Advent Movement publication.) Instead the Church adopted a different method of collecting money from its flock, called "Systematic Benevolence." This fund raising method didn't work very well, and eventually the Church adopted the same Israelitish tithing system that James White had rejected earlier. None other than D. M. Canright pushed for its adoption after seeing that the Systematic Benevolence program wasn't working.

Ellen White claimed that God first showed her that the Systematic Benevolence was the plan God wanted for His Church, and later she claimed that God had apparently changed His mind and wanted them to adopt a variation of the Israelitish system that demanded 10% of each member's income. As we will demonstrate in a later chapter, this bastardization of the Israelitish tithing system could not have even been applied to Israel during the Theocracy period of its history. We will enlarge on the subject of Ellen White and tithing later.

Our research has uncovered a collection of SDA "smoking gun memos," both written publicly and in secret— that prove that the Church founders knew there were impossible problems with the Church's Sabbath doctrine more than 10 years before the denomination formally organized in **1863**. We mentioned the 1866 findings of **Snook and Brinkerhoff**, the **1867** publication of ***The First Day Sabbath Proved*** by **Thomas Preble**, and the highly damaging evidence brought forward by **D. M. Canright** beginning in 1887, the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes**, the 1982 Walter Rea book, ***The White Lie***, and the ***Veltman Report*** which was published in *Ministry* magazine in **1990**. However, the business-as-usual way Adventism has used deception and propaganda to cover up the truth about the factual basis for Adventism goes far deeper yet.

In (circa) 1853, **J. N. Andrews** attempted to refute the idea, expressed in an anti-Sabbatarian paper by **O. R. L. Crosier**, that the Sabbath was not instituted at Creation. This proves that Andrews, from the very beginning of his Sabbath research efforts, was familiar with the logic and facts behind the concept that the Sabbath was not given to His people until the Exodus. In the same paper, "**Review of Objections to the Seventh-day Sabbath**," Andrews concedes that Sunday observance began during apostolic times:

1. We have never said that the keeping of Sunday as a festival, began with Constantine, or originated from the law which he enacted in its behalf. On the contrary, we believe that the Papal apostasy as stated by Paul began even in the days of the apostles. 2 Thess. 2. Hence we are not surprised that sometime after the days of the apostles, men began to pay some regard to Sunday, as also to Good Friday and to Holy Thursday. (p. 8, Para. 8, "Review of Objections to the Seventh-day Sabbath.")

This document is not dated, but it seems to have been written no later than 1853. You can access this document at this web address for the Early Advent Pioneer Resource Library # 1: <http://temcat.com/L-1-adv-pioneer-lib/Advent-Pioneer.htm>

While Ellen White and J. N. Andrews were embellishing their impossible Roman Catholic Church theory, a contemporary of theirs, Scottish biblical scholar, **Robert Cox**, had been conducting exhaustive research on the Sabbath-Sunday Question. We know that Andrews was familiar with Cox's work because he quotes him, but only to the advantage of his own Sabbatarian agenda— something made possible because Cox's document both the arguments for and against Sabbath-keeping. In **1865**, just two years after the **1863** official organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and only one year prior to the unmasking of Ellen White as a false prophet in **1866** by Snook and Brinkerhoff's book, ***The Visions of E. G. White Not of God***, Cox published his comprehensive two-volume set, ***The Literature of the Sabbath Question***.

As a catalog of ideas, Cox's work was about as objective as a book on this controversial study could be. However, as neutral as his presentation was, **just the facts as listed in his work proved one thing for certain, and that is that Sabbatarianism has always been opposed by the Christian Church on well-articulated biblical grounds, and many times has been opposed on both biblical and historical grounds. Cox demonstrated that this principle is true whether looking at the writings of the Early Fathers, the Reformers, or the theologians and biblical scholars from the Reformation until the**

present time. Andrews cites Cox in his later versions of his (Andrews) *History of the Sabbath*, according to Canright, but he seems oblivious to the many fatal-to-Sabbatarian concepts cataloged within its pages. At the conclusion of his section on the writings of the Early Fathers in *Volume One*, Cox made these generalizations:

Did they consider the Sabbath as abolished by Christ?

It is universally admitted that they often speak of it as abolished with the other Jewish institutions, and that, if they ever recognize a primeval Sabbath at all, they nowhere allude to it as an institution surviving in Christian times. In the fact of this silence, Holden sees no adequate reason for concluding that they did not however believe in the continued existence of a Sabbath instituted at the Creation; while Domville maintains that the whole tenor of their teaching about the Sabbath is incompatible with the notion that they so believed. (See Heylin, Part I, Ch. ii. iii. iv.; Holden, 42, 330; Domville, ii.130-148; Cook, ii. 291-8; James,142.) It was a prevailing opinion among them, as after-wards among the Reformers, that the Creator's rest on the seventh day, and likewise the Sabbath of the Jews, were typical of the Christian's rest in the present world from evil works, and in the next from sublunary toils and troubles. This "spiritual Sabbath" on earth they frequently contrast with the "carnal Sabbath" or bodily rest of the Jews (Neale, 88; Domville, I. 295-9; but see Holden, 323-330, and James, 123-6), which no writer before the promulgation of Constantine's Edict recommends to be observed by Christians on Sunday.

Did the Fathers regard the Lord's Day as either the Sabbath shifted to the beginning of the week, or a substitute for the Sabbath?

All who claim any knowledge of the works of the Fathers say these ancient writers usually, if not invariably, speak of the Lord's Day as an independent institution, of which neither the Fourth Commandment nor a primeval Sabbath is once referred to as the foundation (Heylin, Part II. Ch. ii.; Taylor, *Life of Jesus*, Part II. Sect. Xii Disc. x. ss 24, and Duct. Dubit., B. II.ch.ii. Rule VI. SS, 49-53-- *Works*, Heber's ed., iii.29; xii.415-421; Baxter, *Pract. Works*, xiii. 385; Cook, ii.291-303; Holden, 334; Bannerman, 130; Neale, 90, 237; Domville, I. 291-9; Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, iii.76). Certainly both institutions were long kept, each on its appropriate day, by the oriental Christians; but whether even the converts from Judaism observed the Saturday Sabbath so early as the first century is disputed by some, in spite of Acts xxv.8 and xxviii. 17, Rom. XIV 5, Gal. iv.10, Philip. Iii. 6, and Col. Ii.16, 17. (Bingham, *Antiq. Of the Christ. Church*, B. XIII Ch. IX. Ss 3; Kneader, *Hist. Of the Christ. Church*, I. 410; III. 421-2; Holden, 335; James, 157, 164, 169, 170, 179-1818, 193-4, 255; Coleman, 533; Cox, 279-281, 527-9.) How the two institutions were respectively kept, is told by Bingham, B. xvi. Ch. Viii., and B. xx.ch.ii and iii.

Did the Fathers ascribe the observance of Sunday to the injunctions or example of Jesus or his Apostles?

In regard to the Fathers who wrote before the reign of Constantine and whose opinions are alone of importance, Domville, after elaborate inquiry, answers this question in the negative; nor can he discover that any of them has appealed to the Christian Scriptures in proof of a Christian Sabbath (vol. i. p. 302, and Supp.; see also Cox, 531, note). Equally unable is Mr. Baden Powell to find that "these writers in any instance pretend to allege any Divine command, or even apostolic practice, in support of its observance." (Kitto's *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, ii. 270, 1st ed.) Two of them however, Barnabas and Justin Martyr, assign other reasons, of which those given by the one writer differ from those given by the other; each, as Domville shews, assigning as one of his reasons what is either too absurd or too improbable for belief. The credible reason alleged by Justin is, that on Sunday Jesus Christ our Savior arose from the dead. (Domville, i. 307-9.)

In addition to the work of Cox, we know from our study of J. N. Andrews' work that he was also familiar with Peter Heylyn's 1636 book, *History of the Sabbath*. Access to the 1636 edition of this book has always been available to researchers. This

authoritative book saved the Church of England from becoming a nation of Sabbath-keepers by demonstrating the biblical and historical impossibilities of the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath. We will tell you more about the research of Heylyn and Cox later. No wonder neither J. N. Andrews nor Ellen White cared to say much about its content.

Despite his knowledge of the works of Heylyn, Cox, and “apostate” Adventist and scholar, Thomas J. Preble, J. N. Andrews published a revised and expanded edition of his 1859 classic, *History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week*, plus a new book, *Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day*, in 1873. With the subsequent release of these books, we have proof that Andrews had immersed himself even more deeply in a wealth of information that should have told him that the papacy could not possibly have been responsible for the shift from Saturday to Sunday observance-- whether Sabbatarianism were true or not. Andrews’ writings are inconsistent in that he conceded on one hand that Sabbath “abandonment” was virtually immediate-- evidence, he said, that the “apostasy” began very early-- but still pushed the idea that the Roman Catholic Church, which did not come into existence until around 600 AD, “changed the day.” He appears to have placed more faith in the supernatural manifestations of Ellen White’s visions than in the facts that were hitting him smack in the face from the pages of the history books he was reading.

A wide number of eyewitnesses of various persuasions testify to the supernatural activity that frequently accompanied Ellen White’s visions. These testimonies cannot easily be dismissed as merely stories concocted to substantiate a legend, and some of the eye-witness accounts come from outside the control of Adventist circles. After studying a variety of statements by these witnesses, it is our opinion that it is not reasonable to conclude that her visions were not of supernatural origin. Even table-tipping was observed by an eyewitness at one of her visions. While we will have much more to say about this subject in a subsequent chapter, we cannot be too harsh on J. N. Andrews for going along with what he believed were special revelations directly from God.

The “Sister” Church's Response

The Worldwide Church of God and the Seventh-day Adventist Church developed from the same group of post-Millerite Sabbath-keeping believers. This group split shortly after the Great Disappointment of 1844 over the **Doctrine of the Shut Door** adopted and taught by Ellen G. White after a vision showed her that it was the truth. The Church of God Seventh Day split into two factions in 1933, and eventually Herbert W. Armstrong branched off of one of those factions, and his followers metamorphosed into what was became **The Worldwide Church of God** in 1968. Thus, these denominations had shared the same Sabbath heritage from the beginning. (See *Wikipedia*, “Grace Communion International.”) Note: This is the new name adopted by The Worldwide Church of God a number of years after it repudiated the Sabbath and allegedly became a fully Gospel-oriented denomination.

In 1995, The Worldwide Church of God renounced Sabbatarianism, opened its doors for “business” on Sundays, and became a more Gospel-oriented denomination. No greater rebuke to the perfidy of Adventist leaders could be offered. The turning from a religious cult to an orthodox, grace-oriented, Evangelical Christian denomination had never happened before to our knowledge.

Unfortunately, despite ridding itself of the heresy of Sabbatarianism, the cultic behavior of the ministry of the Worldwide Church of God continued despite the change in theology to conform to a more “orthodox” view. Splinter groups broke away and continued to teach that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath. It appears that the desire for income over ethics was still extant, and that the split that occurred was anticipated so that the ministry, despite whether they accepted the changes or not, were still guaranteed an income, seeing as the “replacement” Sabbatarian church was already set to go.

See: <http://www.exitsupportnetwork.com/resrch/oiu%27s/oiu3pt2.htm#The%20United%20Church%20of%20God%20is%20Born>

Never-the-less, the story of the circumstances that led its sister Sabbath-keeping denomination to repudiate Sabbatarianism represents a stern rebuke to the refusal of Adventist leaders to acknowledge the (by now) unequivocal evidence against its Sabbath doctrine that had accumulated by 1995. To follow is the story of how it all happened.

Dale Ratzlaff, a Seventh-day Adventist pastor and Bible teacher, left Adventism in 1981 because he could not find biblical support for Ellen White’s Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. Eventually he also studied his way out of the Sabbath doctrine by reading the research of Robert D. Brinsmead, Carson, and others. In 1990 Ratzlaff published his own refutation of the Sabbath doctrine, *Sabbath in Crisis*, which since has been renamed *Sabbath in Christ*, and is now widely recognized as

the most extensive and authoritative book on the Sabbath heresy. Meanwhile the leaders of **The Worldwide Church of God** were searching for answers due to most of Armstrong's prophecies revolving around 1972 and 1975 failing to come to pass. Even in his last book before he died, Armstrong was claiming the end time events leading up to the return of Christ would come about before the end of the twentieth century (*The Mystery of the Ages*; p. 298).

Somehow one of the leaders of The Worldwide Church of God came across the writings of Brinsmead and Ratzlaff. The WWCG ordered large numbers of Ratzlaff's book. These findings were presented to the Pastor General, **Joseph W. Tkach, Sr.**, by his son, **Joseph W. Tkach, Jr.**, and a few trusted associates. After studying the evidence, Joseph W. Tkach Sr., initiated the doctrinal change that did away with the Sabbath doctrine, and in 1995 this former cultic denomination became a Grace-oriented, Sunday-observing Church. Joseph Tkach Sr. died in 1995, and his son, Joseph Tkach Jr., fully implemented the doctrinal changes that led to the denomination's relatively recent acceptance into the National Association of Evangelicals (WWCG Video, "Called to Be Free", 2004).

There is no doubt that this astonishing development struck terror into the hearts of Seventh-day Adventist leaders everywhere, but there was no effort on their part to follow in the footsteps of their sister church. Apparently they observed the financial disaster that ensued as a result of The Worldwide Church of God's profound doctrinal changes, and they decided the financial risk of major doctrinal reform was too great.

Money has been a huge problem for both denominations. Here are several remarkable similarities that beg comparison:

1. Both churches had a prophet figure that required their followers to tithe and give generously to the organization on the basis that the "church" is the one and only true church.
2. Both denominations taught a version of the Jewish tithing system that is so twisted in its concept that it could not have been applied to Israel back in the days of the theocracy. (Chapter 17 will discuss this subject in detail.)
3. Both organizations developed financial and moral corruption that was way out of proportion to membership size.
4. Both the Seventh-day Adventist Church and The Worldwide Church of God developed this unprecedented financial and moral corruption at almost the same time.
5. Both denominations appear to have developed this large scale corruption because their leaders became increasingly aware that they were following false prophets and that they were teaching their followers to believe what they, themselves, did not believe.

Here is a summary of these parallel developments:

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH – The Seventh-day Adventist Davenport Scandal came to a head in 1980-1981 after multiple revelations of the problems with Ellen White in the 1970's. SDA physician, Dr. Donald Davenport, had managed to bilk over 25 million dollars of SDA Church funds– mostly tithe funds– from various SDA entities, as well as from private SDA investors. (You will learn more about this scandal in a subsequent chapter on Adventist corruption. It is being mentioned here because it is relevant to the story of these sister denominations at this point.) A quick look at our historical time line (See chapter 10) for the 1970's lists a set of astonishing developments, including the discovery and subsequent publication of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* in 1974-1975, which proved that SDA leaders had known she was a fraud since no later than 1919.

WORLDWIDE CHURCH OF GOD - A huge financial scandal came to light in 1979 after a series of revelations that the cult's founder and prophet, Herbert W. Armstrong, had prophesied things that did not happen, the surfacing of the moral problems of Herbert W. Armstrong and his son, Garner Ted Armstrong, and their lavish life-styles. For a comparison with the details of the Adventist record of corruption, here is a condensed version of what happened with The Worldwide Church of God:

Garner Ted Armstrong blamed Stanley Rader (legal counsel to HWA) for his two-time ousting from his father's church. Garner Ted and other former and discontented members of the Worldwide Church of God prompted the State of California to investigate charges of malfeasance by Rader and others involved with the AICF [Ambassador International Cultural Foundation]. By 1979, California Attorney General George Deukmejian had brought civil charges against the church, and the church was placed into an investigative financial receivership for one year.

The group of dissidents also gained the attention of Mike Wallace who investigated the church in a report for the TV program *60 Minutes*. Using documentary evidence obtained, Wallace brought to light lavish secret expenditures, conflict of interest insider deals, posh homes and lifestyles in the higher ranks, and the heavy involvement of Stanley Rader in financial manipulation.

Wallace invited Rader to appear on *60 Minutes* April 15, 1979. Wallace showed Rader a secret tape recording in which Herbert Armstrong had alleged Rader was attempting to take over the church after Armstrong's death, reasoning that the donated tithe money might be quite a "magnet" to some evangelists. Rader abruptly ended the interview.

Rader, with the approval of Herbert Armstrong, was spending millions to fend off any financial audit or examination of the Church's income and expenditures by litigating the issue all the way to the United States Supreme Court, several times, unsuccessfully. Having lost in the courts, Rader lobbied the California legislature to force the California Attorney General to drop the charges against the church and him. Under Rader's lobbying, the California State Legislature passed legislation known as the Petris Bill, signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, which changed the applicable law of California so that the Attorney General had no authority over churches in such circumstances.

The Investigative Judgment Cover-Up

It was her habit to take a doctrine introduced by someone else and report that God had shown her in a vision that it was the truth. It was Ellen White who, in this manner, chose the doctrines she wanted for her new Church and "gave" them God's seal of approval. Her greatest triumph was her adoption and promotion of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. This remarkable feat of theological gymnastics rescued the Adventist Movement from the jaws of defeat and turned it into the biggest little money making church there has ever been.

The Great Disappointment of 1883-1844 was based on William Miller's poorly conceived concept of what he thought were prophetic time periods that all came together to "prove" that Jesus would return at that time. Later we will study the convoluted calculations that led to his prophetic blunder. Ellen White claimed that God had shown her that He didn't want anything changed on Miller's charts and said that God had placed His hand over the errors to create a set of circumstances that would test His people. His conclusion that Jesus would return in 1843 (and then 1844) was based on a single word, mistranslated by the team that produced the King James Bible, rendered as "cleansed." Miller concluded that the sanctuary that was to be "cleansed" was Earth, which would mean that Christ would come and destroy the world with the brightness of His coming. When Christ did not return in 1844, an Advent believer by the name of Hiram Edson had a sudden epiphany while walking through a cornfield. He "saw" that the sanctuary cleansed in 1844 was the sanctuary in Heaven. The Advent believers then studied the earthly sanctuary services and determined that in 1844 Jesus passed from the Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary into the Most Holy Place. Drawing a parallel with the operations of the earthly sanctuary, the Advent believers concluded that a judgment process began in Heaven in 1844. An Advent Movement preacher by the name of O. R. L. Crosier was the one who actually articulated the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment in its complete form. Ellen was "shown" in vision that Crosier's concept was correct. Not much later, Crosier renounced his own teaching, denouncing it as just a crazy idea that had come into his head.

This judgment, according to Ellen White, started with the dead in 1844, and at some point unknown to anyone but God, the judgment of the living begins after the last dead person has been judged. When the judgment gets to the name of a living person, that person doesn't know it, and his or her eternal fate is sealed at that very moment. For logistical reasons, the concept of the Investigative Judgment requires that the dead be truly unconscious, which necessitates the Adventist doctrine of soul sleep.

Down through the history of the Church, many an Adventist leader has questioned this doctrine and lost his Church employment. The Doctrine makes no sense in light of the Gospel, and as the Gospel of salvation by Grace began to make small inroads into Adventism, more and more perceptive Adventists began to see that there was no possible way to reconcile the two. No one had ever been able to suggest a good reason why the sanctuary in Heaven would need to be cleansed. With Jesus' death on the cross as the ultimate sacrifice, why would the temple service continue in Heaven when it ceased for Christians on Earth?

In the year 2002, the most respected Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, **Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell**, published a complete expose of the Church's cover-up of its problems with the Sanctuary Doctrine after he retired from Church employment. This essay, "**The 'Sanctuary Doctrine:– Asset or Liability'**" (2002), is the written version of a speech he presented before the Adventist Forum in San Diego. In it he dismantled the single most important doctrine of Adventism— the **Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment**— which is also known as the **Sanctuary Doctrine**. Dr. Cottrell demonstrated to the point of over-kill that there is no biblical support for it— a highly significant development since for nearly two decades he had chaired the top secret committee that the General Conference president had formed to try to find biblical evidence *for* the doctrine.

Ironically this top secret and entirely unsuccessful Sanctuary Doctrine Committee had disbanded only a few years before the Church defrocked **Dr. Desmond Ford** at Glacier View Ranch in 1980 for voicing his reservations about the Investigative Judgment at a forum at Pacific Union College. The General Conference president at the time, Neal C. Wilson, knew, of course, that the secret sanctuary committee had not been able to find any biblical support for the doctrine before he flew out to Colorado to preside over the proceedings at Glacier View. Dr. Cottrell had chaired the committee. We will have more to say about Wilson's behavior surrounding this situation shortly.

Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell is widely recognized both inside and outside of Adventism as the greatest of all SDA theologians. That he rejected the Sanctuary Doctrine is bad news for Adventists. It means that the Great Disappointment of 1844 was a huge theological joke rather than the inaugural event God ordained to bring the Seventh-day Adventist Church into existence for the express purpose of warning the world about the beginning of the so-called Investigative Judgment in 1844 and the consequences of Sabbath breaking. Worse yet, the total lack of biblical support for this doctrine makes Ellen White's claim that God used deception to test the faith of the Millerites appear blasphemous. As we mentioned earlier, she alleged that God held His hand over certain parts of William Miller's prophetic charts so His people would not see their own errors:

“I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as He wanted them; that His hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until His hand was removed.” (*Early Writings*, p. 74.)

Then she alleges that God played another joke on His people later by “un-fooling” them:

“The hand of the Lord was removed from the figures, and the mistake was explained. They saw that the same prophetic periods reached to 1844, and that that same evidence which they had presented to show that the prophetic periods closed in 1843, proved they would terminate in 1844.” (*Early Writings* p. 236)

Ellen White's brilliant shifting of the blunders of the prophetic calculations of William Miller to God and the shifting of the cleansing of the sanctuary on Earth to the sanctuary in Heaven were very successful, but the price she paid for this feat was committing the “White Collar” crime of blasphemy— charging God with using deception in dealing with His own people.

We will trace the history of the Church's cover-up of the problems with the Investigative Judgment doctrine in subsequent sections, along with the problems of the Sabbath and Ellen White. Many thousands of hours of research over six years have brought us to the following conclusions, for which we will offer abundant support in the pages of our formal study. Please withhold your judgment until you have read the entire book. The Adventist version of Sabbatarianism is much more complex than that of other Sabbath-keeping churches. Rome was not built in a day. Neither will the Adventist concept that Rome changed the Sabbath be easily refuted, since this concept has become part of the DNA of Adventism. Here is what we see:

1. The more evident it became to leaders of the Movement that the Sabbath doctrine is biblically and historically impossible, the louder the propaganda from the Church— in particular the fantastic, fairy-tale story of how the Roman Catholic Church supposedly "changed the Sabbath" from Saturday to Sunday as the result of a diabolical conspiracy.
2. As the factual basis for Adventism was destroyed by a series of block-buster revelations about the Church's cover-up of Ellen White and the weaknesses of the Sabbath doctrine in the 1970's and 1980's, the Seventh-day Adventist leadership became more corrupt than any other Christian denomination of comparable size. There are two relatively recent large-scale scandals at the General Conference level that subsequent

leadership has refused to investigate and prosecute. One example will suffice. There is no sign that the new General Conference president (as of June 2010), Ted Wilson, plans to clean up the mess created by The David Dennis Affair which surfaced previous to the administration of the General Conference president who preceded him. (Note that David Dennis is the innocent party here, and that he was the whistle blower who called attention to a host of illegal activities at the General Conference, including the buying of General Conference positions of leadership and the ADRA financial scandal.) It is also interesting to note that Ted Wilson is the son of former General Conference President, Neal C. Wilson, who shamelessly lied about the proceedings at the 1980 Investigative Judgment “trial” of Dr. Desmond Ford at Glacier View Ranch. Neal C. Wilson flew back to GC Headquarters in Washington after the trial and announced that the committee unanimously rejected Dr. Ford’s ideas when in fact the committee unanimously agreed with Dr. Ford on six of his eight major tenets and partially agreed with him on the other two points. The following year Wilson received a public written rebuke for his lying which was signed by around 40 SDA scholars who witnessed what really happened at the trial. This document is known as the **Atlanta Affirmation**.

3. The single most important reason why Seventh-day Adventist Sabbatarians are unwilling to give up their belief in the Sabbath is their non-biblical view of the nature of the 10 Commandments. The Scriptures explain that the set of 10 Commandments represented a covenant between God and Israel. The Bible does not teach that they represent a complete moral code in and of themselves, and God proved this fact Himself by giving Moses additional laws, not written in stone, which have equal moral value, such as laws against the non-adultery sin of fornication (sex between a man and a woman, neither of whom are married), bestiality, and homosexual relationships. The sins of adultery and fornication are strongly differentiated in Jewish law and culture. Nor are sins of the heart included. By contrast, St. Paul listed a number of sins of the heart that will keep a person out of Heaven. The New Covenant, then, provides a far more complete picture of what a life lived according to the influence of the Spirit of God is like.

4. The reason for the development of this non-biblical view of the 10 Commandments seems to be the failure of Sabbatarian leaders— and in the case of Adventism, specifically the pioneers of the Advent Movement— to use good Bible study methods. Sabbatarianism is a pleasing theory because it gives the believer a wider role in the working out of his or her own salvation. Adventism was not strongly confronted with the Gospel of Grace until 1888 when Wagner and Jones presented the concept of salvation by faith alone at the Minneapolis General Conference session. The True Gospel message was rejected by the Church at that time, and it is widely acknowledged that Seventh-day Adventists maintained a strong legalistic approach to Christianity for almost the next 100 years largely as a rejection of their message. It seems to us that when someone is confronted with Scripture they do not wish to believe, they alter it in order to get Scripture to conform to their beliefs. William Hohmann has spent a significant amount of time analyzing the errors of logic that have created the Sabbatarian belief model, including inference, assumption, drawn out conclusions, proof-texting, altering or redefining words and terms, and the violation of the rules of Critical Thinking. See Bill Hohmann’s presentation of logic and Bible study methods in his chapter, “Does Religion Have To Make Sense?”

We believe the evidence we have provided regarding the specific Sabbatarian theology of the Seventh-day Adventists, as well as Adventist theology in general, demonstrates very serious flaws, not only in regard to the theology and methodology of Sabbatarianism, but also explains the resultant abuses of power and position that the flawed theology has produced. It is also interesting to note that the official salvation doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists, or Progressive Sanctification, is suspiciously very much like the Roman Catholic view of how a person is saved, or a combination of faith and works.

CHAPTER THREE

Ellen White Botches Ecclesiastical History

I - SHE BOTCHES THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION

Ellen White's classic book, *The Great Controversy* purports to give her readers the history of why Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping for Sunday observance. A study of what Advent Movement Sabbath historian, J. N. Andrews, knew and

wrote about regarding the history of the early church proves that he would have to have known that what Ellen White claimed God showed her about the Roman Catholic Church “changing the day” was historically impossible— regardless of whether Sabbatarianism was true or not. A study of several major research studies published between the King James Era and the contemporary times of Andrews and White suggests that both of them had to know that her account of the status of the Sabbath during the Reformation in ***The Great Controversy*** was patently dishonest. For example, her book devotes several chapters to Martin Luther, but she does not disclose the fact that an important Sabbath-Sunday debate arose at the beginning of the Reformation and that Luther was staunchly against Sabbatarianism on the basis of well-reasoned biblical principles. If White had given a fair treatment of her subject, she would have told her readers that he was anti-Sabbatarian and why he had made that choice.

Sanders observes, “Luther heard Carlstadt's teachings on Sabbath observance and he rejected them. Mrs. White states that “angels of light from God's throne” revealed treasures of truth to Luther. If indeed God had shown Luther “treasures of truth” as stated by EGW, then Luther would have accepted the Sabbath. EGW just could not get it right.” Sanders furnishes these two EGW quotes from the Great Controversy:

Ellen White says of him [Luther]: “Zealous, ardent, and devoted, knowing no fear but the fear of God, and acknowledging no foundation for religious faith but the Holy Scriptures. (p. 120)

Angels of heaven were by his side, and rays of light from the throne of God revealed the treasures of truth to his understanding. (p. 122)

Sanders then contrasts what Luther himself said to what Ellen White claimed God had showed her about him:

Now hear Luther. Carlstadt, a zealous and learned Sabbatarian, laid his arguments for the seventh day before Luther, who examined them. Here is Luther's decision in his own words: 'Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath— that is to say, Saturday— must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised; for that is true and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as the law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all.' — Heylyn, *History of the Sabbath* . 457.

Dirk Anderson observes in his article “Shall We Emulate Martin Luther?,” these interesting things and provides extensive documentation for his points at www.nonegw.com. Ellen White claimed direct divine inspiration for her account of the beginnings of the Reformation and the life of Martin Luther. She holds him up as a righteous man whose example Christians should follow. Apparently the attending “angel” who gave her “divine” guidance while writing *The Great Controversy* had “forgotten” that Luther believed and taught that correct belief is all that matters— that Grace frees Christians to do anything they want to do without fear of losing their salvation— and he lived his own life accordingly. The facts of Luther's immoral life-style should have been readily accessible to Ellen White's attending “angel” in the form of history books written by human authors. Luther sexually plundered the nuns that he freed from Roman Catholic bondage, had a sexual relationship with three women at one time, and only married one of them. He was an abominably heavy drinker. The truth is that his own moral example made Christianity “stink” in the sight of his contemporaries. (In fairness there are those who assert that these reports of Luther's unflattering life-style are false and were developed by individuals who were not in harmony with the basic tenets of the Reformation.) However, a noted German historian once observed the following about the effects of Luther's moral example:

As Heinrich Heine said, German history at that time was, thanks to Luther's example, almost entirely composed of sensual disturbances. Looking at the devastated state of Germany, one of Luther's contemporaries spoke the truth when he shouted at the Reformer: "This is due to your carnal teaching and stinking example." To enumerate or give a clear picture of the abhorrent state of affairs of the morals in Germany, would take pages and volumes. The important factor is that "not merely robbed marriage of its sacramental character, but also declared it to be a purely outward carnal union, which has nothing whatsoever to do with religion and church" (Janssen, *History of the German People*, Vol. 16, p. 137)

Furthermore, Ellen White extolled Luther for his commitment to religious liberty. The truth is that Luther was not committed to religious liberty by any sense of the imagination. We credit Dirk Anderson of www.nonegw.com for these insights into the real life and religious liberty views of Martin Luther. Here is an excerpt from Anderson's research:

"When I am angry, I am not expressing my own wrath, but the wrath of God". Luther knew that he was superior to any man or saint. "St. Augustine or St. Ambrosius cannot be compared with me." "They shall respect our teaching which is the word of God, spoken by the Holy Ghost, through our lips". "Not for a thousand years has God bestowed such great gifts on any bishop as He has on me" (E61, 422). "God has appointed me for the whole German land, and I boldly vouch and declare that when you obey me you are without a doubt obeying not me but Christ" (W15, 27). "Whoever obeys me not, despises not me but Christ." "I believe that we are the last trump that sounds before Christ is coming". "What I teach and write remains true even though the whole world should fall to pieces over it." (W18, 401). "Whoever rejects my doctrine cannot be saved." "Nobody should rise up against me".

Dirk Anderson provides the following reference for the above: Peter F. Wiener, *Martin Luther ~ Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor*, p. 28. All quotes from this book are from the electronically formatted document prepared by Patsy Jackson for Tentmaker Publications. The author, Dr. Wiener, was a university professor and Christian of German origin. He was not a Catholic.

See the article, "Shall We Emulate Martin Luther?" By Dirk Anderson, June 2009, posted at www.nonegw.com.

Because the Reformation did not result in a so-called "return" to Sabbath-keeping, Sabbatarians have gone to the trouble to write books with titles like, "**Why the Reformation Failed**," based on the idea that Luther rejected the Sabbath light when it was presented to him, so God could not fully bless the Reformation. This kind of reasoning only makes sense if you ignore the problem that such thinking is circular reasoning and the assumption that Sabbatarianism is true. These writers also point to the fact that the **Council of Trent** (1545-1563), which was convened to deal with the Lutheran "heresy," decided to go with the authority of both the Scriptures and church tradition in the formation of its (The Catholic Church's) doctrine and practice on the basis that the Protestants had capitulated to the Mother Church in regard to the change of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

This claim was a Catholic lie, because in the **Augsburg Confession** (first presented at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530), the Protestants rebuked the Mother Church for its blasphemous claim that it had the authority to change the Sabbath. Then this Lutheran document spelled out the scriptural basis for Sabbath abandonment with many of the same arguments used by anti-Sabbatarians today, demonstrating that it was biblical authority, not church authority that caused the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by Christians. Pro-Sabbatarian writers quote the following passage from the *Confession* to "prove" that the Roman Catholic Church claimed to have changed the Sabbath, while they ignore the significance of the fact that Lutherans understood and cited biblical reasons for their rejection of Sabbatarianism and called "bluff" on the Catholic Church's claim that it had "changed the day"—something Ellen White either never knew about or chose not to disclose in *The Great Controversy*. The first two quotes from *The Augsburg Confession* are taken from the translation posted at the web-site www.reformed.org and posted by the Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics. The third quote comes from a different translation as separately credited:

Moreover, it is disputed whether bishops or pastors have the right to introduce ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, holy-days and grades, that is, orders of ministers, etc. They that give this right to the bishops refer to this testimony John 16, 12, 13: I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth. They also refer to the example of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood and from things strangled, Acts 15, 29. They refer to the Sabbath-day as having been changed into the Lord's Day, contrary to the Decalog, as it seems. Neither is there any example whereof they [the Mother Church] make more than concerning the changing of the Sabbath-day. Great, say they, is the power of the Church, since it has dispensed with one of the Ten Commandments!

But concerning this question it is taught on our part (as has been shown above) that bishops have no power to decree anything against the Gospel.

Then, after castigating the Mother Church for its presumptions, the Confession outlines the biblical reasons the Jewish Sabbath was abrogated in apostolic times:

But there are clear testimonies which prohibit the making of such traditions, as though they merited grace or were necessary to salvation. Paul says, Col. 2, 16-23: “Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days. If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not; taste not; handle not, which all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men! which things have indeed a show of wisdom.” Also in Titus 1, 14 he openly forbids traditions: “Not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men that turn from the truth.”

The Lutherans exhibit an excellent understanding that no day possesses intrinsic holiness and that the Church's decision to designate Sunday as the day of worship and Christian fellowship was utilitarian. A modern anti-Sabbatarian could not have said it better. Please read this passage carefully, as it is packed with significance for the Sabbath-Sunday Question:

[57] Observing the Lord's Day, Easter, Pentecost, and other holy days and rituals are customs of this kind. [58] For those people make a big mistake by claiming that the church by its authority has decreed that Christians must worship on Sunday rather than the Sabbath Day. [59] For it was Scripture that did away with the observance of the Sabbath Day. The Bible teaches that since the gospel has now been revealed, none of the ceremonies of the Law of Moses need be followed. [60] Yet, since a day did have to be chosen so that Christians would know when they should gather for worship, it seems that the Christians chose Sunday for this purpose. It seems that this day was chosen for another reason as well. It gives people an example of how to use their Christian freedom, and shows them that it is not necessary to observe the Sabbath nor any other day in particular. (*The Unaltered Augsburg Confession A. D. 1530*, Translated by Glen L. Thompson, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; posted at wordpress.Com.)

Therefore, Ellen White's book, *The Great Controversy*, is not history. It is pure propaganda. Her claim that her information came from God is disturbing.

The Sabbath heresy has surfaced periodically throughout history, and it re-surfaces from time to time as the result of ignorance and poor Bible study methods (hermeneutics), including repeated attempts to apply the Mosaic Law to a dispensation for which it was never intended. Andrews, White, and the Adventist Sabbatarian apologists who have followed them failed to tell their unsuspecting readers that Sabbath-keeping was opposed on biblical grounds by the Christian Church at virtually all times, including the Early Fathers, the great Reformers, and subsequent Catholic and Protestant scholars.

The more you look into what Andrews and White knew, what they probably knew, and what they should have known, the more reason one has to question their motives and their integrity. Our research suggests that Andrews and White had access to the two most exhaustive histories of the controversy over the Sabbath ever written— Peter Heylyn's **1636** book, *History of the Sabbath*, published during the reign of King Charles I of England (the successor to King James), and the massive two-volume study on the subject by Ellen White's contemporary, Robert Cox, published in 1865. Andrews quotes both Heylyn and Cox. Since Thomas Preble published *The First Day Sabbath Proved* in 1867, which was a direct rebuke of J. N. Andrews' apparent deliberate twisting of historical facts to fit the Sabbatarian agenda, it seems reasonable to assume that Andrews had access to it.

Heylyn compiled an exhaustive biblical and historical study of evidence up through the King James Era that demonstrated to the point of over-kill that Sabbatarianism was impossible. Robert Cox, after discovering Heylyn's work centuries later, compiled an exhaustive list of all the arguments for and against Sabbatarianism from apostolic times through 1865. We quote from Luther's *Larger Catechism* as quoted in Robert Cox's 1865 book, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question, Volume One*, p. 127:

God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore, this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are not left free by Christ. But in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe **that we keep a festival**, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for these have no need of it...But that it is not bound to any particular time, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other... And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelties.

Please note that Luther discussed the church's view of the Sabbath as a festival. Later in our study the understanding that the concept that the Christian church observed Saturday as a FESTIVAL while observing Sunday as the day of WORSHIP is key to correctly interpreting many of passages that mention the Sabbath in the writings of the church fathers during the first 500-600 years of the Faith. In many cases the writings of the early fathers cannot be properly interpreted without a study of the entire context of their statements— a fact which requires, in some cases, the reading of the nearly entire work from which the excerpt is taken as well as its context within the author's entire set of writings. An analysis of the early, middle, and later work of SDA Sabbath historian, J. N. Andrews, proves that he was aware that the early church abandoned the Jewish concept of the Sabbath and created its own, non-sacred way of commemorating the Creation of the World by instituting the Sabbath Festival, which was observed on select seventh days during the liturgical year. Andrews says: "Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's Day." (*Testimony of the Fathers*, p. 11, quoted in D. M. Canright, *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans*.)

According to Cox, the other reformers were of the same opinion as Luther and Melancthon. Cox says in regard to this fact:

The Reformers found more meaning than the Puritans and their followers have done, in Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Gal. IV. 10,11 and Col. ii.16,17; while they failed to see in the New Testament any of those indications which the Puritans were the first to discover, of a transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week by Jesus or His apostles. (*The Literature Of the Sabbath Question, Vol. 1, pp. 127,128.*)

Melancthon, a close associate of Luther, and who, according to Cox (p. 131), was one of the most learned of the Great Reformers, said this about Sabbath-keeping for Christians:

Of this nature is the observation of the Lord's Day, of Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like holidays and ceremonies. For those who think that the observance of the Lord's Day has been appointed by the authority of the church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches, that the ceremonies of the Law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the church appointed for this purpose the Lord's Day, which for this reason also seemed to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that observance, neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary.

Cox's research on **John Calvin**, who died in 1564, established him as firmly anti-Sabbatarian, even though his comments on Genesis 2 and Exodus 20 suggest that it is possible he might have still believed that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation. Cox quotes from Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* as translated by Henry Beveridge and printed in 1845:

As the truth was delivered typically to the Jews, so it is imparted to us without figure; first, that during our whole lives we may aim at a constant rest from our own works, in order that the Lord may work in us by his Spirit; secondly, that every individual, as he has opportunity, may diligently

exercise himself in private, in pious meditation on the works of God, and, at the same time, that all may observe the legitimate order appointed by the Church, for the hearing of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and public prayer; and, thirdly, that we may avoid oppressing those who are subject to us. In this way, we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets, who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment (this they term, in their language, the taxation of the seventh day), while the moral part remains, viz., the observance of one day in seven. But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews. And of a truth, we see what profit they have made by such a doctrine. Those who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews in the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism; so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah (Isa. I.13; viii.13) apply as much to those of the present day, as to those to whom the prophet addressed them. We must be careful, however, to observe the general doctrine, viz., in order that religion may neither be lost nor languish among us, we must diligently attend on our religious assemblies, and duly avail ourselves of those external aids which tend to promote the worship of God. — (Beverly's translation, volume I, p. 466.)

According to the *Wikipedia* article, "Puritans," the movement got its beginning among the Marian exiles (See *Wikipedia* article, "Marian Exiles") who earlier had fled England for the Continent to escape persecution, and then returned to England during the reign of Elizabeth I, who came to the English throne in 1559. This article explains that the Puritans adopted Sabbatarian views during this time. It was the combined forces of the Puritan "Sunday" Sabbatarians and traditional "Saturday" Sabbatarians that created the second major Sabbath crisis of the Christian World. In essence, then, the King James Era Sabbath Crisis in England was really a transplanted controversy that had been brewing in Holland for a long time prior to its eruption on English soil.

II - ELLEN WHITE BOTCHES THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH IN ENGLAND

Ellen White, in her book, ***Great Controversy***, failed to discuss the significance of the post King James Era in regard to the Sabbath-Sunday Question. Therefore, few Adventists know that the Church of England came precariously close to establishing the Sabbath as official church doctrine within only a few decades of the publication of the ***King James Bible***, which was published in 1611. We were astonished by the discovery of this event because it seems like such an important part of the history of the Christian Church, now that we know about it. We also realize that we may not have been told about it because the story does not flatter the history of Sabbatarianism.

During the reign of King James (1603-1625), two tremendously powerful Sabbatarian movements had developed and were putting pressure on the Church of England to require Sabbath-keeping. One faction was pushing for the adoption of the Jewish Sabbath and the other was pushing for the adoption of Sunday observance with Jewish-type Sabbath restrictions.

King Charles I, who succeeded King James, inherited the controversy. When things heated to the boiling point, he turned to his court chaplain, **Peter Heylyn**, for help. He ordered him to begin a "Manhattan Project"-like research marathon to provide him an account of all the arguments for and against the idea that Christians must keep the Sabbath. Thanks to the definitive research that resulted, the Church of England rejected both kinds of Sabbath-keeping.

Heylyn's monumental work, ***The History of the Sabbath***, was first published in 1636, and it appears to encompass almost all the arguments used by modern anti-Sabbatarians, with the exception of advanced Hebrew linguistics studies of Genesis and Exodus. His major points were these: (1) The Sabbath commandment was not instituted until the manna was given in Exodus 16, (2) that the Sabbath was given to Israel and to Israel alone, (3) that the Sabbath commandment is predicated by the requirement of circumcision, was ceremonial in nature, and was abrogated at the Cross—officially and publicly being "retired" at the Council of Jerusalem, (4) that Colossians 2:14-17 clearly abrogates the Sabbath, and (5) that the "abandonment" of Sabbath-keeping by the Gentiles was virtually immediate; the adoption of Sunday observance by them being virtually immediate, and that the Early Church observed the seventh day of the week only as a festival.

No wonder Ellen White did not discuss the history of the Sabbath in England in ***The Great Controversy!***

Seventh-day Adventists may be especially interested to know that the biblical and historical evidence Heylyn discovered demonstrated that Ellen White's concept that the Roman Catholic Church "changed" the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday was impossible. As we noted earlier, Heylyn's work was familiar to pioneer Sabbath scholar of the Advent Movement, **J. N. Andrews**, and he had his own personal antagonist, Thomas Preble, who published a major volume which refuted his positions and exposed his blundering historical errors in the form of the book, ***The First Day Sabbath proved***. Andrews cited Heylyn in his own work, proving that he had no excuse for not understanding his many errors. Furthermore, he dialogged in published writings with Preble, proving that he could not possibly fail to understand that his historical claims were absurd. These books have been available to Seventh-day Adventist scholars and historians throughout the history of Adventism. It is difficult to imagine how Ellen White could have written about the history of the Sabbath without mentioning the Sabbath crisis in England at all. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine that one of the most prominent Sabbath scholars of recent times, the late Seventh-day Adventist theologian, **Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi**, would write as if he were unfamiliar with the evidence Heylyn uncovered against the credibility of Sabbatarianism. If any assumptions can be made about this failure, one would have to think it received no mention because the Sabbath was summarily defeated by Heylyn's clearly defined biblical and historical arguments.

Heylyn also demonstrated an understanding of why Sabbatarianism destroys the Gospel principle that salvation comes by faith alone. In fact Heylyn labeled Sabbatarianism a heresy because it teaches that Sabbath-keeping is ultimately a requirement for salvation.

III - ELLEN WHITE BOTCHES THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHURCH

Ellen White's *de facto* chief historian, J. N. Andrews, conceded in 1859 that Sunday observance was nearly universal by widespread by 100 AD and universal by 200 AD. The first pope was not seated till around 600 AD. If Ellen White had not claimed that God showed her all these things in vision, we might be able to excuse her on the basis that she wasn't a good scholar herself and didn't know how to choose a good historian to help her. Just a little more effort on her part, and she could not have helped stumbling across the facts of history for herself.

Christians "abandoned" Sabbath-keeping so quickly that there was no time for the influence of pagan sun worship or the Catholic Church to play any part in what happened. St. Paul died between 64 AD and 67 AD, and he would have written his last epistle shortly before that— perhaps 63 AD. Within only 40 short years after his death, most Christians were worshipping on Sunday. Even Dr. Bacchiocchi conceded that Sunday observance was wide-spread by 100 AD and universal by 140 AD. Note that Andrews conceded four years before the organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1863 that Sunday observance was wide-spread by 100 AD.

Dr. Bacchiocchi's 140 AD date seems especially reasonable in view of the extensive writings of two of the earliest Christian writers, Justin Martyr, writing in 155 AD., who was strongly anti-Sabbatarian, and Tertullian, who was born in 160 AD. Tertullian discussed at length the Early Church's understanding that the Sabbath was first given to Israel for the first time in Exodus 16, that the Sabbath was a temporary ordinance to regulate Israel between the Exodus and the cross, and that the ordinance of circumcision was required for Sabbath-keeping. He also explained that while Christians worshiped on Sunday, they celebrated the Creation event with festivities on some of the Jewish Sabbaths at various times of the year, including Passover Week, and discussed at what times of year Christians should fast on these occasions. His writings sound very much like those of the new anti-Sabbatarians who have written about the subject after the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco. You can study his anti-Sabbatarian writings in Appendix III. This additional, substantial volume of information is necessary because Sabbatarians quote one or more of his statements out of context to promote the erroneous idea that Tertullian was a Sabbatarian.

At the same time we have every right to question Dr. Bacchiocchi's scholarly integrity for not mentioning the substantial body of evidence that strongly suggests that Sabbath abandonment/Sunday observance took place almost immediately. By the time Dr. Bacchiocchi wrote ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, historians had dated the ***Didache***, which documents Christians worshipping on the first day of the week, to as early as 50 AD and no later than 125 AD. More accurately, the ***Didache*** is a collection of the first Christian writings, and the section of the document that mentions the practice of Christians worshipping on the first day of the week is believed by some researchers to have been authored around 70 AD. American scholars seem convinced that this section was probably written between 50 and 70 AD., whereas European scholars tend to think 70 AD. to 125 AD. In

Appendix II, you will find our critique of SDA historian, **J. N. Andrews'** 1912 study on the *Didache*. If you look at our historical time line in a subsequent chapter, you will see that in 1912 D. M. Canright was still bombarding Adventist leaders with the fact that Sunday observance happened almost immediately. Adventists should have raised the White flag of surrender to Canright, but instead they continued the myth that the papacy was to blame.

As Robert D. Brinsmead so clearly illustrated in his paper, "*Sabbatarianism Re-examined*" (1981), a much clearer picture of the Early Church had emerged from continuing scholarly research by the 1960's, and this clearer understanding spelled disaster for Sabbatarians. Church historians found strong evidence that the Gentile churches probably never kept the Sabbath and that the Jewish churches that did cling to Sabbath-keeping slid very quickly into fatal heresies.

Constantine's Sunday law of 321 AD didn't change the day of worship for Christians. It simply made it possible for Christian slaves (and others) to attend church without interference on the same day they had been worshipping on for over 200 years—Sunday. In fact this same clearer understanding of the Early Church demonstrates that while the Jewish Sabbath-keeping Christians fell into serious heresies and were lost to Christianity within the first 200 hundred years, the Sunday-observing, Gentile churches supplied the Christian Faith with believers who maintained orthodox Christian doctrines and carried the Gospel to the world. In stark contrast to what Seventh-day Adventists teach their followers, Sabbath-keepers were not the heroes of the Early Church. The Jewish, Sabbath-keeping Christians drifted into the fatal heresies of Ebionism and Gnosticism.

IV - ELLEN WHITE BOTCHES THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH BETWEEN 200 AND 500 CE

There are numerous references to the Sabbath by early Christian historians between 200 and 500 CE in addition to those of Tertullian. Except for the writings of the heretical sects, including those who rejected the apostleship of St. Paul, none of the early fathers of the Church write in support of the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath so far as we can tell.

The Eastern Orthodox churches never kept the Sabbath. For the first 3 – 5 centuries after the death of St. Paul the Eastern Church greatly eclipsed the Western Church. **D. M. Canright** in his extensively documented book, *The Lord's Day Neither From Catholics Nor Pagans*, gives this appropriate reference provided to him by Raphael Hawaweeny, Bishop of Brooklyn, The Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church, around 1914:

The Longer Catechism of the Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church says:

“Is the Sabbath kept in the Eastern Church?”

“It is not kept strictly speaking.”

“How does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment?”

“She still every six days keeps the seventh, only not the last day of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the day of the Resurrection, or Lord's Day.”

“Since when do we keep the day of the Resurrection?”

“From the very time of Christ's Resurrection.”

An understanding of the overshadowing supremacy of the Eastern Orthodox Churches during the first few centuries after the death of St. Paul is essential to grasping the immensity of the problem these facts pose to Sabbatarians. It is no wonder that Sabbatarian literature never mentions this subject. A study of Canright's extensive scholarly research on this subject is well worth the effort for anyone who truly wishes to understand the Sabbath-Sunday question.

Early historians from the East and the West also wrote about the Christian practice of celebrating the Sabbath festival. In these two passages the historians commented on which groups of Christians celebrated it with fasting or by eating the Lord's Supper. **Socrates Scholasticus** lived approximately between 379 and 450 AD, and Sozomen between 363 and 420 AD:

Since however no one can produce a written command as an authority, it is evident that the apostles

left each one to his own free will in the matter, to the end that each might perform what is good not by constraint or necessity. Such is the difference in the churches on the subject of fasts. Nor is there less variation in regard to religious assemblies. For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebaïs, hold their religious assemblies on the Sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their offerings they partake of the mysteries. At Alexandria again, on the Wednesday in Passion Week and on Good Friday, the scriptures are read, and the doctors expound them; and all the usual services are performed in their assemblies, except the celebration of the mysteries. This practice in Alexandria is of great antiquity, for it appears that Origen most commonly taught in the church on those days. He being a very learned teacher in the Sacred Books, and perceiving that the importance of the Law of Moses (Romans 8:3) was weakened by literal explanation, gave it a spiritual interpretation; declaring that there has never been but one true Passover, which the Saviour celebrated when he hung upon the cross: for that he then vanquished the adverse powers, and erected this as a trophy against the devil.— **Socrates Scholasticus**, circa 379-450 A.D., *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 5, quoted from www.newadvent.org

That **Socrates Scholasticus** is not discussing Sabbath-keeping in this passage is clearly proved by his introductory words to Book 5, Chapter 22. He sounds very much like an anti-Sabbatarian writing after the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco, quoting principles from St. Paul and linking Sabbath-keeping to the ordinance of circumcision:

As we have touched the subject I deem it not unreasonable to say a few words concerning Easter. It appears to me that neither the ancients nor moderns who have affected to follow the Jews, have had any rational foundation for contending so obstinately about it. For they have not taken into consideration the fact that when Judaism was changed into Christianity, the obligation to observe the Mosaic Law and the ceremonial types ceased. And the proof of the matter is plain; for no law of Christ permits Christians to imitate the Jews. On the contrary the apostle expressly forbids it; not only rejecting circumcision, but also deprecating contention about festival days. In his epistle to the Galatians, verse, 4:21 he writes, 'Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law.' And continuing his train of argument, he demonstrates that the Jews were in bondage as servants, but that those who have come to Christ are 'called into the liberty of sons.' (Galatians 5:13) Moreover he exhorts them in no way to regard 'days, and months, and years.' (Galatians 4:10) Again in his epistle to the Colossians (2:16-17) he distinctly declares, that such observances are merely shadows: wherefore he says, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of any holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come.' The same truths are also confirmed by him in the epistle to the Hebrews (7:12) in these words: 'For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.' Neither the apostles, therefore, nor the Gospels, have anywhere imposed the 'yoke of servitude' (Galatians 5:1) on those who have embraced the truth; but have left Easter and every other feast to be honored by the gratitude of the recipients of grace. Wherefore, inasmuch as men love festivals, because they afford them cessation from labor: each individual in every place, according to his own pleasure, has by a prevalent custom celebrated the memory of the saving passion. The Saviour and his apostles have enjoined us by no law to keep this feast: nor do the Gospels and apostles threaten us with any penalty, punishment, or curse for the neglect of it, as the Mosaic Law does the Jews. (Book 5, Chapter 22, within the first couple of paragraphs) Quoted from: www.newadvent.org

Seventh-day Adventist theologians and church leaders, since no later than 1992, have known that this particular passage from Socrates cannot be used to support the idea that Christians were keeping the Sabbath into the 300's and 400's, as evidenced by this assessment by SDA theologians Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteeg:

In actual fact, Socrates did not say that the churches of Rome and Alexandria had ceased to observe the Lord's Supper (the "sacred mysteries") on the Sabbath, implying that once upon a time they

had so observed it. Instead, he said that the churches do not observe the Supper on the Sabbath, leaving the reader to conclude, if he wishes, that the church in these places never did so observe it. (Part 3, Note 27, (C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday*; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992, as cited in the Internet article, "Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories," by Michael Morrison, posted on the Grace Community International website.)

Morrison, himself says, "Socrates actually said, "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, do not do this." He was commenting on fourth-century practices, with no implications about what had been done in earlier centuries. His comment cannot be used as evidence about the second century, especially if it contradicts all the other evidence we have from second-century documents.

Another early historian, Sozomen, mentions the term *Sabbath* in only one passage in his entire history of the church. He lived between circa 375 and 447 A. D. It is mentioned only in the concept, once more, of which groups fasted on the Sabbath "festival" or celebrated the Lord's Supper on it. He states, as you will notice, that he has digressed from his main topic to address the concept of fasting:

In some churches the people fast three alternate weeks, during the space of six or seven weeks, whereas in others they fast continuously during the three weeks immediately preceding the festival. Some people, as the Montanists, only fast two weeks. Assemblies are not held in all churches on the same time or manner. The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usage established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings, and, although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited nor the same selections read on the same occasions in all churches. Thus the book entitled *The Apocalypse of Peter*, which was considered altogether spurious by the ancients, is still read in some of the churches of Palestine, on the day of preparation, when the people observe a fast in memory of the passion of the Saviour. So the work entitled *The Apocalypse of the Apostle Paul*, though unrecognized by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. Some persons affirm that the book was found during this reign, by Divine revelation, in a marble box, buried beneath the soil in the house of Paul at Tarsus in Cilicia. I have been informed that this report is false by Cilix, a presbyter of the church in Tarsus, a man of very advanced age, as is indicated by his gray hairs, who says that no such occurrence is known among them, and wonders if the heretics did not invent the story. What I have said upon this subject must now suffice. Many other customs are still to be observed in cities and villages; and those who have been brought up in their observance would, from respect to the great men who instituted and perpetuated these customs, consider it wrong to abolish them. Similar motives must be attributed to those who observe different practices in the celebration of the feast which has led us into this long digression.—*The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, bk. 7, ch. 19. (Quoted from: www.newadvent.org)

Additionally, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which can be dated from 375 to 380 AD. (*Wikipedia* article, "Apostolic Constitutions"), mentions the Sabbath. Leading to much confusion is the fact that Chapter 7 is a "remake" of the still more ancient document, the *Didache*. One section of the *Didache* talks about the first Christians meeting together on the Lord's Day (Sunday) for worship, and early church historians have dated this section of the *Didache* to between 50 AD and 125 AD. Since the Christian church observed the Sabbath as a festival, rather than keeping the Sabbath and often debated about whether or not one should fast on the Sabbath festival, it is easy to assume, incorrectly, that these references provide support for Sabbatarianism. A passage like this one, taken out of context, does not do justice to the problem because it ignores its relevance to fasting and that fasting in regard to the Sabbath "festival":

WHICH DAYS OF THE WEEK WE ARE TO FAST, AND WHICH NOT, AND FOR WHAT REASONS.

But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; (15) for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week. But do you either fast the entire five days, or on the fourth day of the week, and on the day of the Preparation, because on the fourth day the condemnation went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray Him for money; and you must fast on the day of the Preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the cross under Pontius Pilate. **But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival.** For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures.

The author of the above statement specifically states that there is only one Sabbath of the year that is to be observed with fasting. Additional study of the *Constitutions* reveals that the early Christians honored the Passover Week with fasting on set days of that week and no fasting on the other days of that one particular week of the year.

We recommend that our readers do a search for the *Apostolic Constitutions* and search the entire document for all references to the word "sabbath." Here is what you will find:

These references to the Sabbath refer to the Sabbath festival.

Virtually all references to the Sabbath are in regard to whether or not fasting should be done on the day of the Sabbath festival.

The case for using the *Apostolic Constitutions* to teach that Christians were keeping the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word through the 300's into the 400's represents highly creative reasoning, or a lack of it.

CAN BOB PICKLE'S SUNDAY "REST" THEORY SAVE ELLEN WHITE?

Bob Pickle is an articulate apologist for Adventism, its Sabbath doctrine, and its Church prophetess, Ellen G. White. He contends that Ellen White was right in teaching that the pope changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, despite the very early universal adoption of Sunday worship, because Christians did not actually rest on Sundays until after Constantine ordered cessation from labor on that day in the early 300's. He reasons that the sanctity of the Sabbath was not actually transferred to Sunday until the Sabbath rest was changed from the Jewish Sabbath to "pagan" Sunday. This is an interesting approach to solving the Ellen White problem because the idea of resting from labor on Sunday did happen as a result of Constantine's new Sunday law. It is most interesting to observe that Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi has no such illusions about whether or not Ellen White's theory of how Sabbath-keeping began could be reconciled in this way. He publicly stated that he disagreed with Ellen's position on the matter:

In an E-mail message to the "Free Catholic Mailing List" catholic@american.edu on 8 Feb 1997 [Bacchiocchi] said:

I differ from Ellen White, for example, on the origin of Sunday. She teaches that in the first centuries all Christians observed the Sabbath and it was largely through the efforts of Constantine that Sunday-keeping was adopted by many Christians in the fourth century. My research shows otherwise. If you read my essay HOW DID SUNDAY KEEPING BEGIN? which summarizes my dissertation, you will notice that I place the origin of Sunday-keeping by the time of the Emperor Hadrian, in A. D. 135." (Posted at Bible.ca and available via search on Dr. Bacchiocchi's website, Biblical Perspectives.)

Here is an analysis of this interesting attempt to salvage Ellen White's historical blunders:

First, there is no sanctity to transfer. The Sabbath literally expired at the death of Christ. St. Paul clarified that under the New Covenant, no day has any sacred importance in itself. The early Christians did not rest on Sunday because they thought of it as a celebration of the resurrection.

Second, since the Gentile churches probably never kept the Sabbath and certainly did not after the Council of Jerusalem,

and since all Christians, including the Jewish Christians, did not keep the Sabbath on a universal basis after 140 AD, they were **working** on Saturdays or having a festival on some of those Saturdays. There was no “resting” left for Constantine to transfer from Saturday to Sunday by the 300's. Christians, and especially the Gentile Christians, began "desecrating" the Sabbath immediately by doing anything on that day that they wished to do, forsaking all Jewish associations with that day from almost the beginning of the Faith.

Third, it was the little horn of Daniel 7 that was to change “times and laws.” Even if this little horn somehow symbolized the papacy (The prophecy was literally fulfilled by the Roman Emperor, Nero.), which did change times and laws that made its brand of Christianity almost unrecognizable in comparison to the early years of the Faith, the little horn did not come into existence until after 500 AD, and Sunday observance was universal by no later than 140 AD. There is no way to rationalize that the little horn existed before 500 AD according to the wheel-within-a-wheel “prolepsis” concept Adventists use to force Antiochus Epiphanes to symbolize something that would come at some time in the future [the papacy], because the prolepsis concept, by its very definition, does not work backward. An example of a prolepsis is, “He was a dead man the moment he entered the room where the killer was lying in wait.” From a logical point-of-view, a prolepsis seems to be a one way street. To prove this to yourself, try to think of a way this last statement could be reversed, and you probably can't. Adventists cannot have their cake and eat it too. As you will see in a revealing transcript of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes*, the Adventist leaders of 1919 understood this problem and struggled with seeming impossibility of propping up their prophetess' claim that the papacy (the little horns of Daniel 7,8,11) changed the Sabbath.

Fourth, Pickle ignores the problem that Rome had no more influence than any other bishopric in the Christian world of that era of early church history, and the Greek Orthodox Church was the very center of Christian influence, doctrine, and practice, greatly over-shadowing Rome, even controlling it and deposing bishops of Rome who strayed from orthodox teachings. We will discuss the eclipsing power of the Eastern Church later, and a complete study is available in Appendix IV.

How, then, can anyone say that the Sabbath was not “changed” until the time of Constantine when from almost the very beginning of the Christian Faith, the Gentile Christians constantly violated the Jewish Sabbath by not ceasing from labor and by celebrating it as a festival? By the Old Covenant Sabbath laws, Christians observing the Sabbath after their own ideas, would create activity which would demand they be stoned. These Christians were likely picking up firewood for their celebrations and preparing meals. One early Christian writer instructed his readers not to eat food that was prepared the day before, which would be Friday! (This quotation will be included in a later discussion.) The “sanctity” of the Sabbath was trampled on from the very beginning, at least by the Gentile Christians, and, according to Dr. Bacchiocchi, Sunday observance was “universal” by 140 AD, which means that even Christians of Jewish descent who chose to remain in the Gospel— rather than to become a part of the Sabbath-keeping, Paul-hating Ebionite heresy— never again kept the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word.

CHAPTER FOUR

Ellen White Gets It Wrong About Why Christians Observe Sunday

In the case of why Christians came to observe Sunday, it appears that she got her views from J. N. Andrews who had been converted to Sabbath-keeping not long after Ellen accepted the Sabbath doctrine from Rachael Oaks Preston and Joseph Bates. Andrews was better educated than most Advent believers of the time, and he became the Advent Movement's first "historian." Unfortunately, once Andrews came to believe in the Sabbath, everything he studied about early church history, by necessity, had to be interpreted along the line that Sabbath abandonment represented apostasy. Once Andrews came to believe that Ellen White was directly inspired by God, and once Ellen asserted that God had showed her that the Sabbath doctrine presented by Joseph Bates was the "truth," he operated as a "historian" in such a way that there was no such thing as a fact that was not compatible with Ellen White's claim that the pope "changed the day" from the Sabbath to Sunday. Thus Andrews and White abetted each other in creating an interpretation of history that disagreed with well-established facts. Their naive view of things implied that the early Christians who abandoned the Jewish Sabbath kept Sundays as one would observe the Sabbath. They failed to notice that while many of the Jewish Christians did continue in the Law, and as such, would have been keeping the Sabbath by resting from labor on that day, but that on Sundays they would have been free to meet in fellowship with their Gentile counterparts for table fellowship along with corporate worship and prayers, which example we see in Acts 20:7. As Jews they would have tended to remain in their homes on the Sabbath according to the requirements of the Law.

What, then, if the Gentile Christians were observing Sundays along the lines of the Sabbath? The Jewish Christians would not have been able to have any concourse with the Gentile Christians for the same reasons! What Jesus' death had accomplished in order to bring the two disparate groups together would have been undone and reversed by the early church had they observed Sundays along the pattern of the Sabbath!

Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; ¹²That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: ¹³But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. ¹⁴ For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; ¹⁵Having 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; ¹⁶And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: ¹⁷And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. ¹⁸For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. ¹⁹Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; ²⁰And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; ²¹In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: ²²In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. —Ephesians 2:11-22 (KJV)

Sundays had no sacredness associated with it in the early Church. Early writings show that Christians either gathered early on Sunday mornings for communal worship and prayers before going off to work on that day, or meeting together after work on that day for the same purpose as well as to share a communal meal.

But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. (Justin Martyr (65-155 AD.) From: **The First Apology of Justin**, Chapter LXVII.-Weekly Worship of the Christians.)

The early church associated Sundays with the resurrection of Christ. His resurrection ushered in a new beginning that was not to be trivialized.

The first Christians were Jews and they understood, as Hebrews, reading the books of Moses in Aramaic, that the Sabbath ordinance was not given at Creation. They understood the subordinate relationship of the Sabbath to the ordinance of circumcision. It was Jewish Christians who, at the Council of Jerusalem, vetoed the move by the Pharisaical members to require the new Gentile believers coming into the Church be circumcised.

There is no hope of salvaging Ellen White's concept that Sunday observance began in the Western Church (Rome). We will now contemplate the fact that Sunday observance came from the East to the Western churches by its missionaries and that the Eastern Orthodox Church exerted powerful control over the church at Rome that these missionaries established.

From The Eastern Orthodox Church

Since the Western Church (Rome) became so powerful after 600 AD, it is so easy to forget that for the first few hundred years of the Christian faith, the Eastern Church (think Eastern Orthodox Church) was the center for the development of Christian doctrine and practice. The Eastern Orthodox Church kept excellent records from its very beginning, and those records show that it never kept the Jewish Sabbath. The center of political power shifted to the East (Think Asia versus Europe.) when Constantine moved the seat of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 324 AD. The fact that the Roman Empire survived in the East for around 1,000 years longer than it did in the West suggests that the Eastern Orthodox Church would retain preeminence in matters of the Christian Faith for hundreds of additional years. The emperor didn't move the bishop of Rome to Constantinople with him. Please study Appendix IV for more information about this subject.

Therefore, speculating about how Sunday observance might have developed in the West (Rome) is an exercise in futility. All the theories developed by SDA scholars to place the development of Sunday observance in the West have been successfully refuted, and these theories include **(1)** Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's Jewish Persecution Theory, **(2)** Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's "Influence of Sun Worship Theory," **(3)** the Dual Day Theory as developed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and **(4)** Kenneth W. Strand's Out of Easter Theory.

During the time that Adventists claim all these various influences were coming together to bring about Sunday observance in the West (Rome), Christian doctrine and practice was flowing from the East to the West. As the significant councils of the Christian Faith began to be held, they were conducted in the East, and the bishop of Rome traveled to Asia to participate as one of a number of others from the Christian world of their day. These bishops returned at the conclusion of these councils to implement the decisions of these councils in their own bishoprics. In a manner of speaking, the bishop of Rome received his "marching orders" from the East as did all the other bishops from around the Christian world.

If we did not already know that Sunday observance and Sabbath breaking was universal by 140 AD— and if we did not already know that the Eastern Church never kept the Sabbath— and if we did not already know that Christian doctrine and practice originated in the East and flowed to the West during this time of ecclesiastical history— we would still conclude that the Western Church (Rome) did not develop the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking on its own, but that it was imposed on it around 363-365 AD by the Council of Laodicea!

While not classified as one of the "great councils," the Council of Laodicea, circa 363-365 AD, was also held in the East. Laodicea is located in what is modern-day Turkey, and is not to be confused with the Laodicea in Syria. (See *Wikipedia* article, "Council of Laodicea.") This council was convened to address many questions, including which books should be in the Bible and the Sabbath-Sunday question. Please read Canon #29 carefully:

Canon 29: Christians must not Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honouring the Lord's Day; and, **if they can**, resting then as Christians. But if any shall be found to be Judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ.

(See <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3806.htm>, New Advent is a Roman Catholic website.)

Notice that the Council, by its directive to have Christians rest on Sunday IF THEY CAN, purposed to establish Christian practice (Think tradition.) rather than Christian doctrine in regard to resting on Sunday. If the Council had intended to transfer the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, resting would not have been treated as an option. The Council wished to provide a day where Christians could worship God and spend time with their families, and working would interfere with these things. There was no element of sacredness of time involved.

This provision of Canon #29 casts even more doubt on **Bob Pickle's** SDA theory that we could still say that the pope changed the Sabbath because this "change" was not complete until rest required by the Jewish Sabbath was transferred to Sunday.

Like all the other bishops in the Christian world, the bishop of Rome continued to receive– not impart– Christian doctrine and practice throughout all the centuries through which Sunday observance and Sabbath rejection developed. Note that as discussed in the comments of R.J. Baukham in the next section, the bishop of Rome utterly failed to influence the other bishops of his day to adopt his preferred date for Easter and to enforce the Sabbath fast. It is not very realistic to think that he would have had a chance to "impose Sunday observance on the entire Christian church, even if he had tried to do so. A review of the Great Councils of the East clearly demonstrates that the center of Christian thought and influence was in the Eastern Orthodox Church during the entire period of time that Adventists like to talk about the role of Rome in establishing Sunday observance, and even to centuries beyond that point: (See *Wikipedia* article, "First Seven Ecumenical Councils"):

The First Seven Ecumenical Councils, as commonly understood, are:

1. First Council of Nicaea (325)
2. First Council of Constantinople (381)
3. Council of Ephesus (431)
4. Council of Chalcedon (451)
5. Second Council of Constantinople (553)
6. Third Council of Constantinople (680)
7. Second Council of Nicaea (787)

The first council held in the West, Lateran, was held in the year 1123 in the Basilica in Rome after the Great Schism between the Eastern and Western churches had existed for some time.

Nicaea, the home of the First Great Council, took place about 40 years before the Council of Laodicea in what is now present day Turkey in 321 AD. While Roman Catholics like to claim that it was the Bishop of Rome who was responsible for establishing the doctrine of the full divinity of Christ at this Council, Protestants quote the following Council's statement that shows that the Bishop of Rome was mentioned only as a peer with the bishops of other major jurisdictions:

"Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis, prevail. Let the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction over all of these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the churches retain their privileges (*Canon 6*)."

The *Wikipedia* article, "First Council of Nicaea," makes this interesting observation:

"According to Protestant theologian Philip Schaff, 'The Nicene fathers passed this canon not as introducing anything new, but merely as confirming an existing relation on the basis of church tradition; and that, with special reference to Alexandria, on account of the troubles existing there.

Rome was named only for illustration; and Antioch and all the other eparchies or provinces were secured their admitted rights. The bishoprics of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch were placed substantially on equal footing'. (Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 3, pp. 275-276.)

Not From The Church At Rome

Dr. Bacchiocchi theorizes that the Church at Rome, which developed into the Roman Catholic Church hundreds of years later, might have had a significant role pushing Christians away from the Jewish Sabbath to adopt Sunday observance. Dr. Bacchiocchi theorized that it was the supposedly preeminent authority of the bishop of the Church at Rome (the predecessor of the pope of the Roman Catholic Church) who influenced the entire church to adopt the "new" practice of Sunday observance (*From Sabbath to Sunday*, pp. 207-212). R.J. Baukham, who lectured in the Department of Theology at the University of Manchester, said this about Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory in his essay, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church:"

This is probably the weakest of Bacchiocchi's arguments, but it is essential to his thesis. Only this assertion of the primacy of Rome can begin to explain how a custom originating in the early second century could have become as universal in the Christian church as Sunday worship did.

Against Bacchiocchi's argument, it must be said that the evidence he presents for the authority of the Church of Rome in the second century is not convincing. The Church of Rome had great prestige, but the kind of jurisdictional authority his thesis presupposes is anachronistic in the second century. No church of that period had sufficient authority to change the weekly day of worship throughout Christendom. Furthermore, Bacchiocchi's other two examples of liturgical change in the second century, the Sunday Easter and fasting on the Sabbath, do not, as he thinks, support his case, but rather highlight its weakness. Whether or not Bacchiocchi is correct in locating the origin of the Sunday Easter in early second-century Rome, it is quite clear that the see of Rome did not have the authority to impose it on the rest of the church. It was not until the *end* of the second century that bishop Victor of Rome attempted to convert the Quartodeciman churches to the observance of the Sunday Easter, and his attempt encountered stubborn resistance in Asia. Similarly, the Church of Rome was singularly unsuccessful in promoting the practice of fasting on the Sabbath. As Bacchiocchi himself admits, as late as the fifth century it was still confined to the Church of Rome, itself and a few other western churches. Both in the case of the Sunday Easter and in the case of the Sabbath fast, the surviving historical records indicate considerable debate and controversy in the churches.

It therefore seems extremely unlikely that already in the *early* second century the authority of the Roman see was such that it could impose Sunday worship throughout the church, superseding a universal practice of Sabbath observance handed down from the apostles, without leaving any trace of controversy or resistance in the historical records. Bacchiocchi's own comparison with Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast shows up the difficulty of his explanations of the origins of Sunday worship. Like all attempts to date the origins of Sunday worship in the second century, it fails to account for the universality of the custom. Unlike the Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast, Sunday worship was never, so far as the evidence goes, disputed. **There is no record of any Christian group (except the extreme part of the Ebonites) that did not observe Sunday, either in the second century or in later centuries of the patristic era.** (*From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, Carson, p.271, 272)

Michael Morrison, in his article, "Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories," posted at the Grace Community International website, provides a list of additional reasons that provide evidence that the Roman Church did not have the power to legislate any particular practice to the other churches in the Roman Empire:

As evidence that Rome did not have such power, we can note:

Ignatius does not greet a bishop of Rome.

Irenaeus disagreed with the bishop of Rome regarding policy toward Quartodecimans.

Polycarp and Polycrates acted as equals with the bishop of Rome.

It was only with difficulty and recorded controversy that Rome pressured a change in the date of Easter for one area in Asia Minor.

Even in later centuries, Rome was unable to force other cities to observe the seventh day as a fast day.

In the fourth century, when many Eastern Christians began to observe the Sabbath as well as Sunday, Rome was unable or unwilling to stop the practice.

(Kenneth A. Strand, *From Sabbath to Sunday in the Early Christian Church: A Review of Some Recent Literature. Part II*: "Samuele Bacchiocchi's Reconstruction," Andrews University Seminary Studies (AUSS) 17 (1979), pp. 96-99. Strand also notes that "Christian influences were still moving largely from East to West rather than vice versa" (*Sabbath*, p. 332, n. 22)

Now we know where Sunday observance came from. The first Christians met on Sundays because the Jews were meeting on Saturdays. The Jews threw the Christians out of the synagogues. The Council of Jerusalem voted not to impose the ordinance of circumcision on the Gentile converts. It is doubtful that many of the Jewish Christians kept the Sabbath, but if they did, they abandoned it within several decades. It is unlikely that the Gentile Christians ever kept it. Sunday observance quickly became the tradition of the Eastern Church, which from the beginning was the center of Christian belief, practice, and influence. Sunday observance was never a church doctrine. The early Christians had no illusions about it having intrinsic sacredness that had been transferred to it from the Jewish Sabbath. As we have seen, the practice of Sunday observance spread from the East to the West— not from the West to the East. The doctrines of Rome were imposed on it by the important church councils, all of which were held in the East. There is no evidence that Rome originated and imposed one single doctrine or practice on the Christian world until many centuries after the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath abandonment had become the unquestioned, universal practice of the Christian Faith for hundreds of years.

Not From Pagan Sun Worship

Dr. Bacchiocchi tried to salvage some components of Ellen White's conspiracy/apostasy theory— that pagan sun worship influenced Christians to adopt Sunday observance. The sun has always had its worshipers throughout the world, especially in ancient times. For Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory to have credibility, he must prove two things beyond reasonable doubt.

1. **First**, he must demonstrate that sun worship was popular enough in the Roman Empire between 100 and 140 AD. to potentially have influenced Christianity in the choice of a day of worship on the basis of a perceived need for commonality.
2. **Second**, he must provide adequate evidence to show a high degree of probability that it actually DID influence Christianity in this manner. The more incredible any theory appears to be, the greater demand there is that the supportive evidence and arguments be strong.

In Dr. Bacchiocchi's book, *Sabbath under Crossfire* (1998), Dr. Bacchiocchi spends nearly an entire chapter discussing the *possibility* that this sun cult or that sun cult was popular between 70 and 140 AD., but there is no consensus among his sources. During the period of time in question, sun worship was not predominant in general and Mithraism was not widely practiced in specific. Bacchiocchi, in an apparent contradiction of himself, concedes:

The Christian Sunday and the pagan veneration of the day of the Sun is not explicit before the time of Eusebius (ca. AD. 260-340)... *From Sabbath to Sunday*, p. 264.

Therefore, **requirement #1, therefore, is not met.**

In the remainder of this same chapter, Dr. Bacchiocchi attempts to make a case for the probability that the Romans were using a 7-day calendar that corresponded with the 7-day Jewish calendar. It is painfully evident that he is grasping at straws to show that a 7-day calendar had even limited use anywhere in the Roman Empire during this period of time. Most of the historical sources we could locate indicate that the Romans used an 8-day calendar during New Testament times and that the day named in honor of the sun was the second day of that 8-day week. These sources are fairly consistent in stating that, so

far as can be reconstructed, the Romans did not *completely* adopt a 7-day calendar until around 300 AD. On the other hand there are a few sources we found which see evidence that the Roman Empire might possibly have partially adopted a 7-day week 100 years or more before the birth of Christ, but that the vast majority of Romans continued using the customary 8 day week. **Robert Cox**, a contemporary of Andrews and White who is quoted in other areas by Andrews, examined this historical question. This book would have been available to J. N. Andrews and Ellen White in that era. Here is what Cox says in his chapter entitled "Origin and Prevalence of the Week:"

The opinion, still frequently expressed, that the week is and ever has been a universal institution, appears to be now untenable. Although anciently employed by the Hindoos, Assyrians, and Egyptians, the week was unknown to the Greeks and Etrurians, and was adopted by the Romans only in the second century, when they borrowed it from Egypt.

In his book *From Sabbath to Sunday*, Dr. Bacchiocchi states that some historians believe that a 7-day calendar was in widespread use in the Roman Empire by the latter part of the Second Century (150-199 AD.). The trouble is that the transition from "Sabbath keeping" to Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD as conceded by Dr. Bacchiocchi himself. As we will explain subsequently, the none of the Roman gods were worshiped on a weekly basis. But let us, for the sake of argument, let us pretend for a moment that the Roman sun worshipers did get together on the day of their "week" that was named in honor of the Sun. The Romans are using an eight-day week. It is the SECOND day of the eight-day Roman week that is named in honor of the Sun. The Jews are using a seven-day week, and it is the 7th day of their week that has been set aside as their sacred day of worship. In this hypothetical case, the day of worship for the Sun worshipers would only fall on the same day as the Jewish Sabbath occasionally.

Since the Romans did not worship their gods on a weekly basis, there was no such thing a day of sun worship during any kind of a week that the Jewish Sabbath could be changed to, even if both weekly systems were the same! The followers of any particular god visited that god's temple whenever they felt the need, and there were special days of a calendar year set aside to honor specific deities. Again, and for a somewhat different reason, we are faced with the impossibility that any worship day was "changed." There was no weekly day of sun worship that the papacy could have moved the Jewish Sabbath to. See Appendix VIII for a body of evidence that this is so.

In 1997 Evangelical biblical scholar, Ralph Woodrow, startled the Christian world by publishing a book, *The Two Babylons?*(1966), which refuted virtually everything he had taught in his best-selling 1966 book, *The Two Babylons*. In the 1966 book he taught that a lot of Christian customs, including its day of worship, had been borrowed from the Pagans. Years later Woodrow was informed by another scholar that his teachings were in error, and he determined set out to find out the truth for himself. He had based *The Two Babylons* largely on the work of a much earlier religious writer, Alexander Hislop (1807-1862). Woodrow began to examine Hislop's sources. Soon discovered that those sources did not validate his claims! Pursuing additional historical records, he managed to stumble across the historical research of D. M. Canright. In his 1997 book, he drew extensively from Canright's findings to show that his initial premise-- that Christians had borrowed a lot of pagan customs-- was not true. The Christian world was impressed that he had the humility to admit that he was wrong and to try to correct his error. Sunday observance could not have come from Pagans because they had no such custom to borrow from.

No later than 1915, D. M. Canright had confronted the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church with historical evidence to the point of over-kill that their claim that pagan sun worship influenced Christians to abandon the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath was as wrong as it could possibly be. In Canright's book, *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism on this Subject* (1915), he had presented the scholarly opinion of a number of noted American historians that the pagans had never had a weekly day set aside to worship any of their gods. You can read this story at:

<http://hwarmstrong.com/sunday-worship.htm> <http://hwarmstrong.com/sunday-worship.htm>

Finally, if Dr. Bacchiocchi's apostasy theory were true, we would be forced to believe that the early Christians were willing to break the Sabbath, which they supposedly believed was based on an eternal, moral principle, while at the same time they were willing to give up their lives rather than to bow the knee to an idol or publicly renouncing Christ.

R.J. Baukham, in his essay, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church," answers Dr. Bacchiocchi as follows:

Bacchiocchi argues that the reason why the church of Rome adopted *Sunday* as the Christian day of worship, instead of the Sabbath, was that the pagan day of the sun, in the planetary week, had already gained special significance in pagan sun cults, and by adopting this day Christians were able to exploit the symbolism of God or Christ as sun or light, which was already present in their own religious tradition.

Bacchiocchi here underestimates the resistance to pagan customs in second century Christianity. The desire for differentiation from paganism had deeper Christian roots than the second-century desire for differentiation from Judaism. It is true that, from Justin onwards, the Fathers exploited the symbolism of the pagan title “Sunday,” but to have actually adopted the pagan day as the Christian day of worship *because* it was prominent in the pagan sun cults would have been a very bold step indeed. Even if the Church of Rome had taken this step, it becomes even more inexplicable that the rest of the church followed suit without argument. (D.A. Carson, ed., *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*, p. 272)

Mithraism is the sun cult that Sabbatarians most suspect was influential in causing the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping for the adoption of the so-called “pagan” Sunday as the day of worship for Christians. Bacchiocchi knew of this possible link, but declined to say that he had proof that such was the case. Since Mithraism had only been present in the Roman Empire for a few centuries before Christ, it did not reach its peak of popularity until a couple of hundred years after Sunday observance had become universal. Here is what The *Encyclopedia Wikipedia* has to say about the relationship of Mithraism with Christianity. You can read it in its full context at this link:

http://www.faculty.umb.edu/gary_zabel/Courses/Phil%20281b/Philosophy%20of%20Magic/Pythagoras,%20Empedocles,%20Plato/Mithraism.htm

Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the legions from the east in the first century BC. As an action god of armies and the champion of heroes, he appealed to the professional Roman soldiers, who carried his cult to Iberia, Britain, the German frontiers and Dacia.

The cult of Mithras began to attract attention at Rome about the end of the first century AD, perhaps in connection with the conquest of then-Zoroastrian Armenia. The earliest material evidence for the Roman worship of Mithras dates from that period, in a record of Roman soldiers who came from the military garrison at Carnuntum in the Roman province of Upper Pannonia (near the Danube River in modern Austria, near the Hungarian border). These soldiers fought against the Parthians and were involved in the suppression of the revolts in Jerusalem from 60 A.D. to about 70 A.D. When they returned home, they made Mithraic dedications, probably in the year 71 or 72.

Statius mentions the typical Mithraic relief in his *Thebaid* (Book i. 719,720), around A. D. 80; Plutarch's *Life of Pompey* also makes it clear that the worship of Mithras was well known at that time.

By A. D. 200, Mithraism had spread widely through the army, and also among traders and slaves. The German frontiers have yielded most of the archaeological evidence of its prosperity: small cult objects connected with Mithra turn up in archaeological digs from Romania to Hadrian's Wall.

At Rome, the third century emperors encouraged Mithraism, because of the support which it afforded to the divine nature of monarchs. Mithras thus became the giver of authority and victory to the Imperial House. From the time of Commodus, who participated in its mysteries, its supporters were to be found in all classes.

Concentrations of Mithraic temples are found on the outskirts of the Roman Empire: along Hadrian's Wall in northern England three mithraea have been identified, at Housesteads, Carrawburgh and Rudchester. The discoveries are in the University of Newcastle's Museum of Antiquities, where a mithraeum has been recreated. Recent excavations in London have uncovered the remains of a Mithraic temple near to the center of the once walled Roman settlement, on the bank of the Walbrook stream. Mithraea have also been found along the Danube and Rhine river frontier, in the province of Dacia (where in 2003 a temple was found in Alba-Iulia) and as far afield as Numidia in North Africa.

As would be expected, Mithraic ruins are also found in the port city of Ostia, and in Rome the capital, where as many as seven hundred mithraea may have existed (a dozen have been identified). Its importance at Rome may be judged from the abundance of monumental remains: more than 75 pieces of sculpture, 100 Mithraic inscriptions, and ruins of temples and shrines in all parts of the city and its suburbs. A well-preserved late 2nd century mithraeum, with its altar and built-in stone benches, originally built beneath a Roman house (as was a common practice), survives in the crypt over which has been built the Basilica of San Clemente, Rome.

Worship of the sun (Sol) did exist within the indigenous Roman pantheon, as a minor part, and always as a pairing with the moon. However, in the East, there were many solar deities, including the Greek Helios, who was largely displaced by Apollo. **By the 3rd century, the popular cults of Apollo and Mithras had started to merge into the syncretic cult known as Sol Invictus, and in 274 CE the emperor Aurelian (whose mother had been a priestess of the sun) made worship of Sol Invictus official.** Subsequently Aurelian built a splendid new temple in Rome, and created a new body of priests to support it (pontifex solis invicti), attributing his victories in the East to Sol Invictus. But none of this affected the existing cult of Mithras, which remained a non-official cult. Some senators held positions in both cults.

However, this period was also the beginning of the decline of Mithraism, as Dacia was lost to the empire, and invasions of the northern peoples resulted in the destruction of temples along a great stretch of frontier, the main stronghold of the cult. The spread of Christianity through the Empire, boosted by Constantine's tolerance of it from around 310 CE, also took its toll - particularly as Christianity admitted women while Mithraism did not, which obviously limited its potential for rapid growth.

The reign of Julian, who attempted to restore the faith, and suppress Christianity, and the usurpation of Eugenius renewed the hopes of its devotees, but the decree secured by Theodosius in 394, totally forbidding non-Christian worship, may be considered the end of Mithraism's formal public existence. Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the legions from the east in the first century BC.

In summary, the idea that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday faces seemingly impossible barriers at every turn. The writings of the first Christians indicate that the Jewish Sabbath was abandoned on biblical grounds. The leaders of the Reformation cited biblical concepts for abandoning the Jewish Sabbath. The early Christians do not deserve the derogation that Sabbatarians have subjected them to over the years with the false claim that they went along with a conspiracy-apostasy to circumvent the Law of God.

Not According To Bacchiocchi's “Jewish Persecution Theory”

As we have seen, Dr. Bacchiocchi has conceded himself into a historical box canyon. He admits the early date of 140 AD for universal adoption of Sunday observance and wisely refuses to suggest that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day. He concedes that he cannot prove a link between sun worship and Sabbath abandonment before 140 AD. His last hope is to prove that the Roman Empire's persecution of the rebellious Jews between 100 AD – 140 AD caused the Christians at Rome to distance themselves from Sabbath-keeping in order to escape the possible threat of associated persecution. Dr. Bacchiocchi presupposes that Christians believed they were still required to keep the Sabbath at that time— something difficult to prove since Sunday observance was already widespread by 100 AD. He further theorizes that the Church at Rome used its influence over the Christians throughout the vast Roman Empire to distance itself from Sabbath-keeping to escape the possibility of such a persecution on the basis of this key religious practice supposedly being common to both Jews and Christians. There are all kinds of problems with Dr. Bacchiocchi's desperate theory, but this approach is really his only hope to explain how Christians came to abandon the Sabbath without admitting they did so over proper biblical and theological reasons.

By around 100 AD there were large numbers of Jewish Christians in Rome. The Jewish population of the Church at Rome might have been keeping the Sabbath as part of their Jewish culture, rather than as a requirement for salvation. If they were keeping the Sabbath merely as a part of their Jewish culture, it is reasonable to assume they would be willing to abandon their Sabbath-keeping to avoid the threat of Roman persecution. On the other hand, if they were keeping the Sabbath from the perspective of a salvation requirement, as Dr. Bacchiocchi supposes, it is very difficult to imagine that they would be willing to risk their eternal salvation to avoid persecution. The Christians of this era appeared to be willing to give up their lives for the Gospel. Since the Jewish Christians in Rome understood that circumcision and Sabbath-keeping cannot be separated, they would understand that Sabbath-keeping was not required of them or their Gentile brethren, but that keeping it as part of their cultural heritage was also okay. Paul did not condemn the Christians at Rome for keeping the Sabbath, but urged that the Jews and the Gentiles of the Church be tolerant of one another in matters that were not essential to salvation. Let us look at the likelihood that the threat of Jewish persecution could have been a powerful enough factor to induce Christians to stop their supposed Sabbath-keeping.

There were two major Jewish revolts against the Roman Empire between 100 and 140 AD. However, historians are divided in their assessment of the extent of the Empire's persecution of Christians during this period of time. The *Wikipedia* article, "**Persecution of Early Christians during the Roman Empire**," sums things up this way:

PERSECUTION UNDER DOMITIAN

According to many historians, Jews and Christians were heavily persecuted toward the end of Domitian's reign. [17] The Book of Revelation is thought by many scholars to have been written during Domitian's reign. Other historians, however, have maintained that there was little or no persecution of Christians during Domitian's time. There is no historical consensus on the matter.

PERSECUTION UNDER TRAJAN

Between 109 and 111 AD., Pliny the Younger was sent by the emperor Trajan (r. 98-117) to the province of Bithynia as governor. During his tenure of office, Pliny encountered Christians, and he wrote to the emperor about them. The governor indicated that he had ordered the execution of several Christians, "for I held no question that whatever it was they admitted, in any case obstinacy and unbending perversity deserve to be punished." However, he was unsure what to do about those who said they were no longer Christians, and asked Trajan his advice. The emperor responded that Christians should not be sought out; anonymous tips should be rejected as "unworthy of our times," and if they recanted and "worshipped our gods," they were to be freed. Those who persisted, however, should be punished.

Domitian reigned from 81-96 AD. (*Wikipedia*, "**List of Roman Emperors**").

Now, for comparison, let us review the Roman Empire's Jewish persecutions (*Wikipedia* article, "**First Jewish-Roman War**:")

The first Jewish-Roman War (66–73), sometimes called The Great Revolt (Hebrew: המרד הגדול, ha-Mered Ha-Gadol), was the first of three major rebellions by the Jews of Iudaea Province against the Roman Empire (the second was the Kitos War in 115–117; the third was Bar Kokhba's revolt, 132–135).

There does not appear to be much of a correlation between the Roman Empire's persecution of Jews and the Roman Empire's persecution of Christians. Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory that Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping between 100 AD and 140 AD due to the fear that the Sabbath link that Christians supposedly shared with the Jews is extremely difficult to defend. While these facts certainly do not absolutely preclude the possibility that Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory is correct, it would collapse if a better explanation could be offered.

There is no evidence that the Christians in the Early Church were persecuted for an unwillingness to work on the Sabbath. If the Early Church had maintained a Sabbath stance, the Romans would have made record of it. Supporting this idea is the fact that the Jews had such a bad reputation with the Romans for their Sabbath keeping that they were generally exempt from

military service and were not valued for slaves, but this was not true for Christians. See Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 9-13. See also William Barclay, *The Ten Commandments for Today* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973), pp. 31-2; Werner Forster, *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1964), p. 72; Eduard Lohse, art. "Sabbath," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 7:9. [Credit for this concept goes to Robert Brinsmead, and it is his references I have cited.]

Brinsmead, in his "A Digest of the Sabbath Question," provides this observation from a well-respected New Testament scholar:

"Whereas circumcision would have been practicable for Gentile converts, Sabbath observance simply was not. Unless they came inside the Jewish ghetto, where there was an ordered life adjusted to the cessation of work on the Sabbath, they could not earn their living or subsist while observing the Sabbath. If they were slaves, Gentile masters would not release them from work; and if they were independent and earning their own living, they would still have had to pursue their trade on a Sabbath. It was no doubt because circumcision was a practical possibility for Gentile Christians, as the Sabbath was not, that it was the centre of controversy" (Moule, *Birth of the New Testament*, 1961, p. 49).

NOT ACCORDING TO KENNETH A. STRAND'S "OUT OF EASTER THEORY"

SDA Bible scholar, **Kenneth A. Strand**, theorizes that Sunday observance grew out of the Quartodeciman Controversy, which was regarding which week Easter should be celebrated, and then over which Sunday Easter should be celebrated, and how the days-dates being considered were related to the Jewish calendar. Michael Morrison explains in his article, "Sabbath and Sunday—Adventist Theories," at the Grace Communion International website:

Strand suggests that weekly Sunday observance grew out of an annual Easter observance. He gives a possible reconstruction for the origin of the Quartodeciman controversy, with some Christians observing Sunday and others a day of the month, both with roots in the Jewish calendar(s). He then notes that some early Christians "not only observed both Easter and Pentecost on Sundays but also considered the whole seven-week season between the two holidays to have special significance. He suggests that Christians began meeting on every Sunday in that season, and then eventually to every Sunday every week: "Throughout the Christian world Sunday observance simply arose alongside observance of Saturday." *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*. Edited by Kenneth A. Strand. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982, p. 327, p. 327, and p. 323, respectively.

Morrison summarizes the weaknesses of Strand's theory, which are many:

This theory, however, in addition to being entirely speculative, does not explain the universality of Sunday observance. Either we must suppose that this custom began before the Gentile mission did, or that it was so obvious that Gentiles everywhere came to the same conclusion (and if it was that obvious, then it would have begun before the Gentile mission!). Also, this theory does not work for the Quartodeciman Christians, and all evidence is that even the Quartodecimans observed Sunday. [16] Strand feels that his theory explains why Sunday is a "resurrection festival," but no explanation for that is really needed; it would genuinely be an obvious connection for anyone meeting on a Sunday.

[16] "The Quartodeciman controversy had nothing to do with Sabbath observance; the Quartodecimans appear to have observed the weekly Sunday like most other Christians did at the time." C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 96.

As we mentioned earlier, the Easter Controversy was settled by the Eastern Church—not by the Western Church.

NOT ACCORDING TO THE “DUAL DAY” THEORY PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS IN 1988

Again, Michael Morrison outlines the “Dual Day” Theory as developed by SDA theologians for the official release of a new book designed to provide so-called biblical support for the Church's 27 key beliefs (*Seventh-day Adventists Believe...: A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines* (Washington, DC.: Review and Herald, 1988), p. 259, footnoting as source Justin, Bacchiocchi, and Socrates 5.22. Please keep in mind that there is no evidence that Christians in any of the very early centuries observed Sunday like the Jews kept the Sabbath. There is no evidence, for example, that they ceased from labor or thought of it as a sacred period of time, much less than observed it for a 24-hour period of time such as from sunset on Saturday night to sunset on Sunday night. It was thought of as a celebration of Christ's resurrection. Here is the mythical theory proposed by the SDA Church in 1988:

By the middle of the [second] century some Christians were voluntarily observing Sunday as a day of worship, not a day of rest.

The Church of Rome, largely made up of Gentile believers (Rom. 11:13), led in the trend toward Sunday worship. In Rome, the capital of the empire, strong anti-Jewish sentiments arose.... Reacting to these sentiments, the Christians in that city attempted to distinguish themselves from the Jews. They dropped some practices held in common with the Jews and initiated a trend away from the veneration of the Sabbath, moving toward the exclusive observance of the Sunday.

From the second to the fifth centuries, while Sunday was rising in influence, Christians continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath nearly everywhere throughout the Roman Empire. The fifth-century historian Socrates wrote: "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this."

If you have been following our discussion of Early Church History, you already see some very serious problems with this alternate theory, including the fact that Christians observed the Sabbath *Festival* as part of their liturgical practices. Morrison outlines the theory's problems for us as follows:

This theory has numerous deficiencies and inaccuracies, some of which we have already covered. First, it was in the early second century that some Christians were observing Sunday, and this was in Antioch and Asia Minor as well as at Rome and Alexandria. Rome did not initiate this trend, nor is there evidence that anti-Jewish sentiments motivated them to abandon customs they held in common with the Jews.

Moreover, second-century Christians were not observing two days, but only one. Second-century writers are uniformly negative toward literal Sabbath-keeping. There is no evidence that anyone (other than Ebionites) kept the Sabbath in the second century.

You may recall that the early Christians observed the 7th day of the week as a festival, but went out of their way to distance the nature of it from any Jewish-related requirements. How the Sabbath festival was observed varied from church to church and from area to area, and some of the components included public worship, observance of the communion ordinance, and sometimes even fasting, along with wholesome festivities. It seems that if resting was included, the “resting” was not considered to be part of a Jewish requirement or law, but as a convention that would be good for the church.

Thomas M. Preble, joined the Seventh-day Adventist Church when it was founded in 1963. After four years he apostatized and published a book, *The First Day Sabbath Proved*, which refuted the biblical and historical claims of the first Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholar and church “historian,” J. N. Andrews. He drew from historical fact to demonstrate that

Adventists were misunderstanding and misrepresenting the intent of some of the early Christian writers who, according to the terminology of the day, meant Sunday, the “Christian” Sabbath, when they referred to their day of worship. Preble explained to Andrews that once the terminology of the age is understood, references to the “Christian” Sabbath and the Sabbath festival cannot be used as evidence that the early Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath. Andrews’ future work never provided any evidence that he acknowledged his errors, and he continued to teach his false understanding of the history of the early church throughout the remainder of his life.

CHAPTER FIVE

EVIDENCE REGARDING WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW ABOUT THE BARRIERS TO THE SABBATH

As we have mentioned before, a review of the Sabbath histories authored by J. N. Andrews proves that he was familiar with virtually every detail of early church history. Let us review some of the things he wrote about. Andrews mentioned the issue of circumcision and was familiar with virtually all of the anti-Sabbatarian comments to be found in the writings of the early church fathers. In fact in some of Andrews' books he attempted to refute and minimize the significance of specific passages. Apostate SDA leader, D. M. Canright, helps us to know what Andrews knew by examining and refuting his claims.

That Circumcision Was A Barrier

In Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho," he discusses circumcision and the Sabbath with his Jewish friend, approaching him in a way that respected his friend's Jewish heritage. Notice that Justin Martyr did not cite St. Paul as an authority that the Sabbath is not required of Christians. Trypho, being a Jew, would not have recognized Paul's authority. It is significant that Justin is able to prove that the Sabbath was for the Jews and the Jews only from Old Testament logic alone. Justin Martyr was born in 100 AD. and died in 165 AD. Here is what Justin Martyr wrote in Chapter Nineteen:

CHAPTER XIX

CIRCUMCISION UNKNOWN BEFORE ABRAHAM. THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES ON ACCOUNT OF THE HARDNESS OF THEIR HEARTS.

"It is this about which we are at a loss, and with reason, because, while you endure such things, you do not observe all the other customs which we are now discussing. This circumcision is not, however, necessary for all men, but for you alone, in order that, as I have already said, you may suffer these things which you now justly suffer.

Nor do we receive that useless baptism of cisterns, for it has nothing to do with this baptism of life. Wherefore also God has announced that you have forsaken Him, the living fountain, and digged for your selves broken cisterns which can hold no water.

Even you, who are the circumcised according to the flesh, have need of our circumcision; but we, having the latter, do not require the former.

For if it were necessary, as you suppose, God would not have made Adam uncircumcised; would not have had respect to the gifts of Abel when, being uncircumcised, he offered sacrifice and would not have been pleased with the uncircumcision of Enoch, who was not found, because God had translated him. Lot, being uncircumcised, was saved from Sodom, the angels themselves and the Lord sending him out. Noah was the beginning of our race; yet, uncircumcised, along with his children he went into the ark. Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High, was uncircumcised; to whom also Abraham the first who received circumcision after the flesh, gave tithes, and he blessed him: after whose order God declared, by the mouth of David, that He would establish the everlasting priest. Therefore to you alone this circumcision was necessary, in order that the people may be no people and the nation no nation; as also Hosea, one of the twelve prophets, declares.

Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God; and after them Abraham with all his descendants until Moses, under whom your nation appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness: wherefore God, accommodating Himself to that nation, enjoined them also to offer sacrifices, as if to His name, in order that you might not serve idols. Which precept, however, you have not observed; nay, you sacrificed your children to demons."

See how God will destroy the nations to the beat of instruments of music as they also are BURNED.

And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths, that you might retain the memorial of God. For His word makes this announcement, saying, 'That ye may know that I am God who redeemed you.'(Ezek. xx. 12.)

D. M. Canright used Justin Martyr's writings to confront Adventist leaders with the real reasons why Christians did not keep the Sabbath. Thomas Preble in 1867. In fact, Preble dedicated a large section of his book to prove to Andrews and his Adventist associates that the young church did not keep the Sabbath and that their claim that the Waldenses clung to Sabbath-keeping was not the case, the claim being the result of their failure to understand the terminology the Christians of that era used when talking about the Sabbath festival on Saturday and the "Christian Sabbath," or the Lord's Day, which was on Sunday. It is fascinating to see the way these early SDA leaders dealt with this problem. Although a bit long, it is well worth your study. Here is an extended quote from the 1895 edition of ***Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists***, edited by Uriah Smith. As you study this passage, keep in mind that the entire passage is taken from ***Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists***, 1895 edition— a SDA book in which Uriah Smith is trying to show that Canright has taken parts of J. N. Andrews's books, ***The Complete Testimony of the Fathers***, and later, Andrews' earlier book, ***History of the Sabbath***, out of context:

[Smith]: Eld. C. quotes from "*The Complete Testimony of the Fathers*" very unfairly, as a few extracts will show. In putting forth a historical argument to show that Sunday was called the Lord's day and was observed as a sacred day by the Christian church immediately after the days of the apostles, he says:

[Canright]: "The Lord's Day, then, is the day belonging to the Lord Jesus, as 'he is Lord {of all}' (Acts 10:36), and 'Head over all things' (Eph.1:22) in the gospel. We shall find this fact abundantly confirmed in the Fathers. I now quote from '*The Complete Testimony of the Fathers*,' by Eld. Andrews:

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

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

[Smith]: We have given these three paragraphs in full, that the reader may be able to see fully how Eld. C. can treat the writings of others to suit his purpose. We have expressed surprise at his efforts to pervert and garble testimony. "Garble" is defined to mean, "to pick out or select such parts as may serve a purpose." - Webster. This quotation from "*The Testimony of the Fathers*" is made, remember, to prove that the Sabbath was discarded, and that Sunday was recognized as the Lord's Day by the Christians of that early time; and now let us see what Eld. Andrews does really say:

[Andrews]: "Justin's Apology" was written at Rome about the year 140 AD. His 'Dialogue with Trypho the Jew' was written some years later. In searching his works we shall see how much greater progress apostasy had made at Rome than in the countries where those lived whose writings we have been examining."

[Smith]: Thus Eld. Andrews' first reference to Justin is to show that Rome was far in advance of other bodies on the course of apostasy and that Justin was himself a leader in that work. In proof of this he introduces testimony that he treated God's Sabbath with contempt, denied its origin at creation, taunted the Jews that it was given to them because of their wickedness, and denied the

perpetuity of the Ten Commandments. Pages 33, 34. As to the next sentence in Eld. C.'s quotation let us give it entire from Eld. Andrews:

[Andrews]: “And it is worthy of notice that though first-day writers assert that 'Lord's Day' was the familiar title of the first day of the week in the time of the Apocalypse, yet Justin, who is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only 44 years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos, does not call it by that title, but by the name it bore as a heathen festival. If it be said that the term was omitted because he was addressing a heathen emperor [just what Canright does now say], there still remains the fact that he mentions the day quite a number of times in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' and yet never calls it 'Lord's Day,' nor indeed does he call it by any name implying sacredness.”

[Smith]: The quotation given from Justin on pp. 34, 35 (“*Testimony of the Fathers*”), about meeting together on “the day called Sunday,” etc., Eld. C. gives in full to show that Justin did regard Sunday as the Lord's Day, though he gives it no such name, nor any title of sacredness. But on p. 37 Eld. A. gives a quotation from Justin's “Dialogue with Trypho,” which shows that he regarded all days alike. He calls the gospel “the new law,” and says: “The new law requires you to keep the perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God.” Upon which Eld. Andrews remarks: “This language plainly implies that Justin held all days alike, and did not observe any one day as a day of abstinence from labor.” Yet the attempt is made by these misrepresentations to wheel Justin in as a witness for Sunday-keeping. Most astonishing to relate, Eld. C. quotes the epistle of Barnabas in favor of his position. Now he well knows that every critic pronounces that so-called epistle the work of a Jew of mean abilities and an absolute forgery. Yet, when reviewing Eld. Andrews in his notice of this work, he says:

[Canright]: “They [the early Fathers] lived early enough to have converse with the apostles themselves, while he [Eld. Andrews] lived eighteen hundred years later! Which would be apt to know best?”

[Smith]: Yes; but here is a man who claims to be a Father who was not; a man who was a fraud, an impostor, a forger. The question is, What do the Scriptures teach? And we have the Scriptures as fully as he. Now we ask, Who would be apt to give us the best exposition of Scripture? An old forger of the second century who wrote things too silly to be repeated, and too shameful to quote? Or a Christian scholar of the nineteenth? It will take no reader a great while to answer. Eld. Canright can take the forger if he prefers. In his fourth article in the *Advocate*, he says: “Let us see what Seventh-day Adventists say upon the sin of Sunday-keeping: 'All who keep the first day for the Sabbath are pope's Sunday-keepers, and God's Sabbath-breakers.'- *History of the Sabbath*, p. 502.”

After studying the above extended quotation from the 1895 revision of the SDA book, ***Replies to Canright***, it is difficult to see the relevance of this quotation and its discussion. It appears that the SDA leaders were trying to show that Canright failed to prove his point because Justin Martyr did not attach any sacredness in itself to Sunday and thus supposedly did not equate Sunday with the Lord's Day. The authors of ***Replies to Canright*** seem to feel that obfuscation will confuse the readers of their book enough to cause their readers to miss a variety of observations that beg to be made. They use circular reasoning at every turn. Whether the ***Epistle of Barnabas*** was a forgery or not had nothing to do with the validity of Canright's point, which was that the writers of the Early Church documented the FACT that the first Christians abandoned the Sabbath astonishingly early, well before the existence of the Roman Catholic Church. Andrews could not seem to grasp the concept that the early Christians chose Sunday as a day of worship without attaching any “day sacredness” to it. We see the following things of significance from this quotation from ***Replies to Canright*** and the other things we have learned so far:

- The SDA leaders of Canright's Era knew that Sabbath abandonment was common by 100 AD and universal by around 140 AD., hundreds of years before a pope or a Roman Catholic Church.
- They knew Ellen White said it was the pope and the Roman Catholic Church that “changed the day.”
- They knew Ellen White was not correct when she said that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day because this change happened far too early for her claim to be true.
- We see that the SDA leaders of Canright's Era were introduced to the concepts that at least some of the first Christians knew that the Sabbath did not begin at Creation and that there can be no Sabbath-keeping without circumcision.
- We now know that SDA leaders knew almost everything Canright confronted them with as early as the late 1850's.
- We observe that these early SDA leaders could not answer Canright's arguments and that any reasonable person should have been able to see that there was no satisfactory rebuttal to his point that Sabbath abandonment took place far too early for Ellen White's Roman Catholic sun worship explanation to be true.

Almost 100 years later, Dr. Bacchiocchi found himself still faced with the problem that Sabbath “abandonment” by Christians was almost immediate. He theorizes that Justin Martyr is rationalizing the Sabbath requirement away, looking for an excuse to justify the fact that Justin Martyr and other Christians were not keeping the Sabbath like they were supposed to. Again, this is an example of circular reasoning at its worst, presupposing that Christians were required to keep the Sabbath. Dr. Bacchiocchi, as well as the contributors to the 1895 edition version of *Replies to Canright*, missed the point completely. Whether Justin Martyr was rationalizing or not, he documented the fact that Christians were not keeping the Sabbath at this time. Whoever may have authored the *Epistle of Barnabas*, it was written very early, hundreds of years before the Roman Catholic Church came into existence, and it documented the fact that Christians were worshiping on Sunday at the time the document was written.

THAT SABBATH ABANDONMENT WAS VIRTUALLY IMMEDIATE

A variety of Early Christian writers documented that Christians chose to worship on Sunday, beginning in 70 AD and continuing until the Roman Catholic Church came into existence hundreds of years after “Sabbath abandonment” was universal (140 AD). Using their excerpts to support either point of view is filled with risks and challenges. Great caution must be observed. Cox (*The Literature of the Sabbath Question*, 1865) provides evidence that the writings of the early fathers have been heavily edited and even “tampered with.” There are translation problems with documents believed to be legitimate, and some of the documents are believed to be fraudulent. Our research suggests that the biggest mistake Sabbatarians make in using these excerpts is their failure to understand that many of these writers discuss the term “Sabbath” in the context of the Sabbath festival (such as whether or not to fast) and not in the Jewish sense of a day that is intrinsically holy and requires resting upon it by Divine law.

At the same time, taken as a whole, these excerpts demonstrate that the Christian Church during its first 500 years or more worshiped on Sundays and celebrated the Sabbath festival at selected times of the liturgical year. If they rested on these Sabbath festivals, it was because of the festive nature of the tradition, and if they worshiped on them it was because it was a festival established as a tradition to keep alive the memory of the Creation Week. The Lord's Supper was often celebrated on this festival. From the Jewish perspective, the early Christians, then, “broke” the Sabbath on all the Saturdays of the year that were not set aside as a Sabbath festival, and they “broke” it on the Sabbath festival days because the festive activities were not what the Law of Moses would have allowed on the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue.

While these writers had the advantage of perspective that living very close in time to the days of the apostles, they did not have access to the large body of the research that has been done on this subject over the last nearly 2,000 years. While a study of the opinions of the early fathers is useful, it is important to keep in mind that a number of biblical concepts and themes

are opposed to Sabbatarian thinking. Just one example is the principle that observing the ordinance of circumcision was a prerequisite to keeping the Sabbath.

Do not suppose for a moment that SDA leaders, historians, and theologians are not keenly aware that the Christian writers of the second and third centuries were not virtually unanimous in their disdain for the Jewish concept of Sabbath-keeping. Michael Morrison of Grace Community International comments that SDA Theologian Mervyn Maxwell, in his book, *Early Sabbath-Sunday History*, concedes that second and early third-century writers had basically the same negative attitudes toward the Sabbath (see part 3, note 27) and summarizes this concept as follows:

These writers taught that the new covenant had put an end to the old law — and that now the new spiritual Israel, with its new covenant and its new spiritual law, no longer needed the literal circumcision, literal sacrifices, and literal Sabbath. Barnabas observed that God "has circumcised our hearts." Justin referred triumphantly to the new spiritual circumcision in Christ. Irenaeus taught that circumcision, sacrifices, and Sabbaths were given of old as signs of better things to come; the new sacrifice, for example, is now a contrite heart. Tertullian, too, had a new spiritual sacrifice and a new spiritual circumcision. Each of these writers also taught that a new spiritual concept of the Sabbath had replaced the old literal one....

This supplanting of the old law by the new; of the literal Sabbath by the spiritual, was a very Christ-centered concept for these four writers. God's people have inherited the covenant only because Christ through His sufferings inherited it first for us, Barnabas said. For Justin the new, final, and eternal law that has been given to us was "namely Christ" Himself. It was only because Christ gave the law that He could now also be "the end of it," said Irenaeus. And it is Christ who invalidated "the old" and confirmed "the new," according to Tertullian. Indeed Christ did this, both Irenaeus and Tertullian said, not so much by annulling the law as by so wonderfully fulfilling it that He extended it far beyond the mere letter. To sum up: The early rejection of the literal Sabbath appears to be traceable to a common hermeneutic of Old and New Testament scriptures. - C. Mervyn Maxwell in Maxwell and Damsteegt, *Early Sabbath-Sunday History*," (pp. 154-156)

Please balance these things in your assessment as you study these excerpts:

1. The Didache [AD. 70]

But every Lord's day . . . gather yourselves together and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one that is at variance with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned" (Didache 14 [AD. 70]). See the critique of the very early analysis of this part of the *Didache* in Appendix II.

2. The Letter of Barnabas [AD. 74]

"We keep the eighth day [Sunday] with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead" (Letter of Barnabas 15:6-8 [AD. 74]). This document is almost certainly fraudulent in regard to its claims of authorship, but it still documents the practice of the first Christians, and that practice was to meet for worship on Sunday.

3. Ignatius of Antioch [AD. 110]

[T]hose who were brought up in the ancient order of things [i.e. Jews] have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's day, on which also our life has sprung up again by him and by his death" (*Letter to the Magnesians* 8 [AD. 110]). This document may have been tampered with, and its authenticity is questionable. If it was tampered with, it may reflect the opinion of very early Christian "editors." We use it for the support of our point-of-view with these reservations. Dr. Bacchiocchi acknowledges that the Early Church was seeking to differentiate itself from Judaism as early as this time in his book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, but seeks to show that Ignatius meant that the OT Jewish prophets did not go around "Sabbatizing," and that because of this fact, Christians should not do so either.

4. Justin Martyr [AD. 155]

“[W]e too would observe the fleshly circumcision, and the sabbaths, and in short all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined [on] you—namely, on account of your transgressions and the hardness of your heart. . . . How is it, Trypho, that we would not observe those rites which do not harm us— I speak of fleshly circumcision and sabbaths and feasts? . . . God enjoined you to keep the Sabbath, and impose on you other precepts for a sign, as I have already said, on account of your unrighteousness and that of your fathers” (*Dialogue with Trypho*, 18, 21 [AD. 155]).

5. Tertullian [AD. 203]

“[L]et him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day . . . teach us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the Sabbath or practiced circumcision, and were thus rendered ‘friends of God.’ For if circumcision purges a man, since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did he not circumcise him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? . . . Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised and unobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering him sacrifices, uncircumcised and unobservant of the Sabbath, was by him [God] commended [Gen. 4:1-7, Heb. 9:4]. . . . Noah also, uncircumcised— yes, and unobservant of the Sabbath— God freed from the deluge. For Enoch too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and unobservant of the Sabbath, he translated from this world, who did not first taste death in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might show us that we also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God” (*An Answer to the Jews 2* [AD. 203] See Appendix III for further information on this key early Christian writer. Sabbatarian apologists quote another passage from Tertullian which appears to be pro-Sabbatarian, but that quote is in reference to the keeping of the Sabbath by the Early Church as a festival. Sabbatarian apologists seek to show that this writer changed his mind about the Sabbath one or more times, but the confusion they experience is the result of their failure to understand that the Early Church observed the 7th day of the week as a FESTIVAL that was deliberately made to be different in its make-up than the Jewish Sabbath but still had religious significance.

6. The Didascalia [AD. 225]

“The apostles further appointed: On the first day of the week let there be service, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the oblation, because on the first day of the week our Lord rose from the place of the dead, and on the first day of the week he arose upon the world, and on the first day of the week he ascended up to heaven, and on the first day of the week he will appear at last with the angels of heaven” (*Didascalia 2* [AD. 225]).

7. Victorinus [AD. 300]

“The sixth day [Friday] is called parasceve, that is to say, the preparation of the kingdom. . . . On this day also, on account of the passion of the Lord Jesus Christ, we make either a station to God or a fast. On the seventh day he rested from all his works, and blessed it, and sanctified it. On the former day we are accustomed to fast rigorously, that on the Lord’s Day we may go forth to our bread with giving of thanks. And let the parasceve become a rigorous fast, lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews . . . which Sabbath he [Christ] in his body abolished” (*The Creation of the World* [AD. 300]).

8. Eusebius of Caesarea [AD. 312]

“They [the early saints of the Old Testament] did not care about circumcision of the body, neither do we [Christians]. They did not care about observing Sabbaths, nor do we. They did not avoid certain kinds of food, neither did they regard the other distinctions which Moses first delivered to their posterity to be observed as symbols; nor do Christians of the present day do such things” (*Church History* 1:4:8 [AD. 312]).

9. Eusebius of Caesarea [AD. 319]

“[T]he day of his [Christ’s] light . . . was the day of his resurrection from the dead, which they say, as being the one and only truly holy day and the Lord’s day, is better than any number of days as we ordinarily understand

them, and better than the days set apart by the Mosaic Law for feasts, new moons, and sabbaths, which the Apostle [Paul] teaches are the shadow of days and not days in reality” (*Proof of the Gospel* 4:16:186 [AD. 319]).

10. Athanasius [AD. 345]

“The Sabbath was the end of the first creation, the Lord’s day was the beginning of the second, in which he renewed and restored the old in the same way as he prescribed that they should formerly observe the Sabbath as a memorial of the end of the first things, so we honor the Lord’s day as being the memorial of the new creation” (On Sabbath and Circumcision 3 [AD. 345]).

11. Cyril of Jerusalem [AD. 350]

“Fall not away either into the sect of the Samaritans or into Judaism, for Jesus Christ has henceforth ransomed you. Stand aloof from all observance of Sabbaths and from calling any indifferent meats common or unclean” (Catechetical Lectures 4:37 [AD. 350]).

12. Council of Laodicea [AD. 360]

“Christians should not Judaize and should not be idle on the Sabbath, but should work on that day; they should, however, particularly reverence the Lord’s Day and, if possible, not work on it, because they were Christians” (canon 29 [AD. 360]).

13. John Chrysostom [AD. 387]

“[W]hen he said, ‘You shall not kill’ . . . he did not add, ‘because murder is a wicked thing.’ The reason was that conscience had taught this beforehand, and he speaks thus, as to those who know and understand the point. Wherefore when he speaks to us of another commandment, not known to us by the dictate of conscience, he not only prohibits, but adds the reason. When, for instance, he gave commandment concerning the Sabbath—‘On the seventh day you shall do no work’—he subjoined also the reason for this cessation. What was this? ‘Because on the seventh day God rested from all his works which he had begun to make’ [Ex. 20:10]. And again: ‘Because you were a servant in the land of Egypt’ [Deut. 21:18]. For what purpose then, I ask, did he add a reason respecting the Sabbath, but did no such thing in regard to murder? Because this commandment was not one of the leading ones. It was not one of those which were accurately defined of our conscience, but a kind of partial and temporary one, and for this reason it was abolished afterward. But those which are necessary and uphold our life are the following: ‘You shall not kill . . . You shall not commit adultery . . . You shall not steal.’ On this account he adds no reason in this case, nor enters into any instruction on the matter, but is content with the bare prohibition” (*Homilies on the Statues* 12:9 [AD. 387]).

14. John Chrysostom [AD. 395]

“You have put on Christ, you have become a member of the Lord and been enrolled in the heavenly city, and you still grovel in the Law [of Moses]? How is it possible for you to obtain the kingdom? Listen to Paul’s words, that the observance of the Law overthrows the gospel, and learn, if you will, how this comes to pass, and tremble, and shun this pitfall. Why do you keep the Sabbath and fast with the Jews?” (*Homilies on Galatians* 2:17 [AD. 395]).

15. The Apostolic Constitutions [AD. 400]

“And on the day of our Lord’s resurrection, which is the Lord’s day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent him to us, and condescended to let him suffer, and raised him from the dead. Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day . . . in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food” (*Apostolic Constitutions* 2:7:60 [AD. 400]). The challenge of interpreting the Sabbath point-of-view of this critically important document is discussed elsewhere in this book. Another passage from the work appears to support Sabbatarianism, but its mention of the Sabbath is almost certainly in the context of the Sabbath as a festival.

16. John Chrysostom [AD. 402]

“The rite of circumcision was venerable in the Jews’ account, for as much as the Law itself gave way thereto, and the Sabbath was less esteemed than circumcision. For that circumcision might be performed, the Sabbath was broken; but that the Sabbath might be kept, circumcision was never broken; and mark, I pray, the dispensation of God. This is found to be even more solemn than the Sabbath, as not being omitted at certain times. When then it is done away, much more is the Sabbath” (*Homilies on Philipians* 10 [AD. 402]).

17. Augustine [AD. 412]

“Well, now, I should like to be told what there is in these Ten Commandments, except the observance of the Sabbath, which ought not to be kept by a Christian . . . Which of these commandments would anyone say that the Christian ought not to keep? It is possible to contend that it is not the Law which was written on those two tables that the Apostle Paul describes as ‘the letter that kills’ [2 Cor. 3:6], but the law of circumcision and the other sacred rites which are now abolished” (*The Spirit and the Letter* 24 [AD. 412]).

Origen [AD. 185-254]

"But what is the feast of the Sabbath except that of which the apostle speaks, 'There remaineth therefore a Sabbatism,' that is, the observance of the Sabbath, by the people of God? **Leaving the Jewish observances of the Sabbath**, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be observed by a Christian. On the Sabbath-day all worldly labors ought to be abstained from. If, therefore, you cease from all secular works, and execute nothing to church, attending to sacred reading and instruction, thinking of celestial things, solicitous for the future, placing the Judgment to come before your eyes, not looking to things present and visible, but to those which are future and invisible, this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath." Origen in *Numeras Homilia 23*, cited by J.N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*, Chapter 18, from the translation of *Origen's Opera*, Tome, p. 358, Paris, 1733:

"Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath **after the Jewish manner**, and rejoice in days of idleness; for 'he that does not work, let him not eat.' For say the [holy] oracles, 'in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, not finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. 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 the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, 'To the end, for the eighth day,' on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ." *Epistle to the Magnesians* (longer form), chap. 9, quoted by J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*, Chapter 18.

Note: J. N. Andrews seemed to think that these excerpts from Origen support the idea that the early Christians were still keeping the Sabbath. He has ignored the scholarly rebuke he received from Thomas Preble, who addressed his errors in 1867. Upon careful analysis, the comments of Origen demonstrate that Christians were observing FESTIVALS on both Saturday and Sunday. Origen does not appeal to any biblical source, and especially not to the 10 Commandments, to support his views. In fact Origen is careful in both statements to distance his Sabbath remarks from anything related to Judaism. He was a strong supporter of Sunday as the day of worship. Observe that he is instructing Christians not to eat food prepared the day before the Sabbath festival. The Jews were forbidden to prepare food on the Sabbath day, and Friday was considered the "day of preparation" for preparing the meals that would be eaten on the Sabbath. He appears to view the Sabbath festival merely as a Christian tradition designed by the Church to keep the memory of Creation Week before the minds of the believers.

Notice the theology in these statements. Some writers gave better reasons for the abandonment of the Sabbath by Christians than others, but the point is that Christians documented the fact that the Sabbath was not being kept in the Jewish sense of the word from virtually the beginning of the Christian Faith.

THAT THE EARLY CHURCH WAS NEGATIVE TOWARD SABBATH-KEEPING

During the 30 years that transpired between the release of Dr. Bacchiocchi's first book in 1977, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, and the publication of Dr. Skip MacCarty's "commemorative" book in 2007, *In Granite or Ingrained?*, Seventh-day Adventists did a lot of research on the problem that early church history poses for Sabbatarianism. Collectively, the research and writings of a handful of these pro-Sabbatarian writers proves that Seventh-day Adventists are more painfully aware than ever that Ellen White's account of how Christians came to observe Sunday is nothing more than a fairy tale. Michael Morrison of the Grace Communion International (formerly the Sabbatarian *Worldwide Church of God*), discusses what SDA scholar, Mervyn C. Maxwell, concedes about what the Christian writers of the second and early third centuries had to say about the Sabbath. Morrison paraphrases Maxwell's summary of the first basic areas of agreement among the early church fathers in regard to the Sabbath as follows. The words of Morrison are indented and in black and the words of Maxwell are in blue:

Sabbath eschatology – The Sabbath foreshadows an age of sinlessness and peace beyond this present age. (2) Moral typology – Living a godly life every day fulfills the purpose of the Sabbath commandment. (3) The Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments not binding on Christians. (4) The Sabbath is not part of the natural law. (5) The patriarchs before Moses did not observe the Sabbath.

Maxwell concludes that second and early third-century writers had basically the same negative attitudes toward the Sabbath. He then writes:

These writers taught that the new covenant had put an end to the old law – and that now the new spiritual Israel, with its new covenant and its new spiritual law, no longer needed the literal circumcision, literal sacrifices, and literal Sabbath. Barnabas observed that God "has circumcised our hearts." Justin referred triumphantly to the new spiritual circumcision in Christ. Irenaeus taught that circumcision, sacrifices, and Sabbaths were given of old as signs of better things to come; the new sacrifice, for example, is now a contrite heart. Tertullian, too, had a new spiritual sacrifice and a new spiritual circumcision. Each of these writers also taught that a new spiritual concept of the Sabbath had replaced the old literal one. . .

The supplanting of the old law with the new, of the literal Sabbath with the spiritual, was a very Christ-centered concept for these four writers. God's people have inherited the covenant only because Christ through His sufferings inherited it first for us, Barnabas said. For Justin the new, final, and eternal law that has been given to us was "namely Christ" Himself. It was only because Christ gave the law that He could now also be "the end of it," said Irenaeus. And it is Christ who invalidated "the old" and confirmed "the new," according to Tertullian. Indeed Christ did this, both Irenaeus and Tertullian said, not so much by annulling the law as by so wonderfully fulfilling it that He extended it far beyond the mere letter. To sum up: The early rejection of the literal Sabbath appears to be traceable to a common hermeneutic of Old and New Testament scriptures.

Morrison observes that these various early church writers came from various parts of the empire and shared a common "hermeneutic" that would only be possible if the practice of Sunday observance had been present from the beginning. He says,

"That same hermeneutic was used in the Gentile mission ever since Acts 15: a mission that did not require Gentiles to keep the laws of Moses, including the Sabbath. It is unlikely that churches throughout the empire would, without controversy, develop the same practice unless that practice had been present from the beginning. It is also unlikely that people throughout the empire would, without controversy, develop the same practice unless that practice had been present from the beginning. It is also unlikely that people throughout the empire would give the same reasons for their practice unless those reasons had also been present from the beginning."

Michael Morrison's series on the history of the Sabbath in the early church can be accessed at the Grace Communion International website, gci.org. Morrison cites Maxwell as follows:

Maxwell, C. Mervyn, and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992.

Dr. Skip MacCarty refused to discuss the historical aspects of the Sabbath-Sunday question in his 2007 book, stating that the subject was beyond its scope. The real history of how Christians came to observe Sunday is totally different that what he would want his readers to believe. If the first Christians hadn't figured it out before, they knew the Sabbath was not part of Christianity when the Council of Jerusalem clarified that the Gentile Christians were not to be bound by the ordinance of circumcision and a very brief list of their requirements was outlined. The list of requirements for the new Gentile converts was very brief, and it did not include the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath-- a no brainer since they were not to be bound by the ordinance of circumcision.

It didn't take long for the Jews to kick the Christians out of the synagogues. Christians were going there to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah. The Christians, out of convenience and expediency, began to meet on the first day of the week. Figuring that it was a good a day to meet as any, they made it a tradition to meet on that day for Christian fellowship and worship.

The Sunday observers, then, were on the right side of the fence. The Jewish Christians-- at least the ones who chose to cling to Sabbath-keeping-- were not the heroes of the Early Church. Instead they were the ones who were seduced into following "another gospel. Somewhat later they became the enemies of Christianity, having evolved into the Gnostics and Ebionites. The Ebionites, who kept the Sabbath, vilified the Apostle Paul and claimed James as their spiritual leader. In his anti-Sabbatarian essay, "**Sabbatarianism Re-examined**," (former) SDA theologian **Robert D. Brinsmead** explains what happened to the Sabbath-keeping Jewish Christians:

The picture emerges of Jewish Christianity which, having lost its influence on the predominately Gentile Church became increasingly isolated. It lost vital contact with Gentile Christianity, so that Gentile Christianity was largely cut off from its Jerusalem roots. This has been a tragedy for both branches of the church.

By the time of Irenaeus (in the late second century) Jewish Christianity was regarded as real heresy. Some Jewish Christians were called Ebionites ("the poor ones"), while others were called Nazarenes. They kept the Sabbath and persevered in a Jewish way of life. They were generally vegetarian. Some even refused to eat e...[text unclear] Their hero was James; their archenemy was Paul.

The most serious heresy of the Ebionites was failure to confess Christ's full divinity. Furthermore, although they believed Jesus was sinless, they taught that he possessed sinful human nature like the rest of Mankind. Yet it is a remarkable fact that the heretical Ebionites traced their lineage back to the original Jewish Christians and claim to be their true successors.

We have reviewed where Sunday observance came from and where it did not come from. In the light of these facts it is difficult to comprehend why the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church would choose to stick with the Sabbatarian belief model other than the fear of the financial disaster that would take place if fundamental doctrinal changes were made. Perhaps these leaders took notice of the financial hardship which struck The Worldwide Church of God when it renounced Sabbatarianism in 1995.

While a study of the facts of Early Church history is interesting, and while it proves to the point of over-kill that Ellen White lied about the source of her information about how Sunday observance replaced Sabbath-keeping, these facts alone do not prove that Sabbatarianism is not correct. Let us look at additional barriers and look at them in greater depth.

CHAPTER SIX

MORE BARRIERS TO ELLEN WHITE'S SABBATH THEORIES

The Sabbath Between The Early Church And The Reformation

The Venerable Bede (672-735 CE), the most respected of the fathers of the early church and the last scholar considered to be a father of the early church, recognized the significance of the fact that the seventh day of Creation did not have an evening and a morning. Here is what he wrote:

Source: *Bede: On Genesis* by Calvin B. Kendall

Google Book, pp. 95, 97

[2.3a] And he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. He did this namely with that blessing and sanctification which he revealed more fully to his people in the Law, saying, Remember that you keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shall you labour, and shall do all your works. But on the seventh of the Sabbath of the Lord your God, you shall do not work. And a little further on, For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Truly this blessing and sanctification of the seventh day was done as a type of a greater blessing and sanctification. For just as the blood of the Lord's passion, which had to be poured out once for the salvation of the world, was signified by the frequent, indeed, daily sacrifices under the Law, so also by the rest of the seventh day, which always used to be celebrated after the works of the six days, was prefigured that great day of the Sabbath, on which the Lord was to rest once in the grave, after having completed and perfected on the sixth day all his works, by which he restored the world, long since lost, which he had completed on the sixth day. On that day also, being mindful, as it were, of the old work, he declared in clear language that he now completed the salvation of the world. For when he had taken the vinegar, he said, It is consummated. And bowing his head, he gave up the ghost. But also this sanctification and blessing of the seventh day, and the rest of God on that day after his works, signified that they were exceedingly good, because each of us after good works, which he himself works in us both will and to accomplish, struggles toward the rest of heavenly life in which we may enjoy his eternal sanctification and blessing. **Hence it is proper that this seventh day is not described as having had an evening, because it truly signifies our eternal rest in it.** [Emphasis by authors.]

No Support For Widespread Sabbath Keeping During Apostolic Times

Various aspects of this subject will be or have been touched on in other parts of this book. Note that in discussions of right and wrong for Christians, the New Testament writers comment about sins that are related to all of the Ten Commandments of the Decalogue with the exception of the 4th Commandment– the Sabbath. While arguments from silence are among the weakest form of evidence and fail to qualify as “proof” taken alone, this is still a most interesting observation. Combine this fact with everything else we now know about the Sabbath from biblical concepts, and its significance is very great for the Jews. In fact, Israelites who deliberately broke the Sabbath were to be stoned.

It is entirely reasonable to suppose that if Sabbatarianism were to be true, the new Gentile converts coming into the Church would have needed some kind of official guidance in regard to the Sabbath. Many Gentile converts had attended the Jewish synagogues where Paul had preached and would have had a degree of familiarity with the Sabbath concept already. However, many other Gentile converts came directly out of heathenism. The apostles, and especially Paul, gave them instructions in almost everything else, including whether or not they could eat meat sacrificed to idols. Paul instructed Christians not to use their freedom from the LAW to fall into licentiousness, and in one passage he gives a list of 23 examples of the kind of sins that a person who lives by the Spirit will not commit. As in every New Testament case where a mention of the sin of Sabbath-breaking would be anticipated by Sabbatarians, Paul does not include it. Neither do any other New Testament writers. The emphasis of the true Gospel of Jesus, as articulated by the Apostle Paul, is that Christians are not guided by the works or deeds of any set of laws, but rather by the Holy Spirit in the heart.

Without exception, every time the New Testament mentions Christians getting together, they met on the first day of the week— never on the Jewish Sabbath.

Christians went to the Jewish synagogues to witness to their Jewish brethren that Jesus was the Messiah. There is no indication they went there for any other purpose.

Sabbatarians teach that the reference to “The Lord's Day” in the Book of Revelation is a reference to the Sabbath (See Rev. 1:9). However, this concept is not in keeping with linguistics and word usage studies. There is abundant evidence that the term, “The Lord's Day,” was consistently a reference to Sunday, the first day of the week. In regard to the Sabbatarian idea that it was a reference to the Jewish Sabbath, *Wikipedia* has this to say in the article, “The Lord's Day:”

Some seventh-day Sabbatarian writers have argued that because Jesus identified himself as “Lord even of the Sabbath day” (cf. Matt. 12:8), *kyriake hemera* in Rev. 1:10 should be interpreted as a reference to seventh-day Sabbath. However, in almost every other instance where *kyriake hemera* or *kyriake* is used, the unambiguous meaning is Sunday, but there are no early witnesses to the use of *kyriake hemera* as a name for Saturday.

The *Wikipedia* article does not provide an authoritative citation for this fact. Notice, however, that the researchers at the *Encyclopedia Britannica* have concluded that the reference to the Lord's Day in Revelation is to Sunday and that the Lord's Day is to be equated with Sunday (See the *Encyclopedia Britannica*'s Web entry for “Lord's Day.”):

First day of the week; in Christianity, the Lord's Day, the weekly memorial of Jesus Christ's Resurrection from the dead. The practice of Christians gathering together for worship on Sunday dates back to apostolic times, but details of the actual development of the custom are not clear. Before the end of the 1st century ad, the author of Revelation gave the first day its name of the “Lord's Day” (Rev. 1:10). Saint Justin Martyr (c. 100–c. 165), philosopher and defender of the Christian faith, in his writings described the Christians gathered together for worship on the Lord's Day: the gospels or the Old Testament was read, the presiding minister preached a sermon, and the group prayed together and celebrated the Lord's Supper.

A “Sabbath” (Gr. *sabbatismos*; “God's rest”) is mentioned in Hebrews 4 to explain the rest that Christians find in the freedom of the Gospel. The apostles went to the synagogues to witness to the Jews on Sabbaths. However, when there is a reference to Christians meeting with other Christians, their meetings always occur on Sunday.

Sabbatarians point to the fact that Jesus kept the Sabbath, and He is our Example. Jesus had chosen to live under the terms of the Mosaic Covenant at that time. The TORAH had not yet been nailed to the Cross. Jesus didn't marry and he raised the dead. Are we to follow Jesus' example in these things also? If He had wanted Christians to keep the Sabbath, He would not have instructed Paul, through the Holy Spirit, to write Colossians 2:14-17, which forbids the enforcement of Sabbath-keeping on the Gentile converts. Greg Taylor in his book, *Discovering the New Covenant: Why I Am No Longer a Seventh-day Adventist*, makes an excellent case that Jesus was preparing His followers for Colossians 2:14-17 by breaking the Sabbath Himself and citing examples of others who had broken the Sabbath and also were guiltless.

D. M. Canright's exhaustive research on the pagan sun worship idea, additional discoveries were made, and none of them favorable to Ellen White's apostasy theory. By the 1960's it had become very clear that the Heathen did not rest from work on Sunday. One historian put it this way:

"In the early centuries of the Church's history down to the time of the Emperor Constantine it would, in any case, not have been practical for Christians to observe Sunday as a day of rest, on which they were obliged, for the sake of principle, to abstain from work. The reason for this was simply that no one in the entire Roman Empire, neither Jews, nor Greeks, nor Romans, stopped work on Sunday" (Willy Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968, pp. 154-155).

Pliny's famous "Letter to Trajan" (c. A. D. 111-112) is also clear evidence that early Christians had no free day of rest. They met for worship early in the morning (probably on the first day of the week), and then they went to work. (See Bruce, *New Testament History*, pp. 423-24.)

The Torah Was To Be Temporary

As we studied earlier, a careful analysis of Moses' account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in Hebrew shows that he went out of his way to indicate to his Hebrew readers that the recurring Sabbath rest did not start in Eden. We have also seen strong evidence that God communicated concepts to Israel in the context of their own cultural familiarity. Then Ten Commandments were modeled after the treaties of their neighboring countries with a ceremonial component in the middle. The best evidence available to date is that the "Sabbath" concept was originally a Heathen idea based on the four phases of the Moon and fertility rites that God took, cleansed of its Heathen connotations, and presented to Israel fully redeemed and cleansed, and newly identified with the seven days of Creation Week as both a remembrance of God's creative power and a reminder that He had brought them out of Egyptian slavery.

Moses stated that the Covenant, which contained the new ceremonial weekly Sabbath, was not given before Sinai: Their fathers prior to Egypt did not keep the Sabbath: Deut. 5:2-3:

"The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. The Lord did not make this covenant with our fathers, but with us, with all those of us alive here today."

God gave them the Sabbath law at Sinai. He did not remind them about it: Nehemiah 9:13-14:

"You came down also on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them just ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments. You made known to them Your holy Sabbath, and commanded them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses Your servant."

It is clear that the Sabbath command did not exist before the Exodus.

In other chapters we will study more about the temporary nature of the TORAH. Colossians 2:14-17 tells us when the reign of TORAH law ended.

Colossians 2:14-17 Means What It Says

In the 1895 version of *Replies to Canright*, we have proof that Adventist leaders were having a struggle with Colossians 2:14-17. *Replies to Canright* quotes the following passage from Canright's book. Instead of addressing his key argument at his foundational point, they show that just a year or two earlier, he argued in favor of a Sabbatarian interpretation of this key passage. They list his own arguments for a Sabbatarian-friendly reading of the passage and attempt to make him appear to flip-flop back and forth to prove that his thinking is inconsistent, but they provide no evidence to validate their stance that he is incorrect. Here is a portion of what Canright said about Colossians 2:14-17. His basic premise is not addressed by his critics:

“But it is argued that as 'the sabbath days' of Col.2:16 'are a shadow of things to come' (verse 17), and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same; for the Sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it cannot point both ways? The Passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Ex.12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Col.2:16,17. 'Even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.' 1Cor.5:7. So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know.... Paul says plainly that sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of Inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasonings. This is in harmony with Paul's argument [**Editor's note:** Although it was Canright's personal belief that St. Paul was the author of Hebrews, there are reasons for questioning the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. Our position is that the authorship of Hebrews is unknown, but that the content strongly suggests that it was written by a true Christian who was influenced by God's Spirit.] in Heb.4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. *For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really cannot mean what it says; but there it stands, and mocks all our theories.* The Sabbath is a type, for Inspiration says so.” Canright in *Advocate* of Oct. 1, 1887.

Looking back at the Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1888-1889, it is compelling to note that Canright knew all the cheap arguments that he had used himself in arguing for the Sabbath, saw that they were cheap, and faced the fact that he had been wrong. Since Canright had been a top leader of the Advent Movement, he was in a better position to know the struggles the Church had experienced in trying to explain away this devastating anti-Sabbatarian passage.

By leaving the employment of the Church, Canright was able to practice Gospel Christianity without any further fear of additional consequences. The unwillingness of other, less noble, Adventist leaders has plagued Adventism from its very beginning. Here is what we now know about the impossibilities of the traditional Adventist defense of Colossians 2:14-17. We are not suggesting that Canright knew all of these arguments. He knew most of them. These are the facts as we know them today, which have been researched from the time of Canright down to our own time:

1. Sabbatarians attempt to discredit the fact that the third reference to ordinances in the passage is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue by saying that Paul used the plural form of the word, which would signify it was one of the other kind of ceremonial sabbaths. This attempt to evade the plain meaning of the passage doesn't work because there are about 20 other places in Scripture where the plural form of the word Sabbath, *Sabbaton*, is used where context demands the meaning be the weekly Sabbath. Sabbath and *sabbaton* work both in the singular and plural, even as the word “fruit”. It is just as valid to refer to fruit or fruits in many contexts.
2. The sentence structure FESTIVAL, NEW MOON, SABBATH is a phrase used in the Hebrew to imply the three aspects of Jewish festival structure and designates the order of ANNUAL, MONTHLY, WEEKLY. This same annual, monthly and weekly sequence appears five times in the Septuagint– i.e., 2 Chron. 2:4; 31:3; Neh. 10:33; Ezek. 45:17; Hosea 2:11. All through the history of the Israelites we have annual Sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and weekly Sabbaths. If the word Sabbath as translated here means monthly sabbaths, the sentence would read, “Annual sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and monthly sabbaths.” If it were an annual sabbath Paul meant here, the sentence would read, “Annual sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and annual sabbaths.
3. Whenever the Old Testament links the New Moon celebration with the Sabbath, as in Colossians 2:16, it is referring to the weekly Sabbath (2 Kings 4:23, 1 Chron. 23:31, 2 Chron. 2:4; Neh. 10:33; Isa. 1:13; 66:23; Ezek. 45:17; 46:1; Hosea 2:11; Amos 8:5).

In the Old Testament, annual Sabbaths are always called “a Sabbath of rest” in the Septuagint. This Greek version of the Old Testament always, or nearly always, translates this as *Sabbata Sabbaton*– not simply *Sabbaton*– as here in Colossians 2:14-17.

1. Paul clearly states that these four things— diet, annual feasts, monthly feasts, and the weekly Sabbath— are not to be a part of Christian belief and practice because they are merely shadows of things that were to come, whereas Christ is the Reality that did come. To try and salvage Sabbatarianism, the Adventists say that Paul could not possibly have meant a weekly Sabbath here because the Sabbath was a memorial pointing backwards to Creation. This SDA approach fails because the most significant Jewish memorials pointed both backward and forward at the same time. In Colossians, prior to this passage, Paul refers to Adam as a symbol of Christ. In fact it is possible that all the major Jewish ordinances point both backward and forward at the same time.
2. Paul was a Jew, and the Jews, for thousands of years, have used the Sabbath as a symbol of the rest that will come in the after-life. This fact is well-documented in Jewish literature, both ancient and modern.
3. Since the Jews viewed the TORAH as 613 equally important, inseparable laws, it is impossible that St. Paul meant that only the “ceremonial” laws were nailed to the cross. Adventists use circular reasoning when they assert that the Sabbath reference in this passage could not possibly refer to the weekly Sabbath because the Sabbath is an eternal, moral principle. It would be unlike a Jewish writer to list a set of items that were not related to each other. Each item— the Jewish dietary laws, the annual sabbaths, the monthly sabbaths, and the weekly Sabbath— were all ceremonial ordinances within the TORAH and thought of as equal in importance in Jewish law.

As Jennifer Rector points out in her personal essay on the Sabbath:

Charles C. Ryrie, formerly Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary, explains that “unless the New Testament expressly says so, part of the law cannot be ended without doing away with all of it” (242). The Jerusalem council’s decision to declare circumcision obsolete did away with the entire old covenant law- the seventh-day Sabbath included.”

<http://www.sabbatismos.com/the-sabbath/new-covenant-sabbath-rest/>

(Rector is quoting from Ryrie; Charles C. “The End of the Law.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 124:495 (1967), pages 240-247.) After the Council of Jerusalem the issue of Sabbath-keeping could never arise again. It would have been settled forever, and this is exactly what we observe about the New Testament record. There is not a single comment about a Sabbath-keeping requirement for Christians from Matthew to Revelation, and there is a command that Sabbath-keeping is not to be required found in Colossians 2:14-17.

Now read this passage again with the understanding that the Sabbath referenced in this text cannot be anything else but the weekly Sabbath. The text is from the NIV:

Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ. — Colossians 2:16-17

Thanks to the recent revelations about Ancient Israel's observance of the lunar Sabbath, we have still more evidence that Bible writers viewed the sabbath system as an inseparable set. The complete set must have a minimum of three components- the annual, monthly, and weekly sabbaths. This set would not be complete in this passage if Paul was listing them as annual, monthly, and annual.

At present Adventism is under intense pressure to develop a credible work-around of Colossians 2:14-17. We need to look no further than the recent work of SDA theologian, Dr. Ronald du Preez, who came up with the **Animal Sacrifices Theory**. You can read a full analysis of his work in our book, **Doctors Bacchiocchi, MacCarty, and du Preez Wreak Havoc With The Sabbath and Ellen White**. In a nutshell, du Preez theorizes that on all the different kinds of sabbaths, Israel offered animal sacrifices. He further theorizes that the first Christians were still sacrificing animals on these sabbaths and that St.

Paul was merely labeling this practice as obsolete “shadows.” There are several serious problems with his theory. For one thing the only place animal sacrifices could be made was at the Jewish temple in Israel. Paul was writing to a predominantly Gentile audience, and these Gentiles lived in Heathen cities that were generally a long ways from Jerusalem. It seems unlikely that Christians were continuing to sacrifice animals after Christ died on the Cross as the Ultimate Sacrifice.

Hebrews 4 Is Not Pro-Sabbatarian

If you use circular reasoning to assume Sabbatarianism to be true, Hebrews Chapter 4 looks like a good proof-text. However, a careful analysis of Hebrews 1-11, using basic principles of literary interpretation, reveals that the author of is using the Sabbath's cessation of labor as a symbol of the rest that the Christian finds in the Gospel. Also the writer's commentary on the events of the 7th day of Creation focuses on what God did— and not what man was supposed to do. A thoughtful analysis of this passage clearly demonstrates that the Sabbath is used here as a symbol of the rest the Gospel brings to the Christian through the Gospel's assurance of salvation as taught by the author of Hebrews. (While many biblical scholars think Paul may have written *Hebrews*, there is no proof that he did. Those who do not believe he wrote it point out that the writing style is not like his.) Read this passage carefully, paying special attention to the symbolism utilized by the writer. This text has nothing to do with proof that Christians are still required to keep the Sabbath:

1 Therefore, since the promise of entering his rest still stands, let us be careful that none of you be found to have fallen short of it. **2** For we also have had the gospel preached to us, just as they did; but the message they heard was of no value to them, because those who heard did not combine it with faith. **3** Now we who have believed enter that rest, just as God has said, “So I declared on oath in my anger, ‘They shall never enter my rest.’ And yet his work has been finished since the creation of the world. **4** For somewhere he has spoken about the seventh day in these words: “And on the seventh day God rested from all his work.” **5** And again in the passage above he says, “They shall never enter my rest.” **6** It still remains that some will enter that rest, and those who formerly had the gospel preached to them did not go in, because of their disobedience. **7** Therefore God again set a certain day, calling it Today, when a long time later he spoke through David, as was said before: “Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts.” **8** For if Joshua had given them rest, God would not have spoken later about another day. **9** There remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God; **10** for anyone who enters God's rest also rests from his own work, just as God did from his. **11** Let us, therefore, make every effort to enter that rest, so that no one will fall by following their example of disobedience. (NIV-Bible, www.Gateway.com)

Israel never enjoyed the rest that God had intended for them because of their unbelief. By contrast, the Christian's belief in the assurance of salvation that they find in Jesus provides the rest that God intended Israel to have. This text says nothing that can be construed to support the requirement that Christians observe the ceremony of the weekly Sabbath. God's rest here is not the weekly Sabbath, which Jesus states is a day that God works on, and does not rest in (John. 5:17). These Israelites had, and entered into the weekly “shadow” Sabbath, but were unable to enter into this “sabbatismos”, being God's rest.

Matthew 5:17-18 Teaches Us Nothing About The Sabbath

Both Sabbatarians and their anti-Sabbatarians try to use Matthew 5:17-19 to support their points of view. Our assessment of this passage suggests that neither side can legitimately use it. This passage says nothing definite about the Sabbath question. It is very difficult to translate it from the original Greek into English:

“Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished.”
(Matt 5:17-18 NIV)

Sabbatarians claim this text proves that the 10 Commandments will last until Heaven and Earth disappear, which takes the end of the Law and the Prophets to way beyond the Cross. Since the Sabbath is a part of the 10 Commandments, this passage supposedly teaches that the Sabbath was *not* nailed to the cross and its observance is required of Christians today.

This meaning is impossible for a number of reasons. The law set here is the TORAH, the entire set of the books of Moses, and it contains 613 moral and ceremonial laws which the Jews would never think could be divided. If none of these laws were nailed to the cross, Christians would have to do ceremonial washings and keep all the Jewish feasts. Taking this problem to its furthest logical conclusion, Christians would find themselves keeping the annual sabbath feast days and the monthly sabbath feast days for eternity in Heaven. Also, Sabbatarians believe the sabbath command survives into the new heaven and earth, citing Isaiah chapter 66. Here, the Sabbatarians claim the Ten Commandments, along with the sabbath, do not! It is an example of the cognitive dissonance inherent in false belief systems.

Paul Kroll explains the problem and possible solutions in the following Internet article, "***The 'Law' of Matthew 5:17-19.***" A Google search will provide you with access to the entire paper, which is well-worth reading:

The meaning of "until everything is accomplished" has several possibilities. It is suggested by the *Tyndale New Testament Commentary* that the translation: "Until what it [the Law] looks forward to arrives" gives the best sense of this phrase. This links the thought with the idea of "fulfillment" in verse 17. This also seems to be the thrust of Paul's comments regarding the relationship of the Law and Jesus' earthly ministry (Galatians 3:19, 23-25).

The *Tyndale New Testament Commentary* expresses the interpretation of "accomplished" in these words:

"The law remains valid until it reaches its intended culmination; this it is now doing in the ministry and teaching of Jesus. This verse does not state, therefore, as it is sometimes interpreted, that every regulation in the Old Testament law remains binding after the coming of Jesus. The law is unalterable, but that does not justify its application beyond the purpose for which it was intended" (page 115).

The *Tyndale* commentary also makes the same point in these words:

"This passage does not therefore state that every Old Testament regulation is eternally valid. This view is not found anywhere in the New Testament, which consistently sees Jesus as introducing a new situation, for which the law prepared (Galatians 3:24), but which now transcends it. The focus is now on Jesus and his teaching, and in this light the validity of Old Testament rules must now be examined. Some will be found to have fulfilled their role, and be no longer applicable...others will be reinterpreted" (page 117).

This explanation must be the correct one, or else the early Christian church and the apostles violated Matthew 5:17-19 by telling gentile Christians that circumcision and keeping the Law of Moses was not necessary. The book of Galatians would also have been in error on this point. And the book of Hebrews would have been in extraordinary violation of Jesus' words, too, since it states that the entire sacrificial system, the temple worship and Levitical priesthood had been annulled.

<http://www.gci.org/bible/matthew517>

St. Paul said that Christ is the end of TORAH law: **Rom.10:4 (NIV): "Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for everyone who believes."** Under the New Covenant, the "Law of God" is written on the hearts of the people, this "law" being identified also as God's Spirit, and a new heart of flesh.

Bill Hohmann offers the following observation in his new blog-based book, *Christian Basics*, Chapter 5, "*Methodology of Truth:*"

One of the Sabbatarian legalist's favorite passages is Matthew 5:17-19 where it is concluded that the legalities of the law remain inviolate even down to the strokes of the letters of the law. Even a

cursory examination of the passage shows this interpretation to be flawed. The context of what Jesus was referring to was the law and prophets. In this context it should be understood that this refers to the first 5 books, commonly called “the law” and the writings of the prophets being “the prophets” as well as the context of Scripture overall. Sometimes the term, “the law” could indeed refer to the entirety of the Old Testament writings.

There are no laws codified in the prophets. You cannot fulfill or destroy something in the prophets that is not there. What then is found in both the law and prophets that has the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed? Prophecies! Did Jesus state He had come to fulfill the prophecies that were written about Him in the law and prophets, i. e. the Old Testament writings? Yes, He most emphatically did.

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. – Luke 24:44

What, then, is the excuse of the Sabbatarian for rejecting this explanation in light of Matthew 5:17? They point out that Jesus did not fulfill everything while He walked the earth in human form. Well then, what do they think the very next verse addresses? Things that were not fulfilled prophetically that are eschatological in nature that will be fulfilled later, at that time, before heaven and earth pass away.

Let's humor the Sabbatarian a bit here, seeing as they insist this is about the legalities of the law. When then is the conclusion in regards to verse 18? When heaven and earth passes, so too passes this law after it is “filled to the full.” So the law passes away; the same law they claim is eternal. Also, if this is all about the legalities of the law being inviolate down to jots and tittles, what about the context of the same chapter where Jesus proceeds to alter points of that law way beyond jots and tittles, and even negating points of that law?

<http://asbereansdid.blogspot.com/2010/06/chapter-5-methodology-of-truth.html>

CHAPTER SEVEN

What Adventist Leaders Knew About Ellen White's Interpretation of Daniel's Key Prophecies

As we have noted before, the 1844 Investigative Judgment (2,300 day) “prophecy” is the foundation upon which Adventism rests. Without the truth of this speculative prophetic interpretation, there is no special group of people raised up after 1844 to take a warning message of Sabbath judgments to the world. Now we find, thanks to the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes**, that, not only is this convoluted doctrine based on a mistranslation of the Daniel 8:14 word rendered “cleansed” by the King James Bible translators, but that Adventists knew this same prophecy had a much earlier literal fulfillment when the principle of “**a-day-equals-a-day**” principle is used. Beyond all this, we now know that Adventists were having an extremely difficult time justifying the use of a symbolic interpretation involving the principle of **a-day-equals-a-year** to stretch it to have a very distant additional fulfillment in 1844. As early as 1867 **Thomas J. Preble**, an apostatized SDA, had confronted the pioneers of Adventism, and specifically, **J. N. Andrews**, the a full set of historical facts that demonstrated to the point of over-kill that Ellen White’s 2,300 year probably was historically impossible. And in 1914, another apostatized Adventist, **Aaron Nyman**, drew from an even larger accumulation of historical knowledge to demonstrate the biblical and historical impossibilities of the 2,300 year prophecy in his book, **Astounding Errors**. By the year 1919, the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference had a good understanding of the fatal problems of their interpretation of the major prophecies of Daniel, including works by Preble, Cox, and Nyman.

Former SDA, Chris Lee, writing in the April-May-June 2011 (Volume 12, Issue 2) edition of *Proclamation! Magazine* (produced by Dale Ratzlaff and Life Assurance Ministries) draws an uncomfortable comparison between the convoluted theological gymnastics of 1844 Adventism with the self-serving prophetic twisting of Harold Camping after his prophecy that the world would end on May 21, 2011 utterly failed. He saved face by claiming that additional Bible study revealed that a major judgment event took place in Heaven on May 21, 2011. Lee calls this technique “the old false-prophecy-becomes-deceptive-doctrine ploy.”

The “Year-Stands-For-A-Day” Concept Examined

The fantastic interpretations of the key prophecies of Daniel developed by Ellen White and her associates are based on the idea that a literal day equals a figurative year in Bible prophecy. The idea for this concept came from a principle that God sometimes used in assigning the duration of punishments.

There are two places in the OT, Numbers 14:33-35 and Ezekiel 4:5-6, where God used the day-for-a-year principle for a judgment, but they could not really be considered a prophetic calculation in the same sense of the word that Adventists think of when try to apply the **a-day-equals-a-year** formula. Observe that the element of mysteriousness is missing. God tells them exactly how many years the judgments will last:

Num. 14:33-35 (NIV) Your children will be shepherds here for forty years, suffering for your unfaithfulness, until the last of your bodies lies in the desert. For forty years—one year for each of the forty days you explored the land—you will suffer for your sins and know what it is like to have me against you.’ I, the LORD, have spoken, and I will surely do these things to this whole wicked community, which has banded together against me. They will meet their end in this desert; here they will die.”

Ezek. 4:5 - 6 (NIV) I have assigned you the same number of days as the years of their sin. So for 390 days you will bear the sin of the house of Israel. ⁶“After you have finished this, lie down again, this time on your right side, and bear the sin of the house of Judah. I have assigned you 40 days, a day for each

year.

There are prophecies of years where God did not assign a day-for-a-year such as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar. If we use the day for a year, as SDA's do with Daniel 8:14, the seven times of Daniel 4:16-25 would be seven prophetic years at 360 days x 7 years = 2520 day/years. This formula would require Nebuchadnezzar to live 2520 years after the pronouncement of the judgment.

Dan 4:16 (NIV) - Let his mind be changed from that of a man and let him be given the mind of an animal, till seven times pass by for him.

There is no biblical support for the concept that Bible prophecies are to be interpreted on the "day-equals-a-year principle. It represents an attempt to compare Apples with Oranges, and it led Ellen White and her enablers to bulldoze right over the obvious applications intended by the prophets. When the principle of a-day-equals-a-day principle is applied to the two key prophecies of Daniel, the little horn of Daniel 7 and the little horn of Daniel 8, the fulfillment of these prophecies is accurate right down to the very day in each case. The astonishingly accurate fulfillment of these prophecies, calculated correctly, has been a hurdle for skeptics for over 1,000 years. Adventism takes a wrecking ball to these icons of biblical prophecy and substitutes highly questionable theories in their place.

Ellen White Errors In Regard To The Little Horn Of Daniel 7

Daniel 7:25— And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

Notice that a time and times and dividing of time in Dan 7:25 is: time =360 days; times 2x360 = 720 days; and dividing of time 360/2 = 180 days. Total number of days is 360+720+180= 1260 days. **This would be 1260 days or 3.5 years, not 1260 years.**

Some Protestant scholars have, at times, sought to apply the prophecy of Daniel 7 to the papacy. Those who have done so have probably been mistaken. In the original language, Daniel's words carefully delineate the specifications of the prophecy. These specifications would not permit the linking of the papacy to any Sabbath "changing" activities even if the prophecy were intended to be applied to the papacy. Biblical scholars, Keil and Delitzsch, explain:

Daniel 7:25 refers to the same king, and says that he shall speak against the Most High. לצד means, properly, against or at the side of, and is more expressive than על. It denotes that he would use language by which he would set God aside, regard and give himself out as God; cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:4. Making himself like God, he will destroy the saints of God. בלא, Pa., not "make unfortunate" (Hitzig), but consume, afflict, like the Hebr. בלה, 1 Chronicles 17:9, and Targ. Jes. Daniel 3:15. These passages show that the assertion that בלה, in the sense of to destroy, never takes after it the accusative of the person (Hitz.), is false. Finally, "he thinks to change times and laws." "To change times" belongs to the all-perfect power of God (cf. Daniel 2:21), the creator and ordainer of times (Genesis 1:14). There is no ground for supposing that זמנין is to be specially understood of "festival or sacred times," since the word, like the corresponding Hebr. מועדים, does not throughout signify merely "festival times;" cf. Genesis 1:14; Genesis 17:21; Genesis 18:14, etc. The annexed ודת does not point to arrangements of divine worship, but denotes "law" or "ordinance" in general, human as well as divine law; cf. Daniel 2:13, Daniel 2:15 with Daniel 6:6, Daniel 6:9. "Times and laws" are the foundations and main conditions, emanating from God, of the life and actions of men in the world. The sin of the king in placing himself with God, therefore, as Kliefoth rightly remarks, "consists in this, that in these ordinances he does not regard the fundamental conditions given by

God, but so changes the laws of human life that he puts his own pleasure in the place of the divine arrangements." Thus shall he do with the ordinances of life, not only of God's people, but of all men. "But it is to be confessed that the people of God are most affected thereby, because they hold their ordinances of life most according to the divine plan; and therefore the otherwise general passage stands between two expressions affecting the conduct of the horn in its relation to the people of God."

See Keil and Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*: <http://bible.cc/daniel/7-25.htm>

Subsequently we will explain an interpretation of Daniel 7 that is fully consistent with the specifications outlined by Daniel. Meanwhile, it is instructive to look at other interpretations that are still more plausible than the papacy theory.

Recently the prophetic interpretations of Isaac Newton have come to light with the re-discovery of over a thousand pages of his commentaries on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. While this is a subject for another book, Newton put the same prophetic periods that Adventists use to theorize that the final events of this world's history will begin in about the year 2060. So far his interpretation of these prophecies correlates better with what is happening in our world now than the self-serving 1844 interpretation of the Seventh-day Adventists. You can read about Newton's prophecies at <http://www.isaac-newton/index.html>. Scroll down to the link to the document entitled, "Isaac Newton, the Apocalypse and 2060 A.D. Here is an excerpt from this article:

Newton, like many historicist prophetic commentators of his age, believed that the prophetic time periods 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2300 days actually represent 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2300 years using the "day-for-a-year principle".

For Newton these time periods (especially the 1260 years) represent the time span of the apostasy of the Church (for Newton this means the Trinitarian Church, chiefly the Catholics). Thus, he looked in history for the likely date when the apostasy formally began (one sign of this for him was the date when the papal church obtained temporal power). From there it was a simple matter of adding the time period to the beginning date. However, things are rarely so simple with Newton. As already mentioned, Newton looked askance at "date-setting", and for this reason he rarely wrote out the end date for a time period once he had settled on a beginning date. There are a small number of exceptions, and the date 2060, found twice in the Yahuda MSS at Jerusalem, is one of them. The date 2060 is also significant because in addition to the rarity of end dates in Newton's writings, the calculation giving the 2060 date comes from fairly late in his life and is asserted with uncharacteristic vigour.

In 1933, New Zealand Adventist critic, R. Vowless, called attention to the dishonest use of these prophetic dates by Seventh-day Adventists. He knew a lot about the subject, having been an Adventist for many years before he apostatized:

And why were William Miller's and Mrs. White's divinely endorsed dates of 508-538, 1798 and 1844, been altered by the Conference Committee at Washington to 503, 533, 1793 and 1838? It is true that 1798 and 1844 are still carried, possibly as a sop to conservatives, but these new dates are a part of the diagram. This never occurred before—why now? Start asking your good elders questions about these dates and you will find them doing similar to the good Elder Stevens, of Detroit, who went limping from the platform when someone put such questions to him. If this proves too embarrassing for them to answer, then write a line to Washington asking them to send you the Committee report, and turn to page 265 and see for yourselves. R. Vowless, *The White Elephant of Adventism*, New Plymouth, New Zealand, P. F. Burrows Ltd., Eliot Street, New Plymouth, p.23.

Access this fascinating document at: http://www.truthorfables.com/white_elephant.htm

THE LITTLE HORN OF DANIEL 7 EXPLAINED

24 And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings.

25 And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. (Daniel 7:24-15)

Ellen White's position on this passage is that the Catholic Church will persecute the Protestants for 1,260 days and that is the culprit responsible for "changing" the Sabbath. We have seen that the linguistics of this passage do not provide support for the changing of the Sabbath. The "year-for-a-day" principle is far-fetched because it is based on two passages from Scripture where God meted out judgment on Israel and on individuals in that manner. The concept does appear to transfer to Bible prophecy in general. The event prophesied is to last 1,260 days. Unfortunately, the dates Adventists use for this period of papal persecution, 538 AD to 1798, do not fit the facts of the period of papal persecution. The beginning date can't be right, and the end date, 1798, is historically impossible. 1798 was supposed to represent the date that the papacy lost a huge measure of its power-- that its deadly wound was inflicted. However, even though the pope was taken captive by a French general in this year, a new pope was sitting at the Vatican throne after about a year, and the Catholic Church continued with its powers no less diminished than it had been before the incident took place for several additional decades. Thus, if interpreted the Adventist way, the prophecy falls well-short of the 100% accuracy required for biblical prophecies. Therefore, this application is impossible.

The research of **Dirk Anderson** of **Amazing Fiction.Org** outlines the serious problems with both the 1,260 day and 2,300 day prophecies, and his work deserves careful consideration. As we will later demonstrate, the 2,300 day prophecy regarding the little horn of Daniel 8 that Adventists use as the foundation of the 1844 Investigative Judgment doctrine-- with its highly questionable "wheel within a wheel" interpretation-- fits Antiochus Epiphanes' persecution of the Jews to a "T." These events happened prior to 161 BCE.

Back to the little horn of Daniel 7, Dirk Anderson outlines why this evil power is a prophecy of the horrid actions of the Roman emperor, Nero. He is not alone since other Christian scholars have done so for a very long time. The participants of the 1919 Bible Conference explored the possibility that this prophecy to Antiochus' desecration of the temple. They seemed aware of the fact that these prophecies applied to specific events that lasted the literal number of days (in contradiction of Ellen White), but they were confused about which event to apply them to at times. Anderson writes in regard to the little horn of Daniel 7:

Who is the little horn?

It is an established historical fact that the little horn of Daniel 7 is Nero. Consider the incredible correlations between Nero and the little horn of Daniel 7:

He will uproot "three of the first horns" (7:24) - Three Emperors, Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius were assassinated to make way for Nero, who was not in the line of succession.

"He shall speak words against the Most High" (7:25) - Nero encouraged emperor worship and had a huge statue of himself erected in Rome. Inscriptions found in Ephesus called Him "Almighty God" and "Saviour...."

He "shall wear out the saints of the Most High" (7:25) - Nero was the first Roman Emperor to launch a persecution against Jews and Christians. Some of the saints slain during his persecution include the Missionary Paul and the Apostle Peter. Historians have described the persecution as "the most cruel that ever occurred."

The saints "shall be given into his hand for time, times, and half a time (7:25) - Nero's persecution began in November of 64 AD, and ended with his death in June of AD 68, a period of exactly 42 months (1260 days).

"His dominion shall be taken away" (7:26) - The Roman Senate eventually voted to put Nero to death, thus effectively taking away his dominion.

The kingdom "shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High (7:27) - It is a mistake to think this passage is a reference to God's eternal kingdom. It is a reference to God's spiritual kingdom, which was established in approximately 30 AD when John the Baptist announced, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2). Christ talked about the "kingdom" as being contemporary (Matt. 12:28; 16:19; 23:13), not in the far distant future. Daniel talks about a kingdom that gradually fills the earth, and Jesus speaks of a Mustard seed which grew into a great tree. (Dan. 2:34-35; Matt. 13:31-33).²² Therefore, the giving of the kingdom (Rome) to the saints of the Most High began when Christ established his kingdom on this earth, and the kingdom continued to grow until one day Christianity would become the dominant religion in the Roman Empire.

See: <http://www.amazingfiction.org/little-horn.shtml>

Ellen White Bombs Out On The Horn Of Daniel 8

A study of Daniel 8 does not state or imply any start date for the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices other than when the defilement of the temple actually begins. It is pure assumption on the part of Adventist adherents to the 2,300 "day," 1844 prophecy that these 2,300 "days" began at the same time another prophetic period began— the 70 weeks, or 490 years— which supposedly began around 457 BCE and was to reach to the appearance of Christ. Historically, nothing important happened in 457 BCE, although something that might meet the specifications (for the command to re-build the temple at Jerusalem took place about 30 years earlier.) Unfortunately, 457 BCE is critical to causing the 2,300 years to end in 1844. **Dirk Anderson** gives us the specifications of the correct interpretation of this prophecy. There are fatal problems to entire Adventist concept of a prophecy that lasts 2,300 years rather than 2,300 days:

The 2300-day prophecy witnessed an amazing fulfillment during the terrifying reign of Antiochus. Could it be that God foresaw this terrible threat coming 400 years before it happened, and sent a message to Daniel to comfort and assure His people that He would ultimately give them the victory? Amazingly, God told the Jews precisely how long His sanctuary would be profaned: 2300 *evening and morning* sacrifices would be suspended while the sanctuary was profaned.

How does the Jewish Calendar Work?

The Jewish lunar year contains 354 days, or 12 lunations of the moon. In a cycle of 19 years, an intercalary month (Veadar) is introduced seven times in order to render the average year nearly correct. Leap years occur in the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th years of the cycle. One day is added to the month of Adar, and a 13th month (Veadar), containing 29 days is inserted, before Nisan. This adds 30 days to the year. Depending upon whether the latter year is regular, perfect, or defective, a leap year may consist of 383, 384, or 385 days. Thus, six years would be 6 multiplied by 354 days (an ordinary common year), plus four alternating months of 29 and 30 days each, plus two intercalary months of 29.

According to the Jewish calendar (see box on right), the 2300 days works out to be **six years, three months, and 18 days**. This time period began on the fifteenth day of the month Cisleu, in the year 145 of the Selucidæ, in which Antiochus set up the Abomination of Desolation upon the altar of God:

"Now the five and twentieth day of the month they did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God." (1 Maccabees 1:59)

This was the beginning of a period of intense suffering for those in Israel who chose to remain faithful to God. Judas Maccabeus was outraged over the injustice done to God's sanctuary:

"Alas! Why was I born to witness the ruin of my people and the ruin of the holy city, and to sit by while it is being given up to its enemies, and the sanctuary to aliens? Her temple has come to be like a man disgraced... Behold, our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory have been laid waste, and the heathen have profaned them." (1 Maccabees 2:7, 8,12)

Maccabeus rose up and started a revolt against Antiochus. For over three years he struggled and fought against the armies of Antiochus. Finally, he was victorious over Nicanor, on the thirteenth day of the month Adar, Anno 151, and the power of Antiochus over Judea was broken.

After his victory, when Judas entered Jerusalem, he found "the sanctuary desolate." (1 Mac. 4:38) Judas immediately directed the sanctuary be rebuilt and cleansed so that it could be used again for sacred services (1 Mac. 4:41-51). The Jews commemorate the triumph of Judas with an annual feast called the Feast of Dedication (or Hanukkah). The Savior honored this feast by His presence (John 10:22).

Reckoning the 2300 Days

There are two principle methods of reckoning the 2300-day period: 1.Reckoning from the fifteenth day of the month Cisleu, in the year 145 of the Selucidæ, in which Antiochus set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar (1 Maccabees 1:59), to the victory obtained over Nicanor by Judas, on the 13th day of the month Adar, Anno 151, are 2300 days. The Jews kept an annual feast on the 13th of Adar, in commemoration of the victory.

2. The period began with the defection of the people from the pure religion by the Jewish high priest Menelaus, on the 6th day of the 6th month of Anno 141. According to Josephus, Menelaus went "to Antiochus, and informed him, that they were desirous to leave the laws of their country, and the Jewish way of living according to them, and to follow the king's laws, and the Grecian way of living." (Antiquities, bk. 7, Ch. 5.1) The period ended on the twenty-fifth day of Cisleu in the year 148, when the Jews offered the daily sacrifice on the new altar of burnt offerings (1 Maccabees 4:52). This is a total of 2300 days.

Using either method results in a 2300-day period. There is also a method, not presented here, which calculate an 1150-day period. [Editor's note. The next section will present the 1150-day period and contrast it with the 2,300 day period.]

The Sanctuary was "cleansed" by Judas Maccabeus when he purified the holy places, sanctified the courts, rebuilt the altar, renewed the vessels of the sanctuary, and put all in their proper places:

"Then Judas appointed certain men to fight against those that were in the fortress, until he had cleansed the sanctuary. So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law: Who cleansed the sanctuary, and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place. And when as they consulted what to do with the altar of burnt offerings, which was profaned; They thought it best to pull it down, lest it should be a reproach to them, because the heathen had defiled it: wherefore they pulled it down, And laid up the stones in the mountain of the temple in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to shew what should be done with them. Then they took whole stones according to the law, and built a new altar according to the former; And made up the sanctuary, and the things that were within the temple, and hallowed the courts. They made also new holy vessels, and into the temple they brought the candlestick, and the altar of burnt offerings, and of incense, and the table. And upon the altar they burned incense, and the lamps that were upon the candlestick they lighted, that they might give light in the temple. Furthermore they set

the loaves upon the table, and spread out the veils, and finished all the works which they had begun to make." (1 Maccabees 4:41-51)

Thus we can see a stunning fulfillment of prophecy as Judas Maccabeus cleansed and vindicated the sanctuary of God at the end of a 2300-day period of desolation.

See <http://www.amazingfiction.org/2300.shtml>

THE 2,300 DAY AND 1,150 DAY CALCULATIONS CLARIFIED

David Guzik's *Commentaries on the Bible* clarifies both methods of applying this prophecy to Antiochus' persecution of the Jews and the defilement of the temple:

b. How long will the vision be? Daniel didn't ask this question; he heard the holy ones speaking together and one asked the question. They wanted to know how long the sacrifices would be suspended and how long the sanctuary would be desecrated.

c. For two thousand three hundred days: Literally, Daniel heard a holy one say "two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings." Bible students debate if this means 2,300 days or 1,150 days. 2,300 days is almost seven years.

i. Either understanding is possible, but it is more likely that this means 2,300 days. The date when the temple was cleansed is well established as December 25, 165 BC. If we count back 2,300 days from then, we come to the year when Antiochus Epiphanes began his persecution in earnest (171 BC).

ii. However, if we take it to mean 1,150 days it can refer to the time the temple was actually desecrated. Philip Newell makes this case: "For a duration of time during which 2300 daily sacrifices would ordinarily have been offered, one at evening and one in the morning, as specified in Exodus 29:38-43. Since there are two of these daily, the actual time period involved is 1150 days, or slightly over three years. This, in fact, was the time of the Maccabean tribulation, 168-165 BC, at the end of which the sanctuary was 'cleansed' by Judas Maccabeus in his restoration of the evening and morning sacrifices (2 Maccabees 10:1-5)."

iii. This passage has been a favorite springboard for elaborate and fanciful prophetic interpretations. A popular and tragic interpretation of this passage took one year for every day, and William Miller used 2,300 "year-days" to calculate that Jesus would return in 1844 (2,300 years after Cyrus issued the decree to rebuild the temple). His movement ended up giving birth to the Seventh-Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and several other movements.

iv. We can know that Miller and other "year-day" theories are wrong because this passage was fulfilled before the time of Jesus. Jesus recognized that the temple was properly cleansed and rededicated when He attended the Feast of Lights, commemorating the cleansing and re-dedication of the temple after the desecration brought by Antiochus Epiphanes (John 10:22).

See David Guzik's *Commentary* at: <http://www.studylight.org/com/guz/view.cgi?book=da&chapter=008>

Because Seventh-day Adventists have a do-or-die need to stretch this literal prophecy to 2,300 literal years so it will reach to 1844, they have a particular love for the King James Version of the Bible, which mistranslates several words in Daniel 8:14 "in their favor." "Days" here is translated from two words-- H6153, *ereb*, meaning dusk/evening, and H1242, *boqer*, meaning morning. "Days" is *always* translated from the Hebrew, H3117 "yom"-- and never "*ereb-boqer*". The KJV is in error, and the SDA embraces this error in order to proffer their "truth."

Dirk Anderson further explains, citing Dr. Russell Earl Kelly, on his website: <http://www.nonsda.org/study6.shtml>

Are the 2300 days *really* 2300 years?

Dr. Russell Earl Kelly explains:

"The odd Hebrew word for days in Daniel 8:14 is not the usual Hebrew word, *yom*, for day. Instead, it is the Hebrew words, '*ereb-boqer*, meaning "evenings-mornings" which are correctly translated in Daniel 8:26 (even in the KJV). When comparing the KJV, NASU, NIV, and RSV, only the King James Version incorrectly reads "days." It is important to know that '*ereb* (evening) and '*boqer* (morning) occur 48 times in the KJV as "evening and morning" and **only once** as "days" -- in Daniel 8:14!"

"Since the common Hebrew word for "day," *yom*, does not appear in 8:14, this is probably a fundamental flaw in SDA calculations. Why? Because when the sanctuary is being discussed, the couplet, '*ereb-boqer* refers to the two daily sacrifices of the evening and the morning and the total count of days could very easily be calculated as half of 2300, or 1150 actual days." (Footnote #11.)

Anderson cited Kelly's work as follows:

¹¹ . Russell Earl Kelley, Ph.D., *Exposing Seventh-day Adventism*, chapter 6, <http://www.tithing-russkelly.com/sda/id18.html>.

The context of this prophecy is Daniel's vision of the Prince and his army taking away the daily sacrifice and defiling the sanctuary. The question is then asked, "How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?"

Dan 8:14 (KJV) - And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

Seeing this is about the daily evening and morning sacrifices the text should read; 2300 morning and evening sacrifices. There was one sacrifice in the evening and one in the morning, thus two sacrifices a day. Therefore we have 1,150 days of sacrifices or a little under 3 ½ years.

Modern translations have corrected the KJV mistranslation such as the NIV, NASV, and NRSV.

Dan 8:14 (NRSV) And he answered him, "For two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state."

The third KJV word correction; Cleansed H6663, *tsadaq*. - The late **Dr. Raymond Cottrell**, who is considered to be the greatest of all Seventh-day Adventist theologians, observes in his essay, "*The Sanctuary Doctrine Asset or Liability?*" that the Hebrew word, *nitsdaq*, never means "cleansed" as the KJV translates it. *Nitsdaq* is the passive form of the verb, *tsadaq*, "to be right," and means "to set right," or as the NRSV renders it, "to be restored to its rightful state." "Had Daniel meant "cleansed" he would have used the word *taher*, which does mean "cleansed" and always refers to ritual cleansing in contrast to *tsadaq*, which always connotes moral rightness."

The sanctuary was made right or justified not by the Day of Atonement animal sacrifices for the sins of Israel, but by Antiochus' departure from the temple in Jerusalem and the subsequent cleansing ceremonies conducted by the Jews after he left which restored the temple to its right and holy uses.

The pioneers of Adventism as well as the modern Adventists' interpretation of Daniel 8:14 is exegetically incorrect. The Sanctuary to be "justified" (cleansed in the KJV) is contextually located in the earthly Jerusalem, not in Heaven. There is nothing in the text to suggest a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844 taught by Ellen G. White.

S we pointed out earlier, there are two places in the Old Testament, Numbers 14:33-35 and Ezekiel 4:5-6, where God used the day-for-a-year in a prophecy and it was God who made it clear when it was to be used. Adventists should have taken note of this principle.

A very complete discussion of the problems of the Adventist interpretation of the little horn of Daniel 8 and 11 can be found at Dirk Anderson's website, **AmazingFiction.Org**. There is no better way to show our readers just how much SDA leaders had learned about the problems with their prophetic interpretations by 1919 than to provide you with an extensive portion of the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes** from July 8, 1919. Keep in mind that **you will see the participants acknowledge the serious problems of the single-most important prophecy to Adventism, observe them discuss how to hide the facts from SDA students**, and watch them desperately try to justify a "wheel within a wheel" strategy of biblical symbolism to establish the legitimacy of the 1844 cleansing of the sanctuary in Heaven, and therefore prop-up their prophetess, Ellen G. White.

We want you to see for yourselves the great difficulties these top SDA leaders were having with the leap from the literal to the symbolic in Chapter 11, which is widely accepted to be a continuation of the explanation of the little horn of Daniel 8. To do this, we are providing an extensive portion of the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes** for you to study. We have taken the liberty to make obvious corrections to the stenographer's type-written manuscript, which is rendered at the General Conference Archives as scans of the original pages as they came out of the stenographer's typewriter almost 100 years ago. Note especially the portions of text we have highlighted in red. Additionally please observe that there are editorial comments inserted within the transcript to show scholarly opinion that tends to support or contradict the various interpretations of these prophecies as proposed by the participants. These commentaries are in green so they can easily be distinguished from the transcript's text.

Again, keep in mind that Seventh-day Adventists traditionally have viewed the little horns of Daniel 7 and Daniel 8 and 11 as the same power. As we pointed out earlier, these delegates seem to be unaware that the 1,260 days of the little horn of Daniel 7 fit the exact number of days that Nero persecuted the Christians in the Roman Empire, and they mistakenly acknowledged the probability that the prophecy applied, initially, to Antiochus Epiphanes rather than to Nero. This misunderstanding, however, provides strong evidence that these delegates knew that one way of calculating the time that Antiochus desecrated the temple came to 3.5 years. In this passage they are discussing the little horn of Daniel 8 by discussing the prophecies of Daniel 11, which are widely viewed as relating to the little horn of Daniel 8, and widely acknowledged to apply in a spectacular way to Antiochus Epiphanes:

From the July 8, 1919 Transcript:

http://www.adventistarchives.org/doc_info.asp?DocID=119300

W. E. HOWELL: Not only has God showed the great mountain peaks of prophecy, but In Daniel 11, especially the first part, he has descended to-the minutest detail of the privacies of personal life, and these are thus shown to be under his supervision just as truly as the rise and fall of Empires. The modern critics are saying that the book must have been written after the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, because the statements are as accurate as a history written in his time. But we believe it was written 200 years before the days of Antiochus Epiphanes and that God could look down and see that man's whole career. Let me read the 25th Verse:

He shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army, and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him. Is this Antiochus Epiphanes, and the two armies are the armies of these two men.

H. C. LACEY: (reading his paraphrase): Daniel 11:25: "And he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall stir up (BC 171) his power and his courage against the king of the south (Ptolemy Philopater) with a great army ("a great multitude"); and the king of the south (Ptolemy) stirred up with a very great

and mighty army (“very many and exceedingly strong horses”) and the king of the south (“Ptolemy Philopater) shall not stand (“was afraid and fled”): for they shall forecast devices him (Eula, his minister, Maroon, a premier, the Alexandra ins). 36: Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (Ptolemy's) Meat (his ministers, Eula, Maroon, etc.) shall destroy (by corrupting and betraying) him (Ptolemy Philopater), and his (Ptolemy's) army shall overflow and many shall fall down slain.”

A.G. DANIELLS: What does it mean by overflowing?

H.C. LACEY: They dispersed and were defeated. In the old view Rome shall overflow, and many shall fall down slain.

A.G. DANIELLS: Does overflow mean to disperse and to run out?

H. C. LACEY: Exactly the same criticism may be applied to both views. I suppose we could turn this thing around and make it apply to Rome. . . . is the language in I Maccabees 1:16, 16, 18, 19. (Reads)

You see that the language both in the bible and the apocryphal book is practically identical.

27 *“And both these kings’ hearts shall be do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper; for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.”*

Upon his arrival at Memphis, Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopater frequently ate and conversed together “at one table, Antiochus pretending he would favor the cause of Ptolemy as against the usurpation of his brother, Physson. This Antiochus pretends to espouse the cause of this older nephew against his brother, Ptolemy, laying the blame of the whole campaign upon Eulasus, his majesty who betrayed him, and professing great obligations to his uncle Antiochus. But these protestations of friendship were “lies” on his part. As soon as Antiochus had withdrawn, the two brothers, Ptolemy and Physson, made peace through the mediation of their sister, Cleopatra, and agreed to reign conjointly in Egypt. But even this did not prosper. The two monarchs came to blows at the time appointed.

Let us read into the Scripture the names of these kings: “And both these kings” hearts (Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopater) shall be to do mischief (each hoping to circumvent the other), and they shall speak lies at one table (in apparent friendliness), but it (this patched up peace between them) shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.”

38: *Then shall he return into his own land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land.”* That is the prophecy.

Antiochus, hoping that the two Egyptian brothers would ruin each other in civil war, returned to Syria. He took with him immense treasures from the captured towns of Egypt. The verse says, “He shall return . . . with great riches.” History says he took immense spoils from the captured towns of Egypt. In 1 Maccabees 1:19-20 it is stated, “Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof.” That is the history.

Notice it says “his heart shall be against the holy covenant.” The next verse—(1 Maccabees 1:20) “And after that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he return again in the hundred forty and third year (312 of the ---- era, which is BC 169), and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the showbread, and the pouring vessels, and the vials, and the censers of gold, and the veil, and the crowns, and the golden ornaments that were before the temple, all which he pulled off. He took also the silver and the gold, and the previous vessels; also he took the hidden treasures which he found. And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly.

That is the history. The prophecy reads thus: ‘and his heart shall be against the holy covenant.’ There is more to that than this, too,— ‘his heart shall be against it.’ When he was in Egypt a false report had been circulated of his death. Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest—(Antiochus Epiphanes had done this) Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest, returned to Jerusalem, drove his brother, Wenelaus, out of office, and cruelly ill-treated the citizens. Antiochus, thinking the whole nation had revolted, and hearing that they had made great rejoicing at the report of his death, besieged Jerusalem with a great army, took the city by storm, and vented his anger upon the helpless Jews. He slew 40,000 of them, and sold 40,000 more, polluted the temple, offered swine’s flesh on the altar of God, restored Wenelaus to the priesthood, and made Philip, a barbarian, governor of Judea. “He shall do exploits,” and then “return to his own land,” just as these events here are brought forth.

PROF. ANDERSON: What verse in the chapter do you allude to when you speak of the pollution of the temple, as you read in the history?

PROF. LACEY: In the 11th chapter, when we get down to verse 30, there is the point. All these modern scholars, I believe—I don’t like to say “all,” but the majority of scholars, you will find, as I have stated, claim indisputably the events occur under Antiochus Epiphanes to Verse 30; but after Verse 30 it is a little hazy, and you cannot group them all around Antiochus Epiphanes. Modern scholars have attempted to do it. Verse 30 speaks of the defiling of the temple. But we will come to that a little later on. In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn—extremely alike, and I did not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekiel expresses it—a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of **Daniel 7 can** apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the eleventh down the line, three were plucked up in his place (names were mentioned), he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the Law of the Most High; **things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years.** And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, suppose you and I had been living in that day we would have thought that that prophecy met its fulfillment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great anti-Christ, of which Antiochus was here the personal representative.

(Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted.)

ELDER DANIELLS: You would not want to say that that you have just said now to a class of students, would you?

PROF. LACEY: I do not think that I would ever say it.

ELDER DANIELLS: I hope you won’t, because the next thing you know some of our boys will be out over the country saying that that is the little horn.

VOICE: They have said it already.

PROF. LACEY: I have never said it. But I do not see why you object if we take this prophecy as a wheel within a wheel.

ELDER DANIELLS – When we come to the discussion, that will come in.

PROF. LACEY: Pass on to verse 29: “At the time appointed he shall return and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.”

At the time appointed Antiochus, perceiving that his cunningly planned scheme failed—that is, to get these two loggerheads fighting against each other—and seeing that Ptolemy and his brother,

Eusalus, had made up and were prepared to resent [resist] his aggressions, he was so offended that he immediately made war and laid siege first to the two brothers of Alexandria. But this expedition was not as his former one, for the reasons given in the next verse.

Let us re-read this verse with the names opposite: “At the time appointed.” Two years later, this is where he comes to his end,— both of the kings come to an end, and Rome arises. “At the time appointed (BC 168) he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall return and come toward the South (Egypt), and it (the Egyptian campaign) shall not be as the former (campaign—the Egyptian campaign of verse 25), or as the latter (the Jewish campaign of verse 28). Notice why—

Verse 30: For the ships of Chittim shall come against him”—the ships of Chittim apply to the Romans, in Italy, the term being applicable to that whole coastal region—they “shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do:”—and the verse proceeds.

Now we would like to know just what did occur just at that junction. “The ships of Chittim shall come against him (Antiochus Epiphanes).” While pressing the siege of Alexandria a Roman embassy reached him and demanded that he desist instantly from his war with Ptolemy and Eulasus. Marcus Popillius Lenas, the head of the embassy, was the old friend of Antiochus, but he drew a circle in the sand around the king, and peremptorily demanded in the name of the Senate and Roman people that he give an immediate answer to the stipulations. As the report of the Battle of Pydna, 168 BC, had just been carried to Antiochus, he assented at once to the request of Popillius, and returned from Alexandria. So we see this campaign was not like the other two. He was pressing the siege, but he was demanded to withdraw, and he obeyed.

This is where Rome comes in contact with Antiochus in the same way that Greece and Persia came together. In that verse Rome and Greece come together. Just a moment longer we follow Antiochus, for it says, “he shall be grieved and return.” Does that say to his own land? No. Just “he shall be grieved and return. Now Polybius uses almost the exact language; “He led back his forces into Syria, grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient to yield to demands for the present.” --- That is the history, it is not the prophecy – “grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient to yield to demands for the present.”

ELDER DANIELS: Where historians use practically the same thing that the prophet used, you consider that some weight of evidence, do you, that the history meets the prophecy?

PROF. LACEY: O yes, in a case like this. Not just an isolated reference.

The next expression: “and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do.” On his way back this Antiochus further vented his spite and his ill temper upon the unfortunate Jews, dispatching Apolloneus with 30,000 men to Jerusalem, who slew great multitudes, plundered the city, set fire to it in various places, pulled down houses and walls, slew those who attended the temple, defiled again the Holy Place so that the whole service was discontinued. The city was forsaken of the Jews and strangers only remained in it. On his arrival at Antioch he published a decree obliging all upon pain of death to conform to the religion of the Greeks. So the Jewish laws were abrogated, and heathen worship was set up in its stead, and the Temple itself was consecrated to Jupiter Olympius.

QUESTION: What was the date of that?

ANSWER: BC 158

PROF. LACEY: “They set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar. They did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God.” 1 Mac. 1:54, 59

You see that they placed the abomination of desolation in the Holy Place. The very language of the Bible, “the abomination of desolation,” is placed in the temple; and this is history. I do not see why you object to taking this in a small way as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, – as a wheel within a wheel view of this prophecy. Living in those times we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfillment, we get a present message from it; as we read any chapter and make other slight allusion to those days and how it applies today. Sister White herself recognized the double application method.

“And he (Antiochus) had intelligence with them that forsook the holy covenant.” That is, Antiochus had intelligence with those who forsook the holy covenant, for there were many Jews who complied with his request and became converts to heathenism.

W. C. WILCOX: The Revised Version says “Regard.”

Verse 31: “And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.” Here I do not see why we cannot take the word which some of you prefer – “Out of him yet shall stand.” Exactly the same word is used as in Daniel 8:9, when you come down to the Greek power, and out of the four horns, out of one of them a little horn waxed exceeding great. That “out of one of them” is the same word, and when we explain that we say that that little horn is Rome, and it came out of Greece--

Not racially and ethically, but it was incorporated and rose a universal power. So here we have the same point – Out of him, or out of this power, shall come arms; another view of Rome. There is clearly strength and consistency in this view. We have not once doubled back on our track. We have made a steady march down. It is uninteresting history, but the Lord has given us these details, and they carry us right on down, so that the people in those days living as they were in that terrible time of persecution might have help, and now we come down to the latter part, which applies more essentially to us. Rome arises.

QUESTION: Did the people back there know anything at all about the book of Daniel—wasn't it a sealed book?

PROF. LACEY: I do not know that it is just right to think that the sealing meant that they were to know nothing about the book of Daniel. They must have understood something about it. When it said that the goat was Greece, they must have understood that. When Alexander came to Jerusalem the high priest went out and pointed out the prophecy of Daniel to Alexander, and said, You are the horn of the goat.

PROF. SORENSON: Mentioned the text, “Whoso readeth let him understand.”

PROF. LACEY (CONTINUING STUDY) - Out of them arms shall stand up.” Arms for this power which followed Rome shall stand up or shall arise.

W. C. WILCOX: Refers to a translation which says, “After him shall arms stand up.”

PROF. LACEY: Many have repudiated the translation, but good scholars have accepted it.

NOTE: (Elder Daniells requests that there be an uninterrupted continuation or presentation of the study.)

PROF. LACEY: Out of him—meaning emerging from that power, arising out of Greece, represented first by Antiochus, from him “arms” – a wonderful symbol of the Roman Empire. He included both the king of the north and the king of the south, and so he is not called the king of the north—it is “arms.” The north and the south were in arms. It is Rome Pagan and Papal in this

chapter, and the duality is suggested by that term “arms.” On the Roman standard, as I pointed out, two arms or extended hands were printed—a striking symbol of Rome. By a natural transition the thought of the prophet passes from this Seleucidaen king to that of the Romans, who came into prominence in the very year brought to view in the previous verse—BC 168.

Now these arms, this power, shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and this has a double aspect. Pagan Rome, Imperial Rome, polluted the earthy sanctuary of strength, and that section of this power represented by “arms,” or Papal or ecclesiastical Rome, polluted the heavenly sanctuary of strength; the former in the year A. D. 70, and the latter, if we want to fix a day, in the year 503. That is the date accepted as we understand for the taking away of the daily mediation the sanctuary. Anticipate that just as soon as Rome is struck in the line of prophecy, then the commentaries which are presented by the same authorities on Daniel 8 and 9, emphasis should be laid on the warfare raised by this power on the sanctuary of God in its double aspect.

“And they shall place the abomination of desolation.”

There the Pagan element gradually disappears, and they place the abomination that maketh desolate – when Rome, or the Papacy, rather, was established in the year 533 to 538, by the decree of Justinian.

May I state at this juncture that the matter---- is perfectly authentic. The matter was raised the first day as a question, and I did not like to say anything because I wanted to look it up. I had a copy of it, but you have to read 35 or 36 pages more beyond the place where the letter of Justinian to the Pope is mentioned; letter to---- Bishop of Constantinople.

And so the year 533, this is an established date. We are brought down to that. Let us pass rapidly down over the following verses:

Verse 32: “And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupted by flatteries. (The Papacy would win over those apostate Christians who proved disloyal to the covenant. We have shown that this is correctly Papal Rome.) But the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.” Here the saints of God are brought to view; the faithful saints of God living during the Dark Ages, who maintained the faith of Christ,—the Waldenses, Albigennes, Huguenots, etc. And so this prophecy is fulfilled.

Editor's note: This text does not appear to have anything in it that suggests that its meaning should be applied to the power of Rome hundreds of years later. The vast majority of biblical scholars apply it to Antiochus. *Gill's Commentary*, for example, says this about verse 32:

And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupted by flatteries,.... That forsook the law of God, the book of the covenant, and did things contrary to it; and particularly violated the covenant of circumcision, drawing on the foreskin, and becoming uncircumcised; as well as rejected other ordinances of religious worship the Jews by covenant were obliged to observe: these apostates Antiochus corrupted by good words and fair speeches, by gifts and presents; and they became his tools, to do his pleasure, and were his instruments to seduce the Jews to renounce their religion, and give in to his idolatry; such as Jason, Menelaus, and others; in the Apocrypha:

"Now when the kingdom was established before Antiochus, he thought to reign over Egypt that he might have the dominion of two realms." (1 Maccabees 1:16)

"Now such was the height of Greek fashions, and increase of heathenish manners, through the exceeding profaneness of Jason, that ungodly wretch, and no high priest;" (2 Maccabees 4:13)

"Yet was he not content with this, but presumed to go into the most holy temple of all the world;

Menelaus, that traitor to the laws, and to his own country, being his guide:" (2 Maccabees 5:15)

"But they that had the charge of that wicked feast, for the old acquaintance they had with the man, taking him aside, besought him to bring flesh of his own provision, such as was lawful for him to use, and make as if he did eat of the flesh taken from the sacrifice commanded by the king;" (2 Maccabees 6:21) but the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits; such who knew the Lord God of Israel to be the true God, and owned and acknowledged him as such; and not only professed him, but served and worshiped him, having a spiritual knowledge of him, and communion with him; and therefore could not be drawn off from him and his worship by flatteries or frowns, by promises or menaces: these were strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; they held fast their religion, and the profession of it, and were proof against all allurements or threatenings, and endured racks and tortures, all sorts of punishment, and death in every shape, with the greatest constancy and courage; such as Eleazar, the mother and her seven sons, and others; as well as others did many valiant actions in the defense of themselves and country, as Matthias, Judas Maccabeus, and his brethren; to which heroic actions the apostle refers in Hebrews 11:34, so Josephus (i) says, "that many of the Jews indeed, some willingly, and others through fear of punishment, obeyed the king's commands; but the more approved, and those of generous minds, had a greater regard to the customs of their country than to the punishment threatened to the disobedient; and for this being continually harassed, and enduring grievous punishments, died; some were scourged, and their bodies mutilated, and being yet alive and breathing, were crucified; women and their children, whom they crucified, were by the king's orders strangled, and hanged about the necks of their parents that were crucified;"

PROF. LACEY: Verse 33: Those "which understand among the people shall instruct many." This refers to the teaching of the various reformers—Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Luther, etc. And those "that understand among the people shall instruct many (as against the Papacy), and yet they (the saints of God) shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, days. It does not say "time, times, and the dividing of time," but "days," which includes that. It may refer to that entire period of persecution suffered by the people of God, the 1,260 years, when millions were martyred, but it is also a general statement, referring to the people of God, the saints of God.

Editor's Note: These prophecies still appear to apply to the events surrounding the Jewish persecution by Antiochus. *Gill's Commentary* for Daniel 11:33 says this:

And they that understand among the people shall instruct many,.... Such as had a better understanding of divine things than others, had more light and knowledge in the sacred Scriptures, in the law of God, and in his mind and will, and were capable of teaching others; and such as these the Lord raises up among his people in the worst of times, in the times of the greatest apostasy and declension; and these are enabled to perform their duty, to instruct the people in theirs, teach them what they should do, and how they should behave; exhort them to retain the doctrines and ordinances of their holy religion, and not embrace the doctrines and inventions of men, will worship, superstition, and idolatry; and so they instructed the ignorant, strengthened the weak, and established the wavering; such were Mattathias the priest of Modin, and Eleazar, one of the chief scribes, in the Apocrypha: "In those days arose Mattathias the son of John, the son of Simeon, a priest of the sons of Joarib, from Jerusalem, and dwelt in Modin." (1 Maccabees 2:1) "Eleazar, one of the principal scribes, an aged man, and of a well favoured countenance, was constrained to open his mouth, and to eat swine's flesh." (2 Maccabees 6:18)

Auk applies this to the times of the apostles, who he thinks are here meant; so Sir Isaac Newton:

yet they shall fall by the sword; by the sword of Antiochus and his soldiers; as multitudes of the Jews did, even both the instructors and the instructed, who would not comply with his orders: and by flame; some were burnt alive in caves, where they fled for shelter; and others as the mother and her seven

sons, were cast into heated cauldrons of brass; in the Apocrypha:

"And others, that had run together into caves nearby, to keep the Sabbath day secretly, being discovered by Philip, were all burnt together, because they made a conscience to help themselves for the honour of the most sacred day." (2 Maccabees 6:11)

"3 Then the king, being in a rage, commanded pans and cauldrons to be made hot: 4 Which forthwith being heated, he commanded to cut out the tongue of him that spake first, and to cut off the utmost parts of his body, the rest of his brethren and his mother looking on. 5 Now when he was thus maimed in all his members, he commanded him being yet alive to be brought to the fire, and to be fried in the pan: and as the vapour of the pan was for a good space dispersed, they exhorted one another with the mother to die manfully, saying thus," (2 Maccabees 7) by captivity; so it is expressly said of Antiochus, that he carried captive women and children and at another time ordered the women and children to be sold for slaves, in the Apocrypha:

"Insomuch that the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled because of them: whereupon the city was made an habitation of strangers, and became strange to those that were born in her; and her own children left her." (1 Maccabees 1:38)

"He sent also that detestable ringleader Apollonius with an army of two and twenty thousand, commanding him to slay all those that were in their best age, and to sell the women and the younger sort:" (2 Maccabees 5:24)

and by spoil many days; being plundered of their substance, their houses rifled, and their goods carried away; and this distress lasted "days", a short time only; Josephus (k) reckons it at three years and a half. All this Cocceius interprets of the persecutions of the Christians by the Romans; and likewise Sir Isaac Newton.

(k) De Bello Jud. l. 1. c. 1. sect. 7.

PROF. LACEY – CONTINUED:

"The time of the end." The time of the end, according to the book of Daniel is 1844. Let us read Daniel 8:13, 14, 17-19. I do not say it could not be 1798 just as well.

"Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said under the certain saint which spake, 'How long shall the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleaned.'"

Now the time brought to view here is 1844.

Vs: 17: *"So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, "understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision."* The Revised Version says: "The vision belongeth to the time of the end."

What is the great objective of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9? 1844. It belongs to the time of the end. Then the time of the end (according to this new application) is 1844.

Vs. 19: *"And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be."* Revised Version reads: "It belongeth to the appointed time of the end." By this then before we come to the 11th chapter the time of the end is referred to as 1844.

Vs. 35: (R.V.) "Because it was yet for the time appointed."

The true indication here is that on this side of 1798 there may be a revival of persecution—to that time, and into it.

Editor's Note: Although it is difficult to categorically say that there can be no possible symbolic prolepsis into the far-off future implied in this prophecy, it applies extremely well, again, to the fate of Antiochus. *Gill's Exposition* comments on Verse 17 as follows:

Even to the time of the end; because it is yet for a time appointed; these distresses, calamities, and persecutions, would have an end, and the time for it was appointed of God; as yet it was not come, but quickly would, and then an end would be put to the third or Grecian monarchy; a hint of the Roman power over that being given, Daniel 11:30, hence we have no further account of Antiochus or his sons. Very remarkable are the words of Aemilius Sara (m), "the Assyrians first were possessors of monarchy; then the Medes; afterwards the Persians; then the Macedonians; from that time the kings, Philip and Antiochus, who sprung from the Macedonians, being conquered, not long after Carthage was subdued, the supreme power of empire came to the Roman people;" of whom, under one character or another, the following part of the prophecy is chiefly to be understood. So another historian says (n), Antiochus being drove out of Asia, the Romans first set footing there; and another (o) observes, that Antiochus being defeated by L. Cornelius Scipio, he took the name of Asiaticus, because he had conquered Asia; as his brother was called Africanus, from his subduing Africa: wherefore Asia and Africa being now in the hands of the Romans, the supreme power might well be said to be with them; and therefore, henceforward, are only spoken of, and particularly the Roman antichrist.

(m) *De annis populi Romani apud Velleii Paterculi Hist. Roman. I. 1. c. 6.* (n) "*Festi Breviarium, prope initium*". (o) *Eutropii Hist. Rom. I. 4.* So Plutarch. in *Vita Scipionis Africani.* (mi).

36: (eleventh chap.) "And the king shall do according to his will." We must insist that the Hebrew rendering the word "king" is "the king." Any other rendering of it is a twisting of the word.—"The King" was the king represented by the arms of Rome, as it was just assuming its papal form. Pagan Rome is passing away.—"and the king shall do according to his will." And in the verses which follow we have an exposition of the character of the papal system.—"shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god. How has he done this? In Rome the Pope sits with his foot upon the altar in St. Peter's, upon which the Host is elevated. The Host they conceive to be Christ recreated. He is placed upon the altar and the Pope sits with his feet upon that altar.

"And shall magnify himself above every God." There has been no heathen god honored as the Pope of Rome has been honored. And it could include the very God of heaven, too. He has magnified himself against God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, by taking away the continual mediation and calling attention to himself instead of to Christ, claiming he (the pope) was the vice-regent of God. The prophecy would far more fittingly apply to him than to the French nation.

Editor's note: These words may apply to the coming anti-Christ, and even the papacy. Keil and Delitzsch' *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* comments on Daniel 11:36 says:

This exaltation of the king is here introduced by the formula כרצנו ועשה, which expresses the self-will and the irresistible might of his proceeding; cf. Daniel 3:16 and Daniel 8:4 - "a feature common to Antiochus and Antichrist" (Klief.). He shall raise himself above every god, not merely "subjectively in his lofty imagination" (Hitzig), but also by his actions. כל-אל, every god, not merely the God of Israel, but also the gods of the heathen. This does not agree with Antiochus. The ἰσοθεα φρονεῖν ὑπερηφανῶς which is said of him, 2 Macc. 9:12, is not an exalting of himself above every god.

"Antiochus was not an ἄθεος; he even wished to render the worship of Zeus universal; and that he once spoiled the temple does not imply his raising himself above every god" (Klief). Of Antiochus much rather, as is said by Livy (41:20), in duabus tamen magnis honestisque rebus fere regius erat animus, in urbium donis et deorum cultu. On the contrary, these words before us are expressly referred to Antichrist, 2 Thessalonians 2:4.

Yet further, in his arrogance he shall speak נפלאות, wonderful, i.e., impious and astonishing things, against the God of gods, i.e., the true God. This clause expounds and strengthens מלל רברבון (speaking great things), which is said of the enemy at the time of the end, Daniel 7:8, Daniel 7:11, Daniel 7:20. In this he will prosper, but only till the anger of God against His people

(זעם as Daniel 8:19) shall be accomplished. Regarding כלה see at Daniel 9:27. This anger of God is irrevocably determined (נחרצה), that His people may be wholly purified for the consummation of His kingdom in glory. The perf. נעשתה does not stand for the imperf. Because it is decreed, but in its proper meaning, according to which it represents the matter as finished, settled. Here it accordingly means: "for that which is irrevocably decreed is accomplished, is not to be recalled, but must be done."

He was to speak marvelous things against the God of gods. This is a parallel expression to that found in Daniel 7:8,12,27. There it says the little horn would speak great things, and then very great things. Revelation 13:6 says, "And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." Take the claims of infallibility of the Bishop of Rome for instance, and the doctrine that the priests have power to create their Creator. They point to that as the wonderful power that is vested in the Roman priesthood.

"And shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished." He shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished, that is, down to the falling of the plagues,

"For that is determined shall be done."

Vs 37: "Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers." The Hebrew word reads (for 'regard') "to understand" "to attend."

"Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women." That does not mean that he denies the desire of women nor denies there is any god. It means he shall not "attend" to them; he will not heed them. How has the Papacy done that? To regard God is to worship him, to obey Him, to worship Him. How does He speak to me? In His word. The Word of God is the Bible; and we disregard God when we disregard the Bible. Now it is a significant fact that the Bible has been eliminated in the Papal system. It always tries to keep the Bible away from the people. It does not "attend" to God or "regard" God. Now no matter what the history has been,— the papacy claims it has "disregarded" the laws of God—disregarded God Who made that law, the Creator of Heaven and earth, and whose law is a sign of His authority.

It does not mean that he denies the being of God, but disregards God.

We would never have thought the old view of applying this prophecy to the French nation if it has not been suggested in "Thoughts on Daniel."

"Nor the desire of women." What is one of the cardinal teachings of the Papal system? The celibacy of the priesthood and the virginity of the nuns.

Editor's Note: It is possible, but not necessary, to apply this prophecy to the Catholic Church's celibacy teachings. *Jamieson-Fausset-Brown Bible Commentary*, has this to say:

37. Neither regard the desire of women—(Compare Eze. 24:16, 18). The wife, as the desire of man's eyes, is the symbol of the tenderest relations (2Sa 1:26). Antiochus would set at naught even their

entreaties that he should cease from his attack on Jehovah's worship [Polanus]. Maurer refers it to Antiochus' attack on the temple of the Syrian Venus, worshiped by women (1 Maccabees 6:1, &c.; 2 Maccabees 1:13). Newton refers it to Rome's "forbidding to marry." Elliott rightly makes the anti-typical reference be to Messiah. Jewish women desired to be mothers with a view to Him, the promised seed of the woman (Gen. 30:23; Luke 1:25, 28).

"Nor regard any god." The papacy does not regard any god. It is entirely irreligious in spirit.

H.C. LACEY: This celibacy of the priests, involving the virginity of the nuns, which follows as a natural consequence, is one of the great items in the papal doctrine. He does not regard any god, that is, he is entirely irreligious in spirit. Now it is this to which Paul alludes in 2 Tess. 2:4: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Notice how it says here [in Daniel] "neither shall he regard any god, for he shall magnify himself above all." This is the thought quoted in 2 Thess. We never deviate from applying that to the papacy, and this in Daniel which is the basis of the verse in Thessalonians, should also be applied to the papacy.

"But in his estate." Instead of calling his attention to the God of the bible, he shall honor the God of forces. It is a very peculiar word translated forces. The Hebrew is *Mahossen*, meaning "god protect us." He shall honor the god of forces. What are the facts of the case? The Catholics have thought to turn to the saints. Every Catholic has some saint to whom he or she looks. The saints come instead of Christ and God. And they are known as the tutelary saints. Perhaps I would better read something from some of these authorities on this point. In the ages past, repeatedly cities have been placed under the protection of certain guardian saints, tutelary deities, of those cities. They have trusted in the relics of the saints they have with them for protection. It will be impossible to find a word more descriptive of that than the word *Mahossen*.

It is not surprising that so many high profile Seventh-day Adventist leaders have left Adventism, willingly or unwillingly, because they could not find biblical support for the Investigative Judgment interpretation of the 2,300 day prophecy. The SDA interpretation of Daniel 8:14 got off on the wrong foot by making too much out of the word, "cleansed" in the King James Version:

And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

The Young's Literal Translation is more in keeping with the intent of the original language, as is less susceptible to a fanciful interpretation:

He saith unto me, Till evening -- morning two thousand and three hundred, then is the holy place declared right.

The delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference may have been unaware that the 2,300 days worked out to exactly the number of literal days that Antiochus Epiphanes polluted and profaned the temple at Jerusalem. Instead they appear to have mistakenly believed that the 1,260 day prophecy of Daniel 7's little horn applied to the persecuting activities of Antiochus as well as to a symbolically arrived at 1,260 years of papal persecution and supremacy. It appears that without any definite start date specified for the beginning of the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices, they made another assumption, and that was that the start date for this prophetic period was the same one as the 70 week prophecy (490 years from the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the Messiah), or 457 BC. Recall that there are serious problems with the 490 year prophecy as well.

Whatever the varied views of the SDA leaders of Adventism in 1919 may have been, they recognized that the fact that at least one of the little horns represented the persecuting activities of Antiochus Epiphanes was so dangerous that this fact should be withheld from SDA students.

The truth is that the facts of the little horn prophecies of Daniel 7, 8 and 11 have nothing to do with the Sabbath-Sunday

Question or 1844. Nothing fits perfectly, as Bible prophecy would require, if these prophecies of Nero (Daniel 7) and Antiochus (Daniel 8, 11) are symbolically stretched to 1798 and 1844. Although this quote from the *Keil and Delitzsch Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* for Daniel 7:25 is long, it provides, in one place, an excellent summary of the problems involved with these speculative, symbolic interpretations, and it gives an excellent summary of why the 1,260 day prophecy might be a valid concept if we seek to understand it on the basis of the linguistics of the passage:

This tyranny God's people will suffer "till, i.e., during, a time, (two) times, and half a time." By these specifications of time the duration of the last phase of the world-power is more definitely declared, as a period in its whole course measured by God; Daniel 7:12 and Daniel 7:22. The plural word עֲדָנִין (times) standing between time and half a time can only designate the simple plural, i.e., two times used in the dual sense, since in the Chaldee the plural is often used to denote a pair where the dual is used in Hebrew; cf. Winer, *Chald. Gr.* 55, 3. Three and a half times are the half of seven times (Daniel 4:13). The greater number of the older as well as of the more recent interpreters take *imte* (עֲדָנִין) as representing the space of a year, thus three and a half times as three and a half years; and they base this view partly on Daniel 4:13, where seven times must mean seven years, partly on Daniel 12:7, where the corresponding expression is found in Hebrew, partly on Revelation 13:5 and Revelation 11:2-3, where forty-two months and 1260 days are used interchangeably. But none of these passages supplies a proof that will stand the test. The supposition that in Daniel 4:13 the seven times represent seven years, neither is nor can be proved. As regards the time and times in Daniel 12:7, and the periods named in the passages of the Rev. referred to, it is very questionable whether the weeks and the days represent the ordinary weeks of the year and days of the week, and whether these periods of time are to be taken chronologically. Still less can any explanation as to this designation of time be derived from the 2300 days (evening-mornings) in Daniel 8:14, since the periods do not agree, nor do both passages treat of the same event. The choice of the chronologically indefinite expression עֲדָנִין, time, shows that a chronological determination of the period is not in view, but that the designation of time is to be understood symbolically. We have thus to inquire after the symbolical meaning of the statement. This is not to be sought, with Hofmann (*Weiss. i.* 289), in the supposition that as three and a half years are the half of a Sabbath-period, it is thus announced that Israel would be oppressed during half a Sabbath-period by Antichrist. For, apart from the unwarrantable identification of time with year, one does not perceive what Sabbath-periods and the oppression of the people of God have in common. This much is beyond doubt, that three and a half times are the half of seven times. The meaning of this half, however, is not to be derived, with Kranichfeld, from Daniel 4:13, where "seven times" is an expression used for a long continuance of divinely-ordained suffering. It is not hence to be supposed that the dividing of this period into two designates only a proportionally short time of severest oppression endured by the people of God at the hands of the heathen. For the humbling of the haughty ruler Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 4:13) does not stand in any inner connection with the elevation of the world-power over the people of God, in such a way that we could explain the three and a half times of this passage after the seven times of Daniel 4:13. In general, the question may be asked, Whether the meaning of the three and a half times is to be derived merely from the symbolical signification of the number seven, or whether, with Lemmert, we must not much rather go back, in order to ascertain the import of this measure of time, to the divine judgments under Elias, when the heavens were shut for three years and six months; Luke 4:25 and James 5:17. "As Ahab did more to provoke God to anger than all the kings who were before him, so this king, Daniel 7:24, in a way altogether different from those who went before him, spake words against the Most High and persecuted His saints, etc." But should this reference also not be established, and the three and a half times be regarded as only the half of seven times, yet the seven does not here come into view as the time of God's works, so that it could be said the oppression of the people of God by the little horn will last (Kliefoth) only half as long as a work of God; but according to the symbolical interpretation of the seven times, the three and a half, as the period of the duration of the circumstances into which the people of God are brought by the world-power through the divine permission, indicate "a testing period, a period of judgment which will (Matthew 24:22; Proverbs 10:27), for the elect's sake, be interrupted and shortened (septenarius truncus)." Leyrer in Herzl's *Real. Enc.* xviii. 369. Besides, it is to be considered how this space of time is

described, not as three and a half, but a time, two times, and half a time. Ebrard (Offenb. p. 49) well remarks regarding this, that "it appears as if his tyranny would extend itself always the longer and longer: first a time, then the doubled time, then the fourfold - this would be a seven times; but it does not go that length; suddenly it comes to an end in the midst of the seven times, so that instead of the fourfold time there is only half a time." "The proper analysis of the three and a half times," Kliefoth further remarks, "in that the periods first mount up by doubling them, and then suddenly decline, shows that the power of the horn and its oppression of the people of God would first quickly manifest itself, in order then to come to a sudden end by the interposition of the divine judgment (Daniel 7:26)." For, a thing which is not here to be overlooked, the three and a half times present not the whole duration of the existence of the little horn, but, as the half of a week, only the latter half of its time, in which dominion over the saints of God is given to it (Daniel 7:21), and at the expiry of which it falls before the judgment. See under Daniel 12:7.

In conclusion, the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* show that the participants suffered from confusion about the meaning of these prophecies in their attempt to reconcile the historical facts, and in some cases, the well-accepted interpretations of these prophecies, with Ellen White's teachings. They understood that the fact that at least one of the little horn prophecies had its literal fulfillment almost 2,000 years before 1844 and believed that this information should be hidden from the Church because it was dangerous to Adventism.

REVELATION 14:12 AND REVELATION 12:17 CAN'T BE USED TO TEACH THAT THE TRUE CHURCH KEEPS THE SABBATH

Revelation 14:12 -Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

Revelation 12:17 - And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

Throughout history God has commanded His people to do many things, but common sense should tell us that in each case we have to look at to whom God was speaking and under what circumstances. For example, one of His Old Testament commandments was that Sabbath-breakers be stoned to death. Adventists assume that the word "commandments" in these passages refers to the Decalogue, but there is no justification in these texts to make such assumptions. If the Sabbath is to be kept by Christians now, they fail to keep it correctly when they do not stone Sabbath-breakers to death.

The problem here, never addressed by Sabbatarians, is that many of the things God commanded of Israel under the Old Covenant are in conflict with Jesus Christ and the Gospel (salvation through faith only in Christ). It was the apostle Paul who wrote that the Law was not of faith. The New Covenant is not like the Old Covenant in many respects.

As we mention earlier, when Paul talked about Christian behavior, he did not mention the 10 Commandments, and although he listed numerous sins in his writings that would keep a believer from going to Heaven, Sabbath-breaking was never included. Paul's various lists included sins of the heart and sins of omission, whereas the focus of the Decalogue was on sins of commission. The real problem with human beings lies in their motives. This is why the focus of the New Covenant and the new "Law of Faith" is the replacement of a person's "heart of stone" with a new heart through the renewing power of the Holy Spirit.

When the author of Revelation thought about the commandments of God, he was likely thinking about the things in Paul's list, the Noachian laws, and/or Jesus' commandment that we should love God supremely and other people as we love ourselves. A little logic may help right here. The Decalogue does not proscribe the sins of homosexuality or fornication, but Paul's list did. The author of the Book of Revelation, therefore, could not have limited the scope of the Law to the Decalogue because St. Paul said that fornicators and homosexuals would not be granted entrance to Heaven.

If the Sabbatarian adds a limiter to the Revelator's scope of what he meant by the Law, it is the same thing as ADDING words to the Bible, and this is what Adventists do when they abuse these passages. Adding words to Scripture is a good way to arrive at false doctrines, and, as William Hohmann points out, Christians are forbidden to add or remove any words from

Scripture. Hohmann cites Revelation 22:18-19 and points out that no one has the right to alter Scripture, and that when they do, this results in the twisting of Scripture that leads to deceptions and lies. Making the Sabbath a salvation issue attempts to impose upon Christians the conditions of a covenant they were never a party to, and a covenant that ended. That obsolete covenant had 613 points of law, and keeping each and every one of them was necessary to comply with its requirements. It cannot be a salvation issue, since St. John flatly states that Jesus broke the Sabbath and that his disciples broke the Sabbath by picking and eating grain on it. Hohmann adds that Christ never commanded even one Christian to keep the 10 Commandments or to keep any of the Old Covenant laws. Here is what Revelation 22:18-19 says:

18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Time Line: The Real History Of Adventism

WHAT ADVENTIST KNEW BETWEEN 1840 TO 1863

1840 – A competent but anonymous biblical scholar publishes a book which exposes the severe historical errors and the non-scholarly blunders of approach of William Miller, which he released as *William Miller Overthrown by a Cosmopolite*. His analysis included an expose of the comedy of historical errors Miller put together to make the prophecies of Daniel suit his purposes. A key point here is that this cosmopolite rebuked Miller for trying to set a date for Christ's return when Christ Himself had instructed His followers not to do so. Keep in mind that later Ellen White claimed that God showed her that Miller's study methods were blessed by God and even stated that not one thing about his prophetic charts should be changed. By 1919 Adventists knew that virtually everything about his charts was incredibly wrong. If Ellen White had been a true prophet, would not God have revealed those errors to her and instructed her to rebuke Miller not only for trying to set dates for Christ's return but for teaching nonsense? Unfortunately, Ellen was too busy setting dates herself.

1843 – Jesus does not return as Miller predicted. William Miller discovers that the Karaite Jews use the lunar calendar to determine when special feast days are to be observed, and his prediction centers around the time of the year for a particular Jewish holy day. From his study of the Karaite Sect, he must have learned that these Jews fully understand the impossibilities of determining which day of the week of our fixed calendar is actually an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation. He would have learned that because of this understanding, the Karaites are willing to keep Saturdays as their seventh-day Sabbath according to the fixed calendar because Saturday is as good a guess as any of the other days of the week. Perhaps because of this reason, Miller does not demonstrate any interest in joining the Advent Movement which evolved out of the group of his disappointed followers. Ellen White tells her flock that Miller just could not “see” the Sabbath “truth” for the wonderful thing it was. We believe that Miller wasn't interested in becoming a Sabbath-keeper because he knew that there was only once chance in seven that the Adventists had the “right” day of the week in the first place.

1844 – Jesus doesn't return as Miller had predicted. Later, Ellen White, the Church's prophetess, claims that God put His hand over the Bible truths that would have prevented this mistake in order to test His people. A few Advent believers stick together, searching for the meaning of what has happened. An Advent believer by the name of **Hiram Edison** claims he was shown in a cornfield that the sanctuary that was to be “cleansed” in 1844 was in Heaven— not the Earth. How the sanctuary in Heaven came to be in a condition that it needed cleansing is never explained, but demonstrates how people's critical thinking skills are compromised by a belief system where the desire to “believe” trumps the need to carefully examine those beliefs. The small Advent flock continues to believe that the “door” to salvation is closed to those who rejected the message that Jesus was to return to Earth in 1844. The Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment is adopted by Ellen White from an Advent believer by the name of **O. R. L. Crosier**, who articulated it, promoted it for a short while, and later repudiated it. This brilliant tactic enables Ellen to snatch victory out of the jaws of defeat. Later she will claim to have been shown in vision that William Miller's failed prophetic chart was accurate and was exactly the way God would have it. (*Early Writings*, p. 64, 1882 Edition). Even a cursory reading of William Miller's prophetic interpretations demonstrates the absurdity of his methods. In writing like this, Ellen White insults the integrity and omnipotence of God, Who she makes to look as if He is unable to understand His own Bible and interpret it with any kind of sensibility. God becomes the “false prophet”, and not Ellen White. (For an explanation of William Miller's prophetic methodology, see Dale Ratzlaff's book, *Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists*.) Here is a condensed outline of five of Miller's crazy calculations as furnished by **E. F. Ballenger** in his (circa) 1950 book, *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists*:

MILLER'S FIVE PROPHETIC PERIODS

Miller had a fertile mind in selecting time prophecies that he thought terminated in 1843. He presented at least five.

The 2300 Days -His most important date was the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14, which he started from 457 BC, at the time of the beginning of the 70 weeks of Dan. 9:24.

SDA's retain only the 2300 days of Miller's five periods, even though Mrs. White mentions “periods” (plural) eleven times in *Early Writings*.

The Earth is 6000 Years Old in 1843.

The 7th millennium would begin at that time.

The 2520 Years

“I will punish you seven times more for your sins.” Lev. 26:18. This he interpreted to mean seven prophetic years of 360 days of 2520 literal years. This period had to begin when Manasseh was taken captive to Babylon, in 677 BC.

The 50th Jubilee

The Jews had a special celebration every fiftieth year, called a Jubilee year. The last one they held, according to Miller, was in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, 607 BC. The fiftieth Jubilee of Jubilees would be held in 1843. That is 49 Jubilees had been missed, a period of 2450 years, and the coming of the Lord would introduce this fiftieth Jubilee.

The 1335 Days

Miller had the 1335 days of Dan. 12:12 begin in 508 AD and terminate in 1843.

In *Early Writings* Mrs. White no less than eleven times speaks of “prophetic periods” (plural) as terminating in 1844, yet the denomination retains *only one* of these periods — the 2300 days.

1845 – The Trial of **Israel Damon** takes place, exposing the shocking fanatical behavior of Ellen White and the other members in attendance at a brawling “Pentecostal” meeting that includes men and women in questionable positioning with one another, so-called amazing manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and an arrest of the host of the meeting, Israel Dammon, for disorderly conduct. Ellen White's testimony of the account, which supposedly demonstrated the power of God, totally contradicts that of the police and other witnesses. This level of prevarication suggests that Ellen White cannot be trusted to tell the truth of things. This means that there is no way to know, in any given instance, whether she has told the truth or not. (See also 1986.) Ellen White was actually jailed for unseemly behavior at the Dammon home according to the records of the newspaper in that town.

1845 – **Thomas M. Preble**, a theologian of some importance, published his pro-Sabbatarian tract, entitled **A TRACT, SHOWING THAT THE SEVENTH DAY SHOULD BE OBSERVED AS THE SABBATH, INSTEAD OF THE FIRST DAY, "ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT."** See **1867** when Preble studies his way out of Adventism and publishes a monumental work against the Sabbath, Ellen White, the SDA interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel, and the 1844 sanctuary doctrine. In many ways he was more thorough in his approach than D. M. Canright, who apostatized later in the century and became an outspoken opponent of Adventism. See **1995**. SDA theologian and author, **George W. Knight**, reprinted this tract in his pro-Sabbatarian book on the history of the Sabbath and Adventism.

1846 – Ellen White receives a vision of the planets at Topsham, Maine in the house of a Mr. Curtis. An influential man by the name of **Captain Joseph Bates** is present. She is “shown” that Jupiter has four moons. Then she describes a planet with 8 moons, which Bates took to mean Saturn, and then she was “shown” a vision of Uranus with six moons. This scientific “accuracy” of this vision and the fact that Bates believed Ellen White had no knowledge whatsoever of astronomy convinces him that Ellen's visions are from God. Bates then lends his influential support to the Whites and her visions. (See 1892.)

1847 – Ellen White writes a letter to Joseph Bates affirming her belief that the door to salvation is closed for those who rejected William Miller's 1844 message. This teaching is referred to as the Shut Door Doctrine. Adventist leaders have denied that Mrs. White taught this perverted doctrine this late in her ministry and denied that she ever tried to cover up any evidence that she had believed it this late in her ministry. Then, a General Conference photographer, **Skip Baker**, photographed the letter in **1980** and subsequently published the photos which showed that the bottom of page two had been mutilated so no one could read what had been written there, and subsequent pages had been mutilated to the extent that Ellen's handwriting could

never be read again. What writing remained that was still legible proves that she fully believed in the Shut Door Doctrine up to this point in 1847 and proves absolutely beyond any possible question that she deliberately tried to cover up this fact and lied about the matter. At the same time it shows that the General Conference and White Estate lied about the existence of the letter until it was impossible to deny it. (See **Skip Baker's** article, "**The Secret Letter**," in *Adventist Currents*, July 1984). Photos of this letter are available, as well as the text of the letter at:

[http://www.truthorfables.com/EGW to J.Bates 1847.htm](http://www.truthorfables.com/EGW%20to%20J.Bates%201847.htm)

Gorham, Maine, July 13, 1847

Dear Brother Bates:

As James is at work and sisters are from home thought I would employ myself in writing a line to you. My health is quite good for me. My faith is still strong that that very same Jesus that ascended up into heaven will so come in like manner as He went up, and that very, very soon. I have had many trials of late; discouragement at times has laid so fast hold upon me it seemed impossible to shake it off. But thank God, Satan has not got the victory over me yet, and by the grace of God he never shall. I know and feel my weakness, but I have laid hold upon the strong arm of Jehovah, and I can say today I know that my Redeemer liveth, and if He lives I shall live also. Oh how good it would be to meet with a few of like precious faith to exhort and comfort one another with words of holy cheer from the word of God. The sheep are now scattered, but thank God, they are about to be gathered to a good pasture.

Oh how sweet it will be to meet all the blood-washed throng in the city of our God. 'Tis then we'll sing the song of Moses and the Lamb as we march through the gates into the city, bearing the palms of victory and wearing the crowns of glory.

Brother Bates, you write in a letter to James something about the Bridegroom's coming, as stated in the first published visions. By the letter you would like to know whether I had light on the Bridegroom's coming before I saw it in vision. I can readily answer, No. The Lord showed me the travail of the Advent band and midnight cry in December, but He did not show me the Bridegroom's coming until February following. Perhaps you would like to have me give a statement in relation to both visions. At the time I had the vision of the midnight cry I had given it up in the past and thought it future, as also most of the band had. I know not what time J. Turner got out his paper. I knew he had one out and one was in the house, but I knew not what was in it, for I did not read a word in it. I had been, and still was very sick; I took no interest in reading, for it injured my head and made me nervous. After I had the vision and God gave me light, He bade me deliver it to the band, but I shrank from it. I was young, and I thought they would not receive it from me. I disobeyed the Lord, and instead of remaining at home, where the meeting was to be that night, I got in a sleigh in the morning and rode three or four miles and there I found J. T. He merely inquired how I was and if I was in the way of my duty. I said nothing, for I knew I was not. I passed up chamber and did not see him again for two hours, when he came up, asked if I was to be at meeting that night. I told him, No. He said he wanted to hear my vision and thought it duty for me to go home. I told him I should not. He said no more, but went away. I thought, and told those around me, if I went I should have to come out against his views, thinking he believed with the rest. I had not told any of them what God had shown me, and I did not tell them in what I should cut across his track.

All that day I suffered much in body and mind. It seemed that God had forsaken me entirely. I prayed the Lord if he would give me strength to ride home that night, the first opportunity I would deliver the message He had given me. He did give me strength and I rode home that night. Meeting had been done some time, and not a word was said by any of the family about the meeting.

Very early next morning J. T. called, said he was in haste going out of the city in a short time, and wanted I should tell him all that God had shown me in vision. It was with fear and trembling I told him all. After I had got through he said he had told out the same last evening. I was rejoiced, for I expected he was coming out against me, for all the while I had not heard anyone say what he believed. He said the Lord had sent him to hear me talk the evening before, but as I would not, he meant his children should have the light in some way, so he took him. There were but few out when he talked, so the next meeting I told my vision, and the band, believing my visions from God, received what God bade me to deliver to them.

The view about the Bridegroom's coming I had about the middle of February, 1845.

While in Exeter, Maine in meeting with Israel Dammon, James, and many others, many of them did not believe in a shut door. I suffered much at the commencement of the meeting. Unbelief seemed to be on every hand. There was one sister there that was called very spiritual. She had traveled and been a powerful preacher the most of the time for twenty years. She had been truly a mother in Israel. But a division had risen in the band on the shut door. She had great sympathy, and could not believe the door was shut. (I had known nothing of their differences.) Sister Durben got up to talk. I felt very, very sad. At length my soul seemed to be in an agony, and while she was talking I fell from my chair to the floor. It was then I had a view of Jesus rising from His mediatorial throne and going to the holiest as Bridegroom to receive His kingdom. They were all deeply interested in the view. They all said it was entirely new to them. The Lord worked in mighty power setting the truth home to their hearts. Sister Durben knew what the power of the Lord was, for she had felt it many times; and a short time after I fell she was struck down, and fell to the floor, crying to God to have mercy on her. When I came out of vision, my ears were saluted with Sister Durben's singing and shouting with a loud voice. Most of them received the vision, and were settled upon the shut door. Previous to this I had no light on the coming of the Bridegroom, but had expected him to this earth to deliver His people on the tenth day of the seventh month. I did not hear a lecture or a word in any way relating to the Bridegroom's going to the holiest.

I had but very few privileges in 1842, 3 & 4. My sisters both went to the camp meetings in New Hampshire and Maine, while my health prevented me from going to but one, in Maine. I know the light I received came from God, it was not taught me by man. I knew not how to write so that others could read it till God gave me my visions. I went to school but very little on account of my health. I do not think I went to school a day after I was twelve years old, and did not go then but a few days at a time, when sickness would cause me to take my bed for weeks and sometimes for months. The first I wrote anything that could be called writing was after I had been sick the prayer of faith was put up for me, and healing [here the sheet ends, and the reminder of the letter is gone.]

E. G. White-Letter 3, 1847

Manuscript Release #281—4

1847 – James and Ellen White publish their pamphlet, “**A Word to the Little Flock.**” This paper clearly teaches the doctrine of the Shut Door. Several years later the White's begin to cover-up the fact that they had written in favor of the Shut Door doctrine in this paper. They lie about the contents of the pamphlet until their deception is unmasked by **A. C. Long** in 1882. (See **1882.**) Her “Halo Vision” is included in this publication.

1847 – See **1887** and **1895.** The Seventh-day Adventist Church tacitly concedes that Adventism had been struggling to explain how Colossians 2:14-17 could be harmonized with Sabbatarianism, but without success, for **forty years.** This takes us back to this date of circa 1847. This fact proves that 16 years before the Advent Movement organized into the Seventh-day Adventist Church, its leaders knew that this passage represented a serious road-block to their Sabbath doctrine, according to this 1887 statement of apostate Adventist leader, D. M. Canright:

“But it is argued that as 'the sabbath days' of Col.2:16 'are a shadow of things to come' (verse 17), and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same; for the Sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it cannot point both ways? The Passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Ex.12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Col.2:16, 17. 'Even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.' 1Cor.5:7. So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know.... Paul says plainly that sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of Inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasoning. This is in harmony with Paul's [*ed. Note: Canright seems unaware that scholars acknowledge that they do not know for certain who wrote Hebrews*] argument in Heb.4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. **For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really cannot mean what it says; but there it stands, and mocks all our theories.** The Sabbath is a type, for Inspiration says so.” **D. M. Canright**, *Advocate* of Oct. 1, 1887, (Quoted in the Seventh-day Adventist anti-Canright book, *Replies to Canright*, 1895 edition.)

1848 - The *Present Truth*, a periodical published by James White, teaches the **Shut Door Doctrine**— the belief that salvation was closed to everyone except the Adventists who believed the Advent message in 1844. (See 1950.) Down through the years copies of these original, suppressed writings have surfaced, proving this fact. **E. F. Ballenger** in his circa 1950 publication, *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists*, proves Adventist leaders lied in their attempt to cover-up this fact that proves that Ellen White lied about how long she believed and taught the Shut Door Doctrine.

1850 - Ellen White predicts Jesus will come within a few months. (See *Early Writings*, p. 58.)

1850 – **Sylvester Bliss**, an Adventist pioneer and Millerite at the time, published a book entitled *Analysis of Sacred Chronology*. He presents evidence that demonstrates that the week is not a biblical or natural measurement of time and that the biblical measurement of limited spans of time is the lunar month, divinely appointed at the time of Creation. He states that the derivation of the week is not even really linked to the phases of the moon, but rather to the command of God to work six days and rest one. Editor's Note:

1850 - Ellen White predicts the City of Jerusalem will never be re-built. (The city has since been built way beyond its 1850 boundaries.)

1853 - **Dr. L. B. Cole** publishes his book, *Philosophy of Health*. Years later Dr. Sadler, a physician at Battle Creek Sanitarium and a devoted follower of Ellen White, will note a wealth of similarities between what Dr. Cole said in this book and what she claimed came to her in vision about health. See 1907 for details.

1853 – **J. N. Andrews** attempts to refute an anti-Sabbatarian paper by **O.R.L. Crosier** which dealt with, among other things, the biblical evidence that the Sabbath could not possibly have started in Eden and that the Early Fathers of the Church recognized this fact (J. N. Andrews, “**A Review of the Remarks of O.R.L. Crosier on the Institution, Design and Abolition of the Sabbath**”). Andrews addresses each anti-Sabbatarian argument Crosier presents, and Crosier presents many of the same arguments used by today's anti-Sabbatarian Movement. It is a shocking revelation of how early the pioneer leaders refused to open their hearts to the Gospel truth and were willing to follow the biblical and historical claims of Ellen White over the truths of the Bible.

1854 – In December **H. L. Hastings** publishes *The Great Controversy between God and Man— Its Origin Progress and End*. There is powerful evidence that Ellen White copied large portions of Hastings. The similarities of sequence, subject matter, and theological interpretation are striking. (See 1974 to learn how researchers later discovered her blatant plagiarism of this earlier work.)

1856 – Ellen White predicts that there will be at least one or more persons in the group to which she is speaking who will be alive when Jesus returns. There is nothing “conditional” implied in her words: “I was shown the company present at the

Conference. Said the angel: 'Some food for worms, some subject to the last plagues, some will be alive and remain upon the earth to be translated at the coming of Jesus'" (*Testimonies, Vol. 1*, p. 131). All these people have since died.

1858 – Horace L. Hastings publishes his first edition of *The Great Controversy between God and Man: Its origin, progress, and termination*, (Boston, 1858).

1858 (March 14th) – Ellen White has her so-called **Lovett's Grove Vision**, which she claimed gave her a panoramic vision of the future. Over a period of time, this she would write out sections of it that would evolve into what we know today as *The Great Controversy*.

1858 (March 18th) – James White's publication, *Review*, features a review of H. L. Hastings' book, *The Great Controversy Between God and Man: Its Origin, Progress, and End*. Dirk Anderson of Ellen White Exposed.Com demonstrates that while there was only a little direct copying of exact quotes from Hastings' book, she used an "astonishing" similarity of main themes, topics, and structure. (www.ellenwhiteexposed.com)

1858 – Ellen White publishes *Spiritual Gifts*, which contained the first of her Great Controversy writings.

1858 – James White published Ellen White's book, *The Great Controversy between Christ and His Angels, and Satan and His Angels*, Battle Creek, Michigan. The Introduction is almost entirely devoted to convincing the reader that Ellen White has the gift of prophecy and that Christians should expect and accept spiritual gifts when they present themselves as genuine. James is virtually crediting the entire work to direct, divine inspiration. An Internet search for the 1858 edition of the book will allow you to read it for yourself. (48,000 words)

1858 (CIRCA) – **J. N. Andrews** thinks he sees great similarities between John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Ellen White's account of a vision she "received" in March regarding the appearance of Satan in the context of the battle between good and evil in the Universe. Ellen denies having read Milton's book before she had the vision. Her grandson, **Arthur White**, explained it away like this:

He [J. N. Andrews] told her some of the things she had said were much like a book he had read. Then he asked if she had read *Paradise Lost*. She replied in the negative. He told her that he thought she would be interested in reading it.

Ellen White forgot about the conversation, but a few days later Elder Andrews came to the home with a copy of *Paradise Lost* and offered it to her. She took the book, hardly knowing just what to do with it. She did not open it, but took it into the kitchen and put it up on a high shelf, determined that if there was anything in that book like what God had shown her in vision, she would not read it until after she had written out what the Lord revealed to her. (See *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 4, cited in "Ellen White's Habit," By Douglas Hackleman, *Free Inquiry*, Fall 1984, posted at ellenwhiteexposed.com.)

Back in the early years of Ellen White's ministry it might have been possible to believe such an excuse, especially if critical judgment is suspended. Today, in the context of everything we know about her track record of prevarication, there is little doubt but that she told a bold-faced lie in this case.

1859 – **J. N. Andrews** publishes his first book on the Sabbath, *The History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week* (Battle Creek, Steam Press, 1859). (See the *Wikipedia* article, "J. N. Andrews.") The earliest version we could find of this book was the one published in 1874. Therefore, it is unsafe to speculate about exactly what Andrews may have conceded about the problems with the Sabbath belief model in the original 1859 edition. However, his earlier writings about the Sabbath, such as his 1853 attempt to refute Crosier's anti-Sabbatarian paper, suggest that much of what he conceded in the 1874 edition was most likely conceded in the original 1859 edition. (See 1874.)

1859 – The Advent believers adopt a business model for the financial support of their work based on a concept called "**Systematic Benevolence**." James White develops the concept, and Ellen White is "shown" that it is the model God wants for them. "Systematic Benevolence" does not work very well. If this "testimony" actually did come from God, He apparently must have been mistaken about what His little flock actually needed.

The plan of Systematic Benevolence is pleasing to God. . . God is leading his people in the plan of Systematic Benevolence” (pp. 190, 191). “Systematic Benevolence looks to you as needless; you overlook the fact that it originated with God, whose wisdom is unerring. This plan He ordained” (*Testimonies for the Church*, p. 545, cited in Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*).

CIRCA 1859-1863 – Ellen White predicts that England will join the South and fight against the North in the Civil War. This did not happen. There is nothing conditional in this prophecy, although Adventist apologists try to explain it away by saying that one word in the statement can have an alternative meaning that would change the prophecy into a conditional one. (See *Testimonies*, Vol.1, p.259.)

CIRCA 1859-1863 – Ellen White states the Civil War is being fought, not to abolish slavery, but to preserve it. This is an amazing statement and contradicts all known facts of Civil War history. (See *Testimonies*, Vol. 1, pp. 254,258).

1862 – J. N. Andrews published his book, *The Three Messages of Revelation XIV, 6-12, and particularly The Third Angel's Message and The Two-Horned Beast*. This book contains concepts that Ellen White said came to her by Inspiration, but appear to have been originated by Andrews and later adapted and enhanced by Ellen White for her series of books which eventually came to be known as *The Great Controversy*.

1862 - Ellen White predicts that **Moses Hull**, who is about to leave Adventism, would suffer a terrible catastrophe as a result. The implication is that he will die much sooner than he might expect to, but she couches her words in general terms: “If you proceed in the way you have started, misery and woe are before you. God's hand will arrest you in a manner that will not suit you. His wrath will not slumber.” (*Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. I., pp. 430, 431) Hull leaves Adventism and becomes a Spiritualist. He leads such an immoral life that even the leaders of the Spiritualist movement are anxious to distance themselves from him. He dies at a ripe old age after enjoying the pleasures of sin for many additional decades. (*The Life of Ellen White*, D. M. Canright, Chapter 15 - “Her Prophecies Fail.”) Also, it is highly probable that the influence of Ellen White’s combination of genuine super-natural manifestations during her public visions with her continuous failure to predict and prophecy with 100% accuracy influenced him to view her as a genuine spirit medium. He observed, in all probability, that spirit mediums do not expect their spirit guides to give them the right answers all the time.

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW

1863-1888

Immediately after the founding of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the Christian community reacted to the claims of Adventism that Sunday-keepers were apostate sinners. Ellen White’s representation of Sunday-observing churches as evil and ignorant of the facts of the Sabbath-Sunday issue is a false one. By 1867, just four years after the denomination organizes, a well-respected biblical scholar who had joined the ranks of Adventism published a volume of nearly 500 pages to refute nearly every aspect of the Church’s biblical and historical errors. Two Conference leaders apostatized in 1866 and published a volume of evidence that documented the deceptions and false visions of Ellen White and disproved some of the doctrines she taught. Meanwhile, Ellen White fumbles her prophetic predictions so many times and says so many absurd things that many thinking Adventists are catching on to her fraudulent claims very quickly. By 1887, a top-ranking SDA leader, D. M. Canright, left the inner circle of Adventist leadership and a close association with Ellen White to be one of the worst critics of Adventism the Christian world would enjoy for a long time. See **1887**.

1863 – The Seventh-day Adventist Church officially organizes. By this time it has been a while since the group of faithful Adventist believers split into two groups over the issue of the Shut Door Doctrine. The group that held on to the Shut Door Doctrine for a number of additional years was the one that organized into the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The other group, rejecting the Shut Door Doctrine almost immediately, organized into the **Church Of God Seventh-day**. Later a dissident member split away from the Church of God Seventh-day and started The Radio (later “Worldwide”) Church of God. This developmental history makes the Seventh-day Adventist Church and The Worldwide Church of God “sister churches.” A study of the early works of Advent Movement pioneer church historian and Sabbath scholar, J. N. Andrews, demonstrates that by 1863 Adventist leaders were already acquainted with most of the anti-Sabbatarian arguments D. M. Canright confronted them with in the late 1880’s. Almost 100 years later, Canright was validated in one way or another by Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in the late 1970’s.

1863 – Ellen White condemns the reform dress in *Testimonies Vol. 1*, pp. 421,422. In 1863, claiming God as her authority, she said that dresses should "clear the filth of the streets by an inch or two", and "Christians should not take pains to make themselves a gazing stock by dressing differently from the world."

Editor's note: The following information on Dr. Jackson and Ellen White comes from Dirk Anderson's article, "Mrs. White's Health Visions: Was it God or Dr. Jackson?" Anderson based his research on a collection of Ellen White letters that were not released by the White Estate until the 1980's and material taken from the chapter, "The Dansville Days", *Prophetess of Health* pp. 77-101, by **Ronald Numbers**, Ph.D. Every date and accompanying entry is supported by documentation from either these hitherto unreleased letters or her very early published writings.

1863 (JANUARY) – The White's sons contract diphtheria. At this time the White's become familiar with Dr. Jackson's water treatment principles.

1863 (FEBRUARY) - James White reprints an article of Dr. Jackson's on February 17, 1863.

1863 (JUNE) – James White writes to Dr. Jackson requesting some of his books.

1863 (JUNE) – Ellen White has her health reform "vision."

1863 (AUGUST) - On August 13, 1863, one month before James supposedly had any knowledge of the operations and teachings at Dr. Jackson's Danville health resort, Dr. Jackson wrote him apologizing for his long delay in replying to James' request for information about his books. It appears that James had written Jackson sometime in June, for in December of 1864 his letter stated that eighteen months earlier (which would have been June 1863) he had sent off to Dansville for some of their books.

1863 (SEPTEMBER) – Ellen claims that this month is the first time James has heard of Dr. Jackson.

1864 (JUNE) – Ellen begins publishing *How to Live* articles– very similar to a series by Dr. Jackson.

1864 (AUGUST) – The Whites spend three weeks on a fact-finding mission to Dr. Jackson's clinic in Danville, New York. Despite this visit, Ellen claimed that her associations with Dr. Jackson did not have anything to do with her views on health, which came from God in vision. Ellen White, in Letter 6, 1864, p. 1. (To Brother and Sister Lockwood, September, 1864.), she made this astonishing claim:

"That which I have written in regard to health was not taken from books or papers. As I related the things which I had been shown to others, the question was asked, 'Have you seen the paper, *The Laws of Life* or the *Water Cure Journal*?' I told them 'No, I had not seen either of the papers.' Said they, 'What you have seen agrees very much with their teachings?' I talked freely with Dr. Lay and many others upon the things which had been shown me in reference to health. I had never seen a paper treating upon health. After the vision was given me, my husband was aroused upon the health question. **He obtained books, upon our eastern journey, but I would not read them. My view was clear, and I did not want to read anything until I had fully completed my books. My views were written independent of books or of the opinions of others.**

1864 (AUGUST) – Ellen and James White have Dr. Jackson do phrenology readings on their boys and write about how they were impressed with the accuracy of his readings. A couple of years earlier, she had denounced phrenology as being from the devil:

"I think Dr. Jackson gave an accurate account of the disposition and organization of our children. He pronounces Willie's head to be one of the best that has ever come under his observation. He gave a good description of Edson's character and peculiarities." [Ellen White, Letter 6, 1864, p. 1. (To Brother and Sister Lockwood, September, 1864.)]

1864 – H. L. Hastings publishes an up-dated edition of *The Great Controversy between God and Man: Its origin, progress, and Termination*.

1864 - Ellen White changes her mind about the Reform Dress, "not only to distinguish them from the world, but because a reform dress is essential to physical and mental health". Max Chugg, author of "*The Truth about the White Lie Refuted*," makes this observation:

Mrs. White's prescribed dress was similar to one worn by Dr. Harriet Austin from Dr. Jackson's clinic. Instead of the previously prescribed "inch or two", the hem was nine inches from the floor. It was extremely unpopular with those condemned to wear it because people stopped, stared, and mocked. One woman spoke of hiding in shops to avoid the troops of boys who followed her. Even F. D. Nichol admits that those who wore the dress were subjected to ridicule. But protests to Mrs. White brought back the reply that "I have done my duty, I have borne my testimony, and those who have heard me and read what I have written, must bear the responsibility of receiving or rejecting the light given. If they choose to venture to be forgetful hearers, and not doers of the work, they run their own risk, and will be accountable to God." *Testimonies Vol. 1*, page 523.

1864 – Volumes III and IV of *Spiritual Gifts* is published, which expands on the 1858 material on the subject of the Great Controversy.

1865 – Robert Cox, a contemporary of J. N. Andrews and Ellen G. White, publishes his massive, two-volume *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*. This set, available to theologians both then and now, furnishes the student of the Bible with a compilation of every Bible text that relates in any way to the Sabbath question and everything of significance that had ever been written about the Sabbath by Jewish rabbis, the Early Fathers, the Reformers, and all the significant biblical scholars and theologians, up through 1865. His book presents a massive number of quotes from writings on the Sabbath-Sunday question from both pro-Sabbatarian writers and anti-Sabbatarian writers, along with the author's commentary along the way. This body of research included an explanation of the following barriers to Sabbatarianism: (1) The concept of circumcision is an impossible barrier to Sabbatarianism. (2) Colossians 2:14-17. (3) No Sabbath-keeping during or before the Exodus. (4) Sabbath a sign between God and Israel only to distinguish Israel from all the other peoples of the world. (5) The history of the early church proves that Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping on biblical grounds and that the Catholic Church could not possibly have "changed the Sabbath."

1866 – Just three years after the Church officially organizes, two Iowa Conference leaders, Snook and Brinkerhoff, apostatize and expose a whole string of Ellen White's failed prophecies and doctrinal absurdities in their book, *The Visions of E. G. White Not of God*. At this early date these SDA leaders did not seem to know that Ellen White was a plagiarist. They document the fact that Ellen White continued to teach the **Shut Door Doctrine** for a lot longer than the Church would admit. These authors prove that Ellen and James White covered up the fact that they had taught the Shut Door Doctrine for several more years than they would admit, and they discuss her failed prophecies. You can access their book at: truthorfables.com/Visions_of_%20EGW_by_Snook_&_Brinkerhoff.htm

1867 – Thomas Preble, having been a convert to Adventism for only four years, apostatizes and publishes an extensive scholarly work debunking the Adventism he once espoused. He utilizes many of the arguments that the anti-Sabbatarians of today have collected to debunk not only the Sabbatarian belief model, but to expose the seemingly dishonest twisting of historical facts J. N. Andrews did to make the historical record look like the Roman Catholic Church had changed the Sabbath. He devotes a large portion of his book to demonstrate conclusively that the Waldenses never kept the Jewish Sabbath, proving that this claim was based on a misunderstanding of the terminology early Christian writers used when discussing the Sabbath festival and the "Christian Sabbath," or Sunday. He devoted a section of his book to refute Andrew's book, *History of the Sabbath* point by point. He devoted another section to showing the biblical problems with an early Sabbatarian publication, "**Both Sides**," which purported to give a fair presentation of both the Sabbatarian and anti-Sabbatarian points of view. The errors of Andrews exposed by Preble appear to be so embarrassing that it is remarkable that Andrews did not cease to make his fantastic claims ever after. The problem appears to be that that Andrews had more faith in the prophetic claims of Ellen White than he did in the well-respected historical writings of the last 2,000 years. Cross reference also to **1845**, the year Preble published a paper in favor of Sabbatarianism.

1867 – Adventist leaders plan to construct a building in Battle Creek for the new Health Reform Institute (Sanitarium) and need God’s blessing on the project. They approach Ellen White, who then has a vision. Ellen says:

“Here, I was shown, was a worthy enterprise for God’s people to engage in. Other people should have an institution of their own. Especially should those who have means to invest in this enterprise.” (*Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 1*, pp. 492,494)

James White, her husband, is away at the time. When he returns to Battle Creek, he is enraged because he had not been consulted. The first story of the building is already completed. He has the building dismantled and put up again according to his design at a loss of \$11,000, which in today’s terms would represent the squandering of over \$1,000,000. (This event, but not the financial equivalent, cited in Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*) After her husband’s return, James demands another testimony to repudiate the first one. Here is that second “testimony.”

“What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it. . . They [the officials at Battle Creek] therefore wrote to me that the influence of my testimony in regard to the institute was needed immediately to move the brethren upon the subject. Under these circumstances I yielded my judgment to that of others, and wrote what appeared in No. 11 in regard to the Health Institute. . . In this I did wrong.” (*Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 1*, p. 563)

It is evident that James White, her own husband, knew that her visions were not from God, or he would not have dared to go against what he otherwise would have considered to be the revealed will of God.

1868 – **James White** claims that his wife’s books contain many things that are not in any other books and presents this as evidence that her visions are inspired. **Douglas Hackleman** in his article, “**Ellen White’s Habit,**” has the following observations about this outrageous claim:

James White, who served as his wife’s editor most of the time until his death in 1881, also made claims and denials. In his autobiographical *Life Incidents* (published by Steam Press, Battle Creek Michigan, in 1868) he argued that Ellen’s writings contained “many things... which cannot be found in other books” (p. 328). In his next sentence James provides as an example “her favorite theme, God in nature.” But Mrs. White’s best-known passage on God in nature is a close paraphrase of an apologetic digression against naturalism from a sermon by nineteenth-century Anglican clergyman Henry Melville.

James White dug a deeper hole for himself and Ellen in his next paragraph:

If commentators and theological writer generally had seen these gems of thought...and had been brought out in print, all ministers in the land could have read them. These men gather thoughts from books, and as Mrs. W. has written and spoken a hundred things, as they are beautiful and harmonious, which cannot be found in the writings of others, they are new to the most intelligent readers and hearers. . . . She could not have learned from books, from the fact that they do not contain such thoughts. [p. 328, 329]. *Life Sketches*, (1880 ed.), pp. 325-329. For whatever reason, when *Life Sketches* was reprinted in 1888, James White’s statement was not reprinted. (This source information is from the EGW Estate.)

The discovery in recent years by a variety of Adventist researchers that Ellen White and her editorial assistants wove the writings of scores of authors into testimonies, articles, and books published over her byline calls into question the integrity of both Ellen and James White. The White Estate recently made available for purchase on request a document comparing eighty-five pages of parallel passages between Mrs. White and **Henry Melville** alone.

1868 – James White publishes *Life Incidents*, which discussed the United States in Bible prophecy, the mark of the beast, and the image to the beast. Dirk Anderson, former SDA and Ellen White fraud expert, notes that the idea that Sunday observance as the Mark of the Beast was first advocated by Joseph Bates in the 1840’s. Additionally he notes that much of the

material from *Life Incidents* was borrowed from J. N. Andrews' book, *The Messages of Revelation XIV, 6-12 and Particularly the Third Angel's Message and The Two-Horned Beast*. Here we have good evidence that Ellen White's source for these concepts in her book, *The Great Controversy*, came from these earlier sources, rather from visions from God.

1868 - Uriah Smith seeks to accomplish damage control for Ellen White by publishing his book, ***Visions of Mrs. E. G. White—Manifestations of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures*** (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1868). Even at this early date there is wide-spread suspicion that the Whites are covering up the fact that in one of her earliest visions she was supposedly shown the “truth” of the Shut Door Doctrine by God. Later research by the critics of E. G. White have conclusively demonstrated that it is highly probable that the account of the **Camden Vision** which teaches the **Shut Door Doctrine** is authentic, despite the fact that the only record of this vision was made by a witness who later became one of her critics. The White Estate does not have anything written by Ellen White herself about this vision. Since Ellen White is now known to have tried to cover her tracks in regard to the Shut Door issue, it would be no surprise that she kept no record of this early vision.

1869 – **Dr. William Russell** examines Ellen White and determines that her visions are “the result of a diseased organization or condition of the brain or nervous system.” (See Canright, ***Life of Mrs. E. G. White.***) Note that the White Estate has done a good job of discrediting the credentials of this doctor. However, from everything we now know about Ellen White's behavior, it appears that whatever the case may be, Dr. Russell was able to diagnose her properly even if his medical training was received informally.

1870 – **H. E. Carver** publishes his book, ***Mrs. White's Claim to Divine Inspiration Examined***, describing among other stumbling blocks to his faith, “two instances in which she claimed to see in vision things that I had communicated to her myself.” (Source: Douglas Hackleman, “**Ellen White's Habit**,” *Free Inquiry*, Fall, 1984.)

1873 – The Church publishes a revised edition of J. N. Andrews' classic, ***History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week***. In this edition, Andrews quotes a respected very early historian, **Joachim Neander** (1650–1680):

Now let us read what Neander, the most distinguished of church historians, says of this apostolic authority for Sunday observance:

“The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin. (Emphasis by authors)

Note that while it is possible that this same quote is in his original 1859 edition of this book, we know for certain that Adventist leaders knew 14-15 years before the Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1887-1889 that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance hundreds of years before there was a Roman Catholic Church or a pope. It is clear that Canright was not telling them very much that they did not know.

For the complete text of the 1873 edition of Andrews' book, go to the *Wikipedia* article, “J.N. Andrews,” and click on the link to the book. You must have the Djvu Reader to view it, which you can down-load free from the Djvu website. Or, paste the following link in your web browser and go directly to it:

http://www.archive.org/stream/historyofsabba00andr/historyofsabba00andr_djvu.txt

1873 - The Church publishes ***Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day*** by **Elder J. N. Andrews** (Steam Press, Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1873). Andrews now expands his original 1859 defense of the Sabbath with this book. As before, he discusses a wide variety of early Christian writers who documented the fact that Christians were observing Sunday very early in the history of the Early Church. By now it should be perfectly clear to Andrews that Ellen White lied about being shown by God in vision that the Roman Catholic Church “changed the day” because he has a wealth of evidence that the phenomenon of Sunday observance by Christians happened hundreds of years before there was a real Roman Catholic Church and a real pope whose authority was sufficient to spread

beyond the city of Rome itself. Again, we see that Adventist leaders did not need **D. M. Canright** to confront them with all this evidence during the late 1880's. Since Andrews published his first history of the Sabbath in 1859, it is apparent that the early leaders of the Advent Movement knew many of these same things for several years before the Seventh-day Adventist Church formally organized in 1863. By this year, 1873, they knew enough about the impossibilities of their biblical and historical teaching could not possibly be as Ellen White claimed God had showed her thanks to the work of Snook and Brinkerhoff in their 1966 book, *The Visions of E. G. White Not of God*, and the work of Thomas Preble's 1867 book, *The First Day Sabbath Proved*.

1874 – Isaac Welcome publishes his *History of the Second Adventist Message*. This several volume set documents the strange fanaticism of the Whites, and their stand, later denied by them, on the Shut Door Doctrine plus the additional covering up by the Whites of a number of their earlier theologically errant statements. (A Google search will provide extensive sections of this book for your study, and it is available from Andrews University in a reproduction as well, indicated by one of the Google links.)

1875 – Mrs. White says God changed His mind again about the reform dress. Again, Max Chugg, author of *"The Truth about the White Lie Refuted,"* makes this observation:

Eight years later God again changed his mind, and Mrs. White wrote in 1875 "As our sisters would not generally accept the reform dress as it should be worn, another less objectionable style is now presented" *Testimonies Vol. IV*, p. 640. This raises the obvious question, why did God demand that an objectionable dress should be worn? After all, God's "prophet" specifically stated that people should not make themselves a gazing stock. But if you go out in public, wearing clothing of objectionable appearance, you automatically become a gazing stock, as those unfortunate women who took their prophet's counsel quickly discovered.

[Editorial: Taking the side of the Adventist here, we would say that the dress was not objectionable to God but to women. For example, when Lot was to flee Sodom, he was supposed go to the mountain but he objected. He pleaded with God for a destination that was less objectionable to him and God consented. The destination was not objectionable to God but to Lot and yet God "worked with him" in this situation. Similarly, God allowed divorce under the law because of the hardness of men's hearts even though it was not what He really wanted. Again, He worked with them.

Some questions that I **would** ask those who actually believe that God told Ellen what style of dress all the sisters should wear:

In the first 6,000 or so years of God's dealings with man, when did He ever feel the need to dictate the **specifics** of a dress code for women through a prophet?

Why, at the end of the ages, did He feel it is necessary to "show" a "prophet" just exactly what style of dress women should wear, or what exact length it should be in regards to the ground?

What style of dress did God prefer before the reform dress? Did He tell anyone or were the women supposed to guess?

Modesty is always to be observed but does modesty know only one form?

Is it possible that God has always allowed a variety of dress among His daughters as long as they stay within the parameters of modesty and their clothing befits a meek and quiet spirit?

If God really wanted all Adventist women to wear the reform dress then would you agree that God's will was that women should wear uniforms?

Why don't Adventist women wear uniforms today?

“For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.”

Because the prominent critic of this dress was Canright, Nichol tries to argue that the descriptions of the dress are probably wrong, and that Canright must be dogmatic with his descriptions or his argument would collapse. Sadly for Nichols, a photo of Harriet Austin in her ridiculous dress has been found. It agrees exactly with Canright's description.

1876 – **Ellen White** predicts that Swedish publishing house manager, **Charles Lee**, who was very ill, would live. He died a few days later.

1876 – The “**Systematic Benevolence**” financial model is discarded in favor of the 10% model developed by D. M. Canright. Ellen White is “shown” in vision that this is the method God wants to support His little flock, which is growing larger. If Ellen White’s testimony were really from God, it would appear that God did not know what was best for Seventh-day Adventists, and He had to learn by experience what His people really needed. Time after time, Ellen’s claim that God has shown her things that He did not show her impinge on God’s character and power, making Him look incompetent. This is a form of White collar blasphemy that has occurred over and over up until this point and will continue to happen as long as Ellen White lives. **Robert Sanders** writes:

Dudley M. Canright: in a series of articles in 1876, **emphasized Malachi 3:8-11** as “the Bible plan of supporting the Ministry.” **He urged Adventists to adopt this plan** to glorify God....“*R&H, February 17, 1876, p.50, 51*”, *see also Spectrum 1986, Adventist Tithing— the Untold Story, p. 139.* [Cited in Sanders, “Tithing Not a Law for Christians,” posted at his website, <http://www.truthorfables.com/Tithing.htm>]

1881 - Ellen White's dead husband is sent to Ellen by “God” in a super-real dream to give her counsel and to predict her future. (Letter 17, 1881, pp. 2-4, to W. C. White, September 12, 1881.) Her dead husband tells her that she can do more with her pen than with her voice. She certainly did make a lot of money by selling her books.

1882 – **Ellen White** publishes a book called **Early Writings**, which claims to be a reprint of her first writings, including the pamphlet, “**A Word to the Little Flock.**” The Whites had claimed that their new book contained no significant changes to the text and no deletions. (See Canright, **Life of Mrs. E. G. White.**)

1882 – SDA pastor **A. C. Long**, who had retained a copy of “**A Word to the Little Flock**” from years ago, publishes a pamphlet entitled “**Comparison of the Early Writings of Mrs. White with Later Publications.**” In this 16-page tract, he places the original text alongside of the altered new text, proving that Ellen White had deleted all the key words and phrases that would have betrayed that she taught the **Shut Door Doctrine** long after she claimed to have abandoned it. Again, we see a deceitful, lying prophet who claims to be directly inspired by God. (See Canright, **Life of Mrs. E. G. White.**)

1882 – **Ellen White** is “shown” that the wrong man committed a great mistake. Here is the account from D. M. Canright’s book, **Life of Mrs. E. G. White:**

Rebuked the Wrong Man

About the year 1882, two Adventist ministers, E. P. Daniels and E. R. Jones, were laboring together in Michigan. In giving a health talk one of them had made some remarks quite offensive to aesthetic tastes.

Not long afterward Elder Daniels received a testimony from Mrs. White, rebuking him for the offense, which she said took place at Parma, Michigan. But, as the event turned out, she rebuked the wrong man, and the incident did not occur at Parma, but at another place.

Review and Herald Supplement, Aug 14, 1883:

Eld. E. P. Daniel's Reply.

In the *Advocate Extra*, Prof. McLearn tells a little story which he claims to have heard from a "prominent minister in the cars [railroad cars?]" to the effect that Mrs. White met Eld. E. P. Daniels, and said, "Bro. Daniels, I have a Testimony for you. The Lord has shown me that you said things, and acted in a manner, unbecoming a Christian minister, when you preached in Parma, Mich.;" and that Bro. Daniels replied, "You must be mistaken: for I never preached in Parma in my life."

This, of course, is a very nice little story for our opposers to use; and they have a great fondness for such, and take no end of pains to circulate them. This is just about as true as many others they circulate. It is but justice to Bro. Daniels that he should have a chance to reply to it. The following from his pen is to the point. G. I. B. [George I. Butler, who served as a president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.]

Ed. Note: Please keep in mind that if **E. P. Daniels** is completely honest here, Ellen White is innocent of any real wrong-doing. The key, here, is whether or not Ellen labeled her rebuke to him as a "testimony." Ellen White and her followers understood that any time she labeled any counsel she gave as a "testimony," it was not her own understanding, but that it was shown to her by a supernatural source. It is the opinion of your authors that it is very difficult to know what really happened as there are motives for distorting the story on both sides. Is E. P. Daniels covering for Mrs. White? We caution our readers to look at the general trend of Ellen White's problems rather than placing too much confidence in isolated incidents in cases where her critics may have been in error, or worse yet, deliberately put an unflattering slant that should not have been given to their report. On the other hand, the Church had every possible reason to protect Ellen White from damaging evidence that she was a false prophet. In this case, only God knows what actually happened:

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

The story is in circulation that at an audience granted me by Mrs. White, I was informed by her that in a temperance lecture given by me in the village of Parma. I had used language unbecoming a Christian minister, and departed myself in a manner disgraceful to the pulpit, and that God had shown this to her in vision, all of which I then and there denied. This story I deny publicly, as I have several times already done in private. Mrs. White never told me that she had ever seen anything of this kind in vision, either about me or anyone else. Through a misunderstanding, I happened to be the person rebuked, in the place of the one for whom the rebuke was intended, and who justly merited it.

Were all the facts known, it would leave no room for even the slightest disrespect for the motives that influenced her, as she had, as she supposed, the best of reasons for believing that her informant had told her the truth. And indeed he had, but had made a mistake in the name of the person; all that she had said was true of another, though the incident did not occur at Parma. More than this, Mrs. White told me plainly that this report came from a gentleman whose acquaintance they had formed when traveling in the West.

Those who fight against Mrs. White and spiritual gifts would do well to forge their weapons of something more substantial than flying reports.

E. P. DANIELS,

Rankin Post Office,

July 25, 1888. Genesee Co., Mich.

What may be seen from the above information from both her supporters and opposers is that by this time Ellen had made enough mistakes to raise concerns and questions about her claim to be divinely led. Furthermore, E. P. Daniels may have fudged on this assessment of the problem by ignoring the fact that what he typically would have received from Ellen White was a “testimony.” By its very definition, a testimony was a message sent to someone with a message from God through His human Messenger, Ellen White. Ellen White would not have to spell out the fact that God Himself had told her that he was the offending person in the content of the letter for Daniels to know that he was being directly rebuked by God. One might also ask *when* Ellen White told him that the report came from a particular person. Is that what she wrote in the letter or testimony, or is that how she explained her mistake to him later? If Daniels had intended to convey the fact that Ellen White had told him she got the information from a human being in the letter or testimony, he certainly could have worded his statement more clearly.

1883 - Ellen White publishes a book for which she claimed divine inspiration— ***Sketches from the Life of Paul***. Later it was discovered to have been lifted almost entirely from a book published earlier in England. The point is that Ellen White *LIED* about her source for the book. **Compared to her lying, the issue of plagiarism is a much less serious evil.** (See ***The Life of Ellen White— Seventh-day Adventist Prophet— Her False Claims Refuted***, by D. M. Canright, Chapter 10 - “A Great Plagiarist”).

1883 – Uriah Smith in a letter dated March 22nd, 1883 reveals that he does not believe in the visions of Ellen White. The “stunners” he is talking about refer to a situation where Ellen White, who sought a reputation as one to whom God reveals the secret sins of others, knew nothing about the fact that the denomination’s foremost evangelist was having sexual relationships with numerous women in one of the SDA churches on the East Coast. She had stayed in the home of this prominent minister and his wife when she visited his community. **E. F. Ballenger** tells the story in his circa 1950 book, ***Facts about Seventh-day Adventists***:

Elder Uriah Smith was connected with the editorial staff of the RH for fifty years, most of the time as editor in chief. His works on the prophecies are still considered standard in the denomination.

In a letter written March 22, 1883, he said:

It seems to me that the Testimonies, practically, have come into that shape, that it is not of any use to try to defend the erroneous claims that are now put forth for them.... Bro. Littlejohn has preached on the subject here treating it mostly from a theoretical standpoint. But that does not touch the question at issue among us at all. I presume you noticed in the Review of March 13, Bro. Waggoner's extinguisher of the Mormon gifts. But, if the same reasoning will not apply somewhat to our own experience, I cannot see straight. The cases of F----, C----, and S--- S--- are stunners to me.

If all the brethren were willing to investigate this matter candidly and broadly, I believe some consistent common ground for all to stand upon could be found. But some, of the rule or ruin spirit, are so dogmatical and stubborn that I suppose that any effort in that direction would only lead to a rupture of the body.

Elder Smith was editor of the *Review and Herald*, the official periodical of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, for thirty years before he discovered that any omissions had been made from the early visions in ***Early Writings***. We have a letter of his stating this fact.

The three people referred to above were all prominent workers in the Advent cause, associated with James White and his wife, but were very immoral in their conduct; yet Mrs. White never knew of their immorality until the women who were involved confessed their sin. The fact that she did not know of their vileness was a “stunner” to Elder Smith. It is a sad fact that Elder Smith after writing these things stultified his conscience and openly maintained his defense of the idea that Ellen White was inspired of God.

1884 – Ellen White further expands her *Great Controversy* material from 1858 and 1864 and re-names the book, *The Spirit of Prophecy, v. 4: The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan From the Destruction of Jerusalem, to the End of the Controversy* (136,700 words).

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW: 1887-1919

D. M. Canright apostatizes, leaving the inner circle of SDA leadership and a close connection with the Whites. He publishes, over the years that follow, a series of books that document the fraudulent prophetic claims of Ellen White, the biblical impossibilities of Sabbatarianism, and the myth that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. He utilizes almost all of the anti-Sabbatarian arguments that anti-Sabbatarian writers use today. He makes little headway against the denomination. He is one of the first anti-SDA writers to clearly articulate and document the incessant plagiarism of Ellen White. However, we believe that the combination of the Canright Crisis, the Chicago Buildings Fiasco, and the prophetic blunders she made between the Chicago Buildings and her death in 1915 that combined to create an atmosphere of doubt about Ellen White that led delegates of the 1919 Bible Conference who attended the secret session on the prophetic claims of Ellen White to boldly concede that Ellen White was a fraud and to consider whether the denomination should publically renounce her or initiate a cover-up plan. By failure to come to a clear choice of action, the delegates instituted a cover-up.

1887 – A powerful SDA leader, **D. M. Canright**, apostatizes from the Church and begins writing articles and papers against Adventism, including proof from historical and biblical sources that the Sabbath doctrine is impossible. By this time Canright is well aware of Ellen White's plagiarism, in addition to her failed prophecies and aberrant teachings.

1887 – **J. N. Andrews** publishes a revised edition of his book on the Sabbath, entitled *History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week* (Review and Herald). He quotes Sylvester Bliss's statement that the week is not a natural or a biblical measurement of time and that the biblical measure of time is the lunar month, appointed to measure human time from the time of Creation. This comment adds to the agitation over the lunar calendar issue that has seemed to be ever-present in the background of Adventism. **Editor's Note:** The fatal implications for the idea that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath are very clear once the lunar calendar is properly understood. It is especially threatening to Sabbatarians because it is considered to be a genuinely moral issue, and to follow the truth about the biblical way the Sabbath is to be kept would create mass confusion within Adventism, which, in turn, would result in huge financial disaster that would cause a lot of workers employed by the Seventh-day Adventist Church to lose their jobs.

1887 (CIRCA) - Alonzo T. Jones writes a scathing rebuttal of the **lunar calendar** concept that according to editors at the web-site of the 4 Angels Publications was "more of an impassioned attack than a well-reasoned, logical refutation addressing the various evidences supporting the concept."

1888 – Ellen White expands her *Great Controversy* material from 1858, 1864, and 1884, and changed the name of the book to *The Great Controversy*. Ellen White's introduction claims strong direct, divine guidance in the book's preparation:

Through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the scenes of the long-continued conflict between good and evil have been opened to the writer of these pages. From time to time I have been permitted to behold the working, in different ages, of the great controversy between Christ, the Prince of life, the author of our salvation, and Satan, the prince of evil, the author of sin, the first transgressor of God's holy law.

1888 – Fearing that Canright was about to release an anti-Sabbatarianism, anti-Adventist book soon, Adventist leaders attempt to beat him to the draw by publishing *Replies To Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists*. This action turns out to have been unwise, since the following year Canright was able to refute their poorly constructed arguments and reference them by the Adventist book's page numbers.

1889 – Arch Apostate, **D. M. Canright**, publishes his classic ***Seventh-day Adventism Renounced***. He presents encyclopedic evidence from reliable scholarly sources that prove Sabbatarianism is biblically and historically impossible. He refutes the SDA leadership point-by-point and page number by page number, referencing the Church's 1888 book, ***Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists***.

1889 - The Healdsburg, California *Enterprise* publishes a remarkable story, March 20, 1889, exposing Ellen White's plagiarism. The article compares five passages from her writings side by side with the passages from the authors she had copied. The reporter concludes that she is, indeed, a plagiarist. This is an interesting fact, since Adventist leaders try to say that back in Ellen White's day there was no well-defined concept of what constituted plagiarism. (You can do an Internet search to read the article from the *California Enterprise* for yourself.)

1890 – MARCH 7 - The General Conference holds a meeting behind closed doors to discuss a new religious liberty publication at **Salamanca, New York**. She deceives the participants into believing that she knew in advance about the bad things they were doing. Careful research in the 1980's conducted by Douglas Hackleman proves that there was ample opportunity for her to glean the information from human sources prior to the meeting and that she altered the dates in her personal diary to cover her tracks. He puts the events surrounding this incident together from a variety of sources, much as we did to get to the bottom of the Chicago Buildings Vision, and his findings are extremely interesting. See Chapter 15 for details.

1892 – Astronomer Bernard at Lick Observatory discovers the 5th moon of Jupiter, proving that the source of Ellen White's visions must have been from a god who didn't remember what he or she had done when our solar system was created. (See also **1905**.)

1892 – Elder **J. N. Loughborough** publishes ***Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists***. His publishers have the audacity to change the mention of Ellen White's words in regard to the moons of Jupiter to, "I see *eight* moons." This is absolute proof that the author and his publishers knew Ellen White was a fraud. Their actions are inexcusable. If the Church were not a religious business, their false "product" claims would be illegal. (See **1905**.)

1892 – In his 1892 book, ***Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists***, **J. N. Loughborough** exalts Ellen White's predictions about the Civil War as evidence that her visions are from God without bothering to mention the fact that she predicted that England would fight with the South against the North. Instead he tells the story of how at a certain believer's home, she predicted that the sons of some of the people present in that room would die in battle. In a real history, Loughborough would have had no choice but to give the account of Ellen White's disastrous prognostications in regard to England joining the South to fight against the North, as well as other Civil War predictions and comments that were incredibly inaccurate and absurd. It is no wonder that the *Wikipedia* article on Adventist Studies says that Loughborough's book is now regarded as down-right dishonest Adventist propaganda, rather than genuine history (**Roelf J. Poehler**, unpublished paper on the shut-door era. Quoted in "**Early Adventures in Maine**", letter to the editor by **Donald E. Casebolt**, *Spectrum* 18:2 [1987], p. 63). To read Loughborough's 1892 book, you must down-load the Djvu reader from Lizard Technologies and then go to this SDA website: adventistarchives.org/docs/RP/RiseAndProgress/index.djvu

1893 – The General Conference exiles Ellen White to Australia. From what the 1919 Bible Conference minutes later reveal about what Adventist leaders knew about her, and from what we now know they knew about her as early as **1863** from the paper by **Snook and Brinkerhoff**, there is circumstantial evidence that the Church was aware of the fact that their prophetess was causing a lot of trouble for Adventism at the time. According to **Arthur L. White**, (***Ellen G. White: The Australian Years***, Review & Herald, 1983, p. 16), she sailed September 9, 1891. [The facts for this event, but not the interpretation of this incident, came from the paper, "**When the Visions Led: an Adventist Anomaly**," by **Douglas Hackleman**, March 25, 2006.]

1895 - The Church publishes a more complete version of ***Replies to Canright***. The book's contributors reference Canright's 1889 book by the page number. This publication proves SDA leaders had to know that their Sabbatarian arguments were impossible. The best they are able to do is to obfuscate the issue in hopes that their readers will lose their focus on the importance of what Canright proved. They grapple poorly with the fact that the first Christian writers documented the extensive adoption of Sunday observance by Christians before the end of the First Century and attempt to use this evidence, which is highly damaging to their own position, as evidence that their preconceived notion of an "apostasy" began very early. They fail to acknowledge the fact that the angel "lied" to Ellen White about the Roman Catholic Church "changing the day," since they

were trying to explain away proof that Christians were not keeping the Sabbath hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Catholic Church. Their attempted rebuttal of Canright on Colossians 2:14-17 is proven to be equally reprehensible. It does not address Canright's central point at all, and their quotation of Canright's exact words from his 1889 book prove that these early Adventist leaders had been struggling, without success, to explain away this devastating passage from Paul's writings from almost the very beginning of the Advent movement.

1895 (CIRCA) – J. H. Wierts, a young Adventist pastor at this time, learned from his Hebrew teachers, who were Jewish rabbis, that the Karaite Jews used the lunar calendar to determine when their holy days would fall. He discovered that William Miller had used the lunar calendar to “correct” one of errors in his calculations for determining the exact date for the Second Coming of Christ. He finds evidence that Ancient Israel probably used this lunar calendar for determining their weekly Sabbaths as well. He researches this subject for decades before he presents his findings to the General Conference. See **1932** and **1938** when he completes his research, presents it to the General Conference, and the issue is tabled because his conclusions appear to be valid and therefore threatening to the well-being of the institution of Adventism. Our reference is www.4angelspublications.com/amadon.php

1899 – Ellen White writes to Dr. J. H. Kellogg accusing him of erecting some buildings in Chicago with funds diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Dr. Kellogg and the Battle Creek Sanitarium represent the last road-block to the consolidation of power at the General Conference. Ellen White's son, **Willie White**, conceded his mother was “shown” that the buildings were built but that, indeed, the buildings were not built. You will find an extensive presentation on this fiasco in a later chapter.

Compare that against the specific testimony of Dr. Kellogg by searching for “**The Kellogg File.**” You can also reference the mention of the date of 1899 for this event in the “Letter from **Dr. Charles Stewart** to Ellen G. White,” dated May 8, 1907 at: http://www.ex-sda.com/perplexed_stewart.htm

1899 – Astronomer Professor W. H. Pickering discovers the 9th moon of Saturn. Adventist leaders should have realized that something smelled fishy in regard to Ellen White's claims that her visions came from God. Surely these leaders could use their brains to reason that the True God would know how many moons He created for Saturn. (See 1905.)

1901 – The first volume or volumes of the **Jewish Encyclopedia** is released. The final volume will not be released until 1906. This encyclopedia provides a number of interesting facts that make the case of Sabbatarianism more difficult: (1) The Jews probably kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar until sometime after the Captivity and the building of the Second Temple. (2) Keeping track of time with the lunar calendar was so characteristic of ancient peoples that it is highly likely that any knowledge of which day of our fixed calendar is an exact seven-day multiple of the 7th day of Creation Week. (3) Jews with only a few exceptions believe that the Sabbath was given only to them. (4) The majority of Jewish scholars—especially those with special training in Ancient Hebrew-- do not believe that there is any Sabbath content in Genesis 2.

1902 – Dr. **John Harvey Kellogg** finishes preparation on the book, **The Living Temple**. Ellen White has a book of her own she wants to sell to the Church that teaches principles that are similar to those taught by Dr. Kellogg called **Ministry of Healing**. She accuses him of being a Pantheist and teaching pantheistic ideas in his book. Dr. Kellogg denies being a pantheist, but agrees not to publish the book. (Our comparison study between the books of these two authors indicated to us that both of them made statements that if stretched and taken out of context might possibly suggest a slight bent towards a hint of Pantheism. Our research could not substantiate Ellen White's charges of Pantheism against Kellogg.) Access “The Kellogg Files” with an Internet search. Note that several General Conference officials read the manuscript draft for **The Living Temple** and stated they did not see any Pantheism in it.

1903 – Ellen White claims that her books did not come from her, but came from God:

Sister White is not the originator of these books. They contain the instruction that during her life-work God has been giving her. They contain the precious, comforting light that God has graciously given his servant to be given to the world. (Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Jan. 20, 1903.)

1903 – The General Conference moves its headquarters to Washington DC from Battle Creek, Michigan. The environment of the Battle Creek location has become inhospitable to Adventism, having made a bad name for itself in the treatment of Dr. J.

H. Kellogg and the community's awareness of the behavior and false prophetic claims of the Church prophetess, Ellen White. Adventism could no longer flourish in a community beset by so much trouble and controversy.

1904 – A group of key physicians associated with Dr. J. H. Kellogg at the Battle Creek Sanitarium find numerous contradictions in the testimonies of Ellen White and begin to question whether she was inspired of God or not.

1904 – Ellen White reiterates her claim that her books are directly inspired by God in Letter H-339, December 6, 1904:

These books contain clear, straight, unalterable truth and they should certainly be appreciated. The instruction they contain is not of human origin.

1905 – **A. F. Ballenger**, a prominent SDA leader in England, discovers there is no biblical support for the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. Furthermore, he finds that the doctrine is squarely against what the Bible teaches about the concept of judgment and the Gospel. He writes of his concerns to Ellen White. Soon he is defrocked at a hearing held at the General Conference headquarters in Washington, DC. During his presentation he is bombarded with questions from the “jury” from the writings of Ellen White, but no one can provide Bible proof for the doctrine. He is deprived of his SDA income; he is forced to live in near poverty as he attempts to find a way to feed his family back on the farm. (See “On Trial for Heresy—The A. F. Ballenger Story,” by **Dirk Anderson** at **Ellen White Exposed**: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/egw13.htm)

1905 – Continuing the deliberate deception in regard to how long Mrs. White taught the Shut Door Doctrine, **J. N. Loughborough** publishes *The Great Second Advent Movement*. In the section of his book devoted to an extensive defense of the charges that Ellen White believed in the Shut Door Doctrine for far longer than she admitted, he deliberately omits three words from a quotation from the very early Adventist publication of James and Ellen White, “**A Word to the Little Flock**” (1847) that proves that Ellen White's critics are correct. On page 263 of the 1905 edition, he quotes from this early work:

“I believe the work [of Mrs. White] is of God, and is given to comfort and strengthen his scattered, torn and peeled people, since the closing up of our work. . . in October, 1844.”

Note the three little dots— ellipses— which indicate some words were left out. Here are those words from the original 1847 copy of “**A Word to the Little Flock**”: “*since the closing up of our work FOR THE WORLD in October, 1844.*”

These three words reveal the fact that Bates and the Whites did believe as late as 1847 that the door of mercy was shut to everyone but a tiny group of people who clung to the 1844 Message! By 1905, Loughborough had to have been acquainted with the 1882 work of **A. C. Long**, which had proved the Whites were guilty of covering up this fact to the point of over-kill! You can access the Loughborough publication by doing a Google search. In fact, it is now a Google Book. We learned of this deception from Canright's book, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*, and verified it by going to the Loughborough book ourselves.

1905 - Astronomer Perrine at Lick Observatory discovers the 6th and 7th moon of Jupiter, again proving that the god who gave Ellen White the astronomy vision in 1846 was either very forgetful or was a liar who deceived her to make her look foolish later on. (See 1908.)

1905 - Astronomer W. H. Pickering discovers the 10th moon of Saturn, once again showing that the god who showed Ellen White the vision of the solar system had been out to lunch when the solar system was created.

1905 - Elder Loughborough revises his 1894 book, *Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists* and publishes it under the title of *The Great Second Advent Movement*. On page 258 of that book, there is a footnote that says, “More moons to both Jupiter and Saturn have since been discovered.” Perhaps he and his publishers thought God might have created some additional moons for these planets after Ellen White's vision in 1846. How embarrassing! Absolute proof that SDA leaders knew her claim that her visions were from God was fraudulent! Imagine participating in a crime like this deception! (See D. M. Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White* for the basic uncomplimentary information about the falsification of her visions. See the article, “J. N. Loughborough,” at The Narrow Way Ministries website for documentation of the re-naming of the book, which Canright does not indicate. Note that The Narrow Way Ministries is strongly Pro SDA and we use this source only for the purpose of getting the name change of Loughborough's book correct.)

1905 (MARCH) – Ellen White is distressed by the questionings of the Battle Creek physicians and is “shown” that she is to instruct them to write out their difficulties regarding her writings and send them to her, promising to respond to each concern. Here is her “testimony,” dated March 30, 1906:

Recently in the visions of the night I stood in a large company of people. . . I was directed by the Lord to request them, and any others who have perplexities and grievous things in their minds regarding the testimonies that I have borne, to specify what their objections and criticisms are. The Lord will help me to answer these objections, and make plain that which seems to be intricate. . . Let it all be written out, and submitted to those who desire to remove the perplexities. . . They should certainly do this, if they are loyal to the directions God has given.

Editor's Note: This statement of Mrs. White is dated to March 30, 1906 by A.T. Jones in a letter to Ellen White dated April 26, 1909 as posted on the Web. D. M. Canright credits it to March 30, 1905. Per EGW scholar, Robert K. Sanders, Canright made a mistake by dating it to 1905, since all three primary sources, Sadler, Jones, and Stewart, refer to EGW's 1906 date.

1906 (APRIL) - Dr. William S. Sadler, in a letter dated April 26, 1906, writes to Ellen White in response to her 1905 testimony that those who are perplexed by things they find in her writings should put a list of their concerns together and send them to her for explanation. Among other things, he asks Ellen White to explain how God could have shown her that Dr. Kellogg built buildings in Chicago when, indeed, he did not. Dr. Sadler is a Battle Creek Sanitarium physician and associate of Dr. J. H. Kellogg.

1906 (APRIL) - Many days after the San Francisco Earthquake took place on April 18th, Ellen White reports that an angel had shown her a vision of great buildings falling and awful destruction in a large city and that this had happened two days before the San Francisco earthquake. She claimed that these events had been shown to her in two sessions, one the night of April 16th and one the night of April 17th. She wrote that she did not announce that these visions had taken place until many days later because it had taken her so long to write out the extensive information the angel had shown her. **As D. M. Canright observes in *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*, she had learned to be cautious about naming dates and places until after the events had occurred due to her previous failures at foretelling the future. It is much safer to forecast events after the fact.**

1906 (MAY) - The *Watchman* publishes an article entitled “Religious Liberty,” written years prior by Elder George E. Fifield, as an article written by Ellen G. White and presented to the Church as a revelation from God. The first page article in every issue of the *Watchman*, a weekly magazine published by the SDA publishing house, at Nashville, Tenn. was given to Mrs. White's supposed “writings in 1906,” excepting one issue which was devoted to reporting the proceedings of the Southern Union Conference. In the issue of May 1, the section devoted to the writings of Ellen G. White was used to perpetrate this deception. (Courtesy Robert K. Sanders, www.truthorfables.com)

See http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1906 (JUNE) - In a communication dated June 3, 1906, Ellen White is “shown” that God has apparently changed His mind about whether she should try to answer all the questions raised by the Battle Creek physicians. Now, Ellen says God does not want her to answer these questions. Her “testimony,” quoted in **A. T. Jones** letter of 1909, is as follows:

Sabbath night, a week ago, after I had been prayerfully studying over these things, I had a vision, in which I was speaking before a large company, where many questions were asked concerning my work and writings.

I was directed by a messenger from Heaven not to take the burden of picking up and answering all the saying and doubts that are being put into many minds.

1907 – Dr. Charles E. Stewart of the Battle Creek Sanitarium publishes an 89-page pamphlet, which questions Ellen White about evidence that would indicate that her prophetic claims were fraudulent. All these questions have been answered by now, and they have not been answered in her favor. He published his questions as a booklet because she would not answer any of the questions he had sent her in previous letters, and he was, as you can see, quite perturbed with her. You will recall than in 1905 Ellen sent out a letter inviting Stewart and everyone else to submit such questions to her. The pamphlet was

published as *A Response to an Urgent Testimony from Mrs. E. G. White*, and it soon became known as “The Blue Book.” You can read a complete copy of it at Robert K. Sander’s website, Truth or Fables at this Web address:

http://www.truthorfables.com/A_Response_to_Urgent_Testimony.htm#AResponse

Stewart placed Ellen White’s plagiarisms of **Conybeare and Howson’s** book, *Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul*, side-by-side with the sections she copied into her book, *Sketches from the Life of Paul*. Then he asked her to explain why she had claimed that the information had come from God. The comparison was devastating.

Stewart had noticed that the health message she taught and claimed was given to her by God read very much like what Dr. **L. B. Cole** had written in his book, *Philosophy of Health*, in **1853**. He showed her a devastating example of the kind of things he found in abundance, and made this remarkable statement to her:

We have read also Dr. L. B. Cole's *Philosophy of Health*, published first in 1853, a book which was so popular that it went through twenty-six editions and thirty-five thousand copies were disposed of. In your works we have not found a single essential point with reference to health reform which is not to be found in Dr. Cole's and other books written several years before you wrote anything on the subject. Since your writings on this point contain so much that is identical with that which is contained in books by other authors, are we not to infer that the special light you have upon this subject came, through your reading Dr. Cole's, Dr. Jackson's, and other writings on this particular topic, and also as in the case where you saw it in a new light when the selfishness of taking the lives of animals to gratify a perverted appetite was presented to you by a Catholic woman?

Note that as of the writing of this book, the Ellen White propaganda website, www.ellenwhite.info, tries to defend her plagiarism by arguing that the Conybeare and Howson book was in the public domain and that copyright laws were different in her day. **This propaganda outlet fails to disclose that the real problem with Ellen White in this instance is that she claimed to have gotten this information from God in vision, making her a liar and committing a White-collar type of blasphemy.**

1907 – Adventist leaders fight dirty in regard to Dr. J. H. Kellogg. He has too much power, and the Whites want to consolidate their power at the General Conference. The Church decides Kellogg must go. Two General Conference officials, Elder George W. Amadon and Elder A. C. Bourdeau, visit Dr. J. H. Kellogg in his home on October 7th. He is disfellowshipped without being given the opportunity to defend himself in a church board meeting, as is the customary practice when a Seventh-day Adventist member contests his charges and wishes to remain in the Church. He denies being a Pantheist and explains to them how Ellen White herself had earlier read his transcript for *The Living Temple* and had no criticism for it. He confronts the leaders with the fact that he did not build any buildings in Chicago— a fact by this time— and questions how God could have shown Ellen something that was not true.

http://www.truthorfables.com/Statement_by_MG_Kellogg.htm

1908 – **Astronomer Malotte** at the Greenwich Observatory discovers the 8th moon of Jupiter, again proving Ellen’s 1846 astronomy vision to be either a product of her imagination or a diabolical spirit guide. (See 1914.)

1909 – **A. T. Jones**, a partner to **Elder E. J. Waggoner** in the 1888 “*Righteousness by Faith*” movement that was squelched by the Church, finds out that Ellen White had offered in March of 1906 to answer any questions people might have about things she has written. He writes Ellen that by now he has heard about the second “testimony” she was “shown” that she was not to answer the questions that her first “testimony” had told her to answer. He confronts her with the fact that Dr. Sadler and Dr. David Paulson had written to her on June 3rd, 1906 and she had not answered their questions. Furthermore, he tells her that it is impossible for her to answer their questions because there are no answers:

For if the writings were really the word of God -

a. They need no explanation.

b. If the writings to be explained were not the word of God, then I would not want any explanation of them; for I would not care anymore for them than for any other writings that were not the word of God.

Further I knew that the things that could be written, you simply could not explain; and that any explanation would be worse than no explanation. And the event has fully justified this view. (Cited in the letter Jones to White, April 26, 1909)

1909 – A. F. Ballenger publishes his classic *Cast out for the Cross of Christ*, which represents a very complete debunking of the **Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment**. He wrote this book after he moved to California to recover from the financial ruin that his termination from denomination employment caused and to promote the truth that he has learned about the Gospel. The book includes a presentation of the letter he wrote to Ellen White explaining, point by point, her errors placed side-by-side with the Bible statements that show that what she teaches conflicts with Scripture. (See Dirk Anderson, “**On Trial for Heresy— the A. F. Ballenger Story**,” at: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com)

1909 – At the last General Conference Mrs. White attended, a certain minister was asked to read one of her unpublished testimonies. As he read it, he recognized that it was his own production. Since he had been taught all his life that Ellen received her testimonies from God, his faith in her was shaken. (See Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*.) Edward S. Ballenger, a former Adventist who published the anti-SDA/EGW paper, *The Gathering Call*, tells the story in the January-February 1938 issue, pp.16-23:

At the general conference of 1909, held at Washington, DC, the last conference Mrs. White attended, Elder W. A. Colcord was handed a batch of Testimonies supposedly from Mrs. White, to read at a special session of the Religious Liberty Association. In reading it over, previous to the session, he discovered an article that was quite familiar to him, and behold, the whole article was a product of his own pen, which he had sent to Mrs. White two or three years before, yet it was assigned to him to read as a revelation from God. We would be pleased to have Elder W.A. Spicer offer a satisfactory explanation of this kind of plagiarism."

See: http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1911 - Ellen White writes in Letter 56 (*Colporteur Ministry*, p. 128): The book *The Great Controversy*, I appreciate above silver or gold, and I greatly desire that it shall come before the people. While writing the manuscript of *The Great Controversy*, I was conscious of the presence of the angels of God. And many times the scenes about which I was writing were presented to me anew in visions of the night, so they were fresh and vivid in my mind." (Unfortunately, God appears to have sent her an angel that was deficient in the knowledge of the history of the world since the time of the Early Church.)

1911 – The Church spends \$3,000 to revise Ellen White's book, *The Great Controversy*, due to anger over the fact that she had plagiarized extensively. The revisions were demanded by Church leaders because she had copied from so many sources without giving credit to the original authors while she, in general, claimed that her work was directly inspired by God. **It is this version of the book that has been sold world-wide ever since.** Dr. Stewart had done extensive research on Ellen's plagiarism for his 1907 booklet, which placed her plagiarisms alongside of the original sources she had not credited. Until Walter Rea discovered extensive plagiarism in the writings of Ellen White in the early 1980's, Seventh-day Adventist leaders denied any knowledge of significant or extensive plagiarism by her as late as 1979. This deception is incredible in view of the fact that it was an official Church action, taken under extreme public pressure, to correct her blatant copying in the single most important book to Adventism, *The Great Controversy*. (See Canright, *Life of Mrs. E.G. White*.)

Kevin Morgan, SDA author of *Sabbath Rest: Is there something missing in your busy life?*, as well as other books on a variety of topics, provides evidence that the problem with Ellen White's plagiarism in *The Great Controversy* was blown out of proportion. Since he is a highly respected writer both inside and outside of Adventism, his assessment is worthy of consideration. From an e-mail from Kevin Morgan to Kerry Wynne on November 21, 2011, he explained some facts that give balance to the problem:

Based on a statement in the 1919 Bible Conference made by A. G. Daniells, it would seem that there were no footnotes or quotation marks in "page after page" of *The Great Controversy*. This is misleading. There were footnotes in the 1884 and 1888 editions of GC. It was Scripture--an indication of what the author intended to emphasize. And there were quotation marks in the 1884 *Spirit of Prophecy* (predecessor to the 1888 *Great Controversy*), though Canright claimed that there were none. An observant reader should have noticed the quotation marks within quotation marks and the ellipses (...) inside quotation marks, denoting omitted portions of dialogue. Both of these indicate that Ellen White was using historical sources and not hiding the fact (e.g., 4SP 83, 92, 96, 108, 115, 125). To clear up any doubt about her use of sources for sake of descriptiveness and not for authority, Mrs. White included an explanatory statement in the Author's Preface of the 1888 revision of *The Great Controversy*.

It is the position of your present authors that although Ellen acknowledged her use of historical sources to a limited extent even from the beginning, her claim that God directly guided her in the writing of the book is impossible to accept because she was dead wrong not only about many details, but about the spin she put on the events that she purported to interpret under the direct guidance of God. By 1919, the evidence of her failed predictions and reputation for plagiarizing led to a secret meeting of top SDA leaders to try to decide whether to publicly renounce her prophetic claims or to continue to cover-up the deception. (See 1919.) Notice in her introduction to the 1911 edition, Ellen White still claims the same or even somewhat greater direct, divine guidance for writing the book:

Through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the scenes of the long-continued conflict between good and evil have been opened to the writer of these pages. From time to time I have been permitted to behold the working, in different ages, of the great controversy between Christ, the Prince of life, the Author of our salvation, and Satan, the prince of evil, the author of sin, and the first transgressor of God's holy law.

[In a subsequent paragraph]: As the Spirit of God has opened to my mind the great truths of His word, and the scenes of the past and future, I have been bidden to make known to others that which has thus been revealed—to trace the history of the controversy in past ages, and especially so to present it as to shed a light on the fast-approaching struggle of the future.

Furthermore, if Apologist Kevin Morgan is presenting us an accurate and balanced view of the problems of plagiarism in *The Great Controversy*, why would the General Conference have to spent \$3,000 in 1911 to address the problem of plagiarism in the book?

1912 – The Church publishes J. N. Andrews' book, *Advent History of the Sabbath*— a book that proves that Adventist leaders now have an exhaustive understanding of the breadth and depth of Early Church writings and understand that Sunday observance was characteristic of Christianity by around 100 AD. Andrews, in a much earlier, 1873 work, *Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day*, proved that the Church was well-aware of this fact. Actually Andrews knew by 1859 that Sunday observance was wide-spread by 100 AD. as evidenced by the content of his 1859 book, *The History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week*. (See also 1859.) As mentioned elsewhere, in 1867 Andrews received a full-volume explanation of his impossible prophetic interpretation methods and his embarrassing historical errors that should have, but did not, deter him at any time in the future from However, Andrews' 1912 book provides a much more extensive and more scholarly approach to the Church's defense of this difficult problem. D. M. Canright quotes the 1912 edition of Andrews' book in his own 1915 book, *The Lord's Day From neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism on This Subject*:

The "*Advent History of the Sabbath*," edition of 1912, is compelled to admit that Sunday observance was in the Christian Church at the beginning of the second century. The author says: "**The results of our investigation concerning the origin of Sunday [is] that it was not introduced into the Christian Church until the beginning of the second century**" (page 450).

In this same book, his research on the interpretation of a key section of Chapter 14 of the *Didache* is thorough and balanced. He seems to present all the facts. However, his general approach to the *Didache* and other such sources is to seek to demonstrate that they are invalid because they are forgeries or contain non-canonical ideas. See Appendix II for an evaluation of Andrews' work on the *Didache*.

1912-1913 (CIRCA) Prominent Swedish Chicago Area SDA leader, **Aaron Nyman**, studies his way out of Adventism and begins challenging his former SDA associates to debates about the prophecies of Daniel. He is also a man of means, so he offers his home, valued at \$5,000, to any Adventist who can prove that the 2,300 days and the 70 weeks begin at the same time. There were significant written exchanges of letters between him and the Conference leaders, which are published in his book. The debates never took place because the Conference backed down after studying his preliminary refutations.

1914 – Recently apostatized Swedish SDA leader, **Aaron Nyman**, publishes *Astounding Errors*, a scholarly volume of over 450 pages which focuses on exposing the historical deceptions of Adventism's twisting of the prophecies of Daniel and the blasphemous claims of Ellen G. White regarding her prophetic gift. He utilized excerpts from her book, *Early Writings*, to point out that her claim that God led William Miller to make an error that would deceive God's people for a brief while made God look like a hypocrite, disparaging His integrity and benevolence. [Editor's Note: Nyman was a brilliant businessman. People who are highly successful in business typically have a very high level of intelligence. Aaron Nyman's great sense of logic makes the claims of Ellen White and the historical fantasies of J. N. Andrews to appear less than honorable. We have proof that SDA leaders were aware of Nyman's arguments because he published the letters he received from them in his book.

1914 – **D. M. Canright** publishes his last revision of *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*. Adventist leaders are confronted with virtually all the fundamental, fatal-to-Sabbatarian arguments that the new anti-Sabbatarian movement of today uses with the exception of the facts of Hebrew linguistics in regard to the Creation Story and the discovery in more recent years of even stronger evidence that Chapter 14 of *Didache* was written as early as 50 AD. Canright disproves the theory that sun worship had any possible influence on the very early adoption of Sunday observance by Christians to the point of over-kill, and reminds his Adventist "brethren" of what they have known since 1873, when J. N. Andrews published his book on the history of the Sabbath— that Sunday observance was characteristic of Christianity by the beginning of the Second Century (100 AD.).

1914 – **Astronomer Seth B. Nicholson** at Lick Observatory discovers the 9th moon of Jupiter. By this time there is no excuse for Adventist leaders not to repudiate the prophetic claims of Ellen White. The biblical requirement for a true prophet is to be right 100% of the time in matters for which it is claimed God is responsible for communicating said information. This is a major disgrace! Her false claims would appear to "embarrass" God terribly, making Him look like He couldn't keep track of His own moons. This is why Ellen White's false claim that her visions came from God represents "White Collar" blasphemy.

1915 - Life Sketches, published in 1915, p. 104, shows a photograph of page one in Ellen's handwriting of the Bates' letter, sent to him in 1847, a letter which proves that Ellen White lied about how long she held on to the Shut Door Doctrine. The incriminating information was centered on page two. The White Estate had full knowledge of the fact that Ellen believed in the shut door from her visions. This letter was put back in the White Estate Vault after 1915 and never saw the light of day till it was uncovered by **Skip Baker** in 1980 and later published in *Adventist Currents* in July 1984.

Credit to: http://www.culthelp.info/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=659&Itemid=8

1915 (APRIL) - W.W. Prescott, who will later attend the 1919 Bible Conference, carefully and cautiously *rebukes Willie White for not cooperating with him and others who are trying to understand the truth about her writings in this amazing statement*, which includes a prediction that a crisis over her writings will happen in the future since it has not been addressed by them at the time:

The way your mother's writings have been handled and the false impression concerning them which is still fostered among the people have brought great perplexity and trial to me. It seems to me that what amounts to deception, though probably not intentional, has been practiced in making some of her books, and that no serious effort has been made to disabuse the minds of the people of what was known to be their wrong view concerning her writings. But it is no use to go into these matters. I have talked with you for years about them, but it brings no change. I think however that

we are drifting toward a crisis which will come sooner or later and perhaps sooner. A very strong feeling of reaction has already set in." [Emphasis by authors.]

W. W. Prescott to Willie C. White, April 6, 1915

1915 – D. M. Canright publishes *The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism on This Subject*. This book utilizes a wide variety of scholarly sources that not only prove that neither the influence of the Roman Catholic Church or sun worship had anything to do with Sabbath abandonment. With evidence this powerful, it is no wonder that much later, in 1977, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi had no choice but to concede that Canright was right about this fact, since he conceded that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance by 140 AD., hundreds of years before there was a Catholic Church or a pope. It is also worthy to note that Bacchiocchi was also forced to concede that he could not prove a link between sun worship and the virtually immediate abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by the first Christians. Read this for yourself at:

truthorfables.com/The_Lord's_Canright.htm

1916 – On July 16, 1916, Ellen White died deep in debt from over-extending herself to pay for the personal care and the editorial staff she retained at her mansion at Elmshaven, California. The Church was forced to borrow money to settle her estate and acquire ownership of her publications. During her life-time she made more than the equivalent of two million dollars in today's dollar value (calculated in 2005) from her ministerial salary, which was paid from tithe funds, and from the royalties she received from the publication of her books. She had advised everyone else to follow the biblical principle of shunning debt, but apparently she felt that since she was writing books for God, she was entitled to be an exception to the rule. No wonder she taught that it was wrong to use the tithe money for anything else but to pay the ministry!

1916 – D. M. Canright publishes *The Complete Testimony of the Early Fathers Proving the Universal Observance of Sunday in the first Century*. This booklet confronts Adventist leaders of the day with every imaginable proof that Sunday observance was universal by the early part of the second century. He uses biblical evidence, discusses the meaning of various Greek words, and observes scholarly restraint in his claims. For example, he gives 125 AD. as the accepted date for the testimony of the *Didache's* documentation of Christians worshiping on the first day of the week, but adds that some authorities even date that part of this collection of the first Christian writings to 80 AD. By the 1980's, scholars, using a variety of analytical approaches, have dated the *Didache* to as early as 50 AD and no later than 125 AD. The *Wikipedia* article, "Didache," indicates that American biblical scholars are willing to date this document to as early as 50 AD. This booklet makes very interesting reading. It can be found at: exadventist.com/Home/Sabbath/tabid/53/Default.aspx

It is in the form of a complete photocopy of the original pamphlet showing both sides of the page. Its contents should have moved Adventist leaders to abandon their apostasy theory of Sabbath abandonment and to cease their reprehensible propaganda campaign.

1916 – Still continuing to cover-up the Shut Door Doctrine lies of Ellen White and the Church, **Elder G.I. Butler** writes to defend her claim that she had only believed and taught the Shut Door Doctrine for a very short time by quoting the same passage and suppressing the same three words as did his predecessor in that conspiratorial crime– **J.N. Loughborough**. (See 1905.) See also Canright, *The Life of Mrs. E. G. White*.

1916 - D. M. Canright signs an affidavit that he has not recanted his rejection of Adventism. He does so to counteract rumors started by the Adventist Church that he has recanted. We speculate that he deemed this necessary because he had made some kind remarks about Ellen White when he attended her funeral in 1915. Here is the text from the affidavit:

State of Michigan

County of Kent

Dudley M. Canright, of the City of Grand Rapids, Kent County, and State of Michigan, being duly sworn says:

1. I renounced Seventh Day Adventism in 1887, after twenty-eight years experience in that church, because I lost confidence in some of its chief doctrines.

2. I have never once regretted that I withdrew from that church.
3. A further study and experience have strongly confirmed my conviction, that, as a system, it is an error, and must in time, end in failure.
4. I have never at any time, or anywhere, or to any person ever suggested that I wished to go back to that church.
5. I believe now, just as I did in 1888, when I first published by book, *Seventh Day Adventism Renounced*, now in its fourteenth edition.
6. I gladly bear witness to the various excellent principles Adventists hold in common with Evangelical Churches. But these do not sanctify their numerous errors. I have only kindly feelings toward them.
7. Deponent further says that he makes this affidavit for the purpose of correcting certain erroneous statements concerning himself, that have become current in various parts of the world.

Dudley M. Canright

Subscribed and Sworn to Before

Me this 8th day of March, A. D. 1916.

Benn M. Corwin

Notary Public, Kent County, Michigan.

My Commission expires January 12, 1919

Rev. D. M. Canright died May 18, 1919. Funeral May 18, 2:30 P.M. At Otsego, Mich. All Baptist ministers of Grand Rapids took part.

Oliver W. Van Asdel [Oliver? Handwriting obscure.]

1917 – The editor of the *Youth's Instructor*, in the midst of all the controversy about Ellen White's plagiarism problems, writes a scathing rebuke of the practice of plagiarism. Here is what **E. F. Ballenger** said:

It is quite fitting that we should reprint an editorial which appeared in the *Youths' Instructor* of Dec. 25, 1917:

"Thus it goes. On every hand there are similar evidences of dishonesty. It is just as wrong to appropriate to one's self credit for productions written by another as to steal a horse. One who boldly signs his name to another's article, and allows it to appear in print as his own, is a thief of the darkest hue.

"Taking another's knowledge and parading it as one's own is a despicable thing to do. The student who copies at examination time is dishonest; but plagiarism is a meaner kind of thievery, if there are degrees of dishonesty.

"Why do people do it? It is a crime punishable by law. It is as much of a disgrace, to say nothing of the sin, as to break into a neighbor's house and steal his goods.

"All who profess common decency, much less Christianity, should eschew all forms of dishonesty. Let us be true and pure in all we do, that the Lord may claim us as His own, and that we may not grieve Him again by playing a Judas part in Life."

Editor's Note: Ballenger is not claiming here, so far as we can see, that the editor of the *Youth's Instructor* openly labeled Ellen White as the person who was guilty of plagiarism. To have done so would likely have cost him his job. However, in the context of years of controversy about Ellen White's plagiarisms and the high cost to the General Conference of having to remedy the plagiarisms in her book, *The Great Controversy*, it is quite clear that he was targeting her. At the very least this *Youth's Instructor* article is of keen interest because it shows that contrary to the claims of those who sought to defend Ellen White by saying that plagiarism was not considered wrong in her generation, it was, indeed, considered to be a grievous wrong. It shows that whatever their claims may have been, Ellen White should have known that she was doing wrong when she credited her material to divine revelation from God rather than to the various human authors she copied.---- Kerry Wynne See: http://www.truthorables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1919 – D. M. Canright publishes his book, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White Seventh-day Adventist Prophet: Her False Claims Refuted*. In this book he thoroughly treats her plagiarism. It is amazing that in the early 1980's, the secretary of the White Estate at that time, Dr. Robert Olson, stated that the charge of significant plagiarism on the part of Ellen White was unfamiliar to him. Canright's book is easy to find with an Internet search engine like Google, Yahoo, or Bing. Also incriminating is the fact that circa 1966 to 1968, Dr. Robert Olson recommended this book to Kerry Wynne, who is a student at Pacific Union College at that time. This Canright book deals extensively and explicitly with Ellen White's plagiarism. What is the likelihood that Dr. Olson had not read this book carefully enough to know about the chapter on plagiarism?

1919 – Top Adventist leaders meet secretly for several days at the 1919 Bible Conference to discuss their growing realization that Ellen White was a fraud. They discuss her failed prophecies, historical errors, and her plagiarism, as well as other problems. They discuss whether to tell the truth about her at the time or to cover-up the whole thing. Special concern is expressed as to how to keep the truth about Ellen White from the Church's seminary students. You can access the portion of the transcripts that specifically deal with the fraudulent claims of Ellen White at its posting at *Spectrum* magazine at:

spectrummagazine.org/files/archive/archive06-10/10-1couperus.pdf

You can access the entire set of transcripts the General Conference Archives at:

<http://www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=19&SortBy=1&ShowDateOrder=True>

The stenographer's transcript of these meetings is ordered by General Conference president, A. G. Daniells, to be locked up in the vault and made inaccessible for 50 years. It will later be discovered in 1974.

1919 – Top Adventist leaders discuss the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 11 at the **1919 Bible Conference**, secretly conceding that the little horn of Daniel 7 was a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes. They conclude that this fact is so dangerous to Adventism that knowledge of it should be kept from Seventh-day Adventist students.

1919 – In the 1919 Bible Conference discussion of the problems with Ellen White and specifically with her book, *The Great Controversy*, W. W. Prescott diminishes the 1911 assessment of the divine element in this book by stating:

You are touching exactly the experience through which I went, personally, because you all know that I contributed something toward the revision of *Great Controversy*. I furnished considerable material bearing upon that question . . . When I talked to W. C. White about it (and I do not know that he is an infallible authority), he told me frankly that when they got out *Great Controversy*, if they did not find in her writings anything in certain chapters to make the historical connections, they took other books, like [Uriah Smith's] *Daniel and the Revelation*, and used portions of them...

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW:

1920-1939

1922 – At the 1922 General Conference session, Adventist leaders **Holmes** and **Washburn**, having heard about what happened at the **1919 Bible Conference** from stories leaked out from some of the participants, work behind the scenes to purge as many of the delegates as possible who were not supportive of Ellen White. Since Ellen White had few supporters at the

conference, the purge was a big one. **A. G. Daniells** loses his position as General Conference president. (See the *Wikipedia* article, “1919 Bible Conference.”)

1930 – William W. Fletcher, a distinguished SDA leader and Bible professor at Avondale College in Australia, voluntarily resigns from the Church because he cannot accept the traditional SDA teaching of the Sanctuary Doctrine. (See Raymond F. Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1930 – A. G. Daniells reveals to the young **Leroy Froom** the existence of thousands of Ellen White documents relating to the Gospel versus legalism debate of 1888, conceding that he had had a part in covering up the fact of the existence of these manuscripts. He tells Froom that these documents paint a completely different picture of Adventist history and explains that the Church has misused her writings, manipulating her writings as they chose to further the legalistic goals of those leaders. He charges the young Froom to set the record straight with the Church *after* he is gone by releasing those writings. (See 1971.)

1931 – Louis R. Conradi, a key European Division leader, voluntarily separates himself from the Adventist Church and forfeits his ministerial credentials because he could not prove the traditional SDA Sanctuary Doctrine from the Bible. (See **Raymond F. Cottrell**, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”).

1932 – Now an older SDA pastor, **J. H. Wierds** has now extensively researched the lunar calendar problem and has published a 283 page manuscript regarding the implications for Sabbath-keeping. The General Conference is not interested. Our reference, again, is www.4angelspublications.com/amadon.php (See also 1938, when a committee at the General Conference looks into the problem and scuttles the whole thing when they realize the whole thing is probably correct. See 1995 when the same thing happens and a similar committee is disbanded when at least three committee members, reportedly theologians from the SDA seminary at Andrews University, are convicted that the Sabbath should wander through the week according to the lunar calendar.

1932 – William W. Fletcher publishes his paper, “**Reasons for My Faith.**” **Raymond F. Cottrell**, who is conceded by many to be the greatest Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, stated years later that Fletcher’s arguments were superior to those of his opponents. (Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”).

1932 – The official paper of the Central Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, the *Central Union Reaper*, in its June 12th issue, reports that a friend of the anti-SDA, anti-EGW publication, **The Gathering Call** (an anti-SDA/EGW publication published by ex-SDA, **A. F. Ballenger**), offers a cash reward to those who can find a specific example of Ellen White’s plagiarism:

Turning now to another section of the May-June, 1933, number of *The Gathering Call*, we find on pages 22, 23, and 24-- a most remarkable bit of literature. It is entitled, "Five Dollars Premium Offered." It reads in part as follows: A friend of *The Gathering Call* authorizes us to offer five dollars in cash to the first one who will locate what he believes is a plagiarized paragraph found on pages 601 and 602 of the old edition, and pages 641 and 642 of the new edition of "*Patriarchs and Prophets*," in any publication printed before 1890. [That is, printed by the SDA Church prior to 1890.]

As we will note in other places the fact that the issue of plagiarism was openly discussed in an official Church paper– the *Central Union Reaper*– is very interesting in light of Dr. Robert Olson’s 1979 denial that he had any knowledge of Ellen White being guilty of any significant copying of the writings of other authors.

1933 - In Defense of the Faith, by **William H. Branson** (Review and Herald, 1933, 398 pages), is published. Branson attempts to refute Canright, but his basic arguments are disproved decades later, either by the direct testimony of, or by the inadvertent “hostile witness” of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in 1977. Branson seeks to prove that the Roman Catholic Church really did “change the day,” but Dr. Bacchiocchi later proved that the adoption of Sunday observance was universal centuries before there was a Roman Catholic Church or a pope. J. N. Andrews wrote about the almost immediate adoption of Sunday observance by Christians as early as 1859. Why Branson thought he could write a successful rebuttal of Canright is difficult to fathom. Andrews conceded that Sabbath abandonment took place in the Second Century back in writings he published in 1859 and 1873. Canright disproved even the possibility of the sun worship/Roman Catholic Church Sabbath “apostasy” theory

to the point of over-kill, and it was the writings of Canright that Branson wrote his book to refute! It helps to understand why he would attempt such an impossible task when we remember that his pay check came from the Church.

1933 - “The White Elephant of Seventh-Day-Adventism?” by R. Vowless (New Plymouth, New Zealand, P.F. Burrows Ltd., Eliot Street, New Plymouth, accessed at: www.truthorfables.com/white_elephant.htm is published, proving that Adventist leaders knew even as early as 1933 that Ellen White did wholesale copying from other authors for her *Conflict of the Ages* series and other books. Here is a remarkable quotation from this pamphlet:

Turning to the Bible again, I read: “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets,” Hebrews 1:1; and “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” 2 Peter, 1: 21.

I do not know how the S.D.A.'s interpret the above Scriptures; for, Mrs. White, the prophethess of the remnant church, is recognized, as, perhaps, one of the world's greatest plagiarists. Let anyone compare the “*The Great Controversy*,” by Mrs. E. G. White, with the book entitled “*History of the Reformation*,” by D'Aubign'e; “*The History of Protestantism*,” by J. A. Wylie; “*History of the Waldenses*,” by Wylie; “*History of the Sabbath*,” by Andrews; and “*Sanctuary*,” by Smith. Then they will soon see where her inspirations came from. Also, it would be found interesting to compare her first edition of “*The Great Controversy*” with the last edition, a very marked difference will be found in thought and expression. The criticism was so strong against her plagiarism that she was forced to make the alterations.

“*Patriarchs and Prophets*” by Mrs. E. G. White, received some wonderful help from Adam Clarke's Commentaries as we cannot help but notice when comparing the different paragraphs. It is now becoming a well-known fact that “*Steps to Christ*” was written by Miss Fanny Bolton, without any dictation or assistance whatever from Mrs. White— yet it carries Mrs. White's name. Is this in keeping with the eighth commandment? Some people think if they keep the fourth, it does not matter so much about the others.

[Editor's note: It is questionable if Vowless is correct about this fact being well-known. We believe that few Adventists knew about it then, and we are certain that the vast majority of Adventists do not know it now. Additionally, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists disputes the credibility of her story on the basis that Fanny Bolton was mentally ill and claims that she was confined to a mental institution at three different times.]

Some of their pastors say that “all the critics of Mrs. White could not put together one chapter of *Desire of Age[s]* “by the same author.” No, perhaps not, and it is very evident that Mrs. White was not able to produce many of them, or, in fact, any of them. *Desire of Ages* was culled from other authors on the “*Life of Christ*,” special mention may be made of Geikie's “—*Life of Christ*. Again, it is interesting to compare her first edition of *Desire of Ages* with the latter and again notice the changes in thought and expression; and even as late as 1926, *Desire of Ages* was undergoing another revision. I trust that Mrs. White's critics are more honest than to copy the words of another author's pen in order to write a chapter of *Desire of Ages*.

We hear so much about her Health Reform Teachings, but they do not mention that the teachings were taken from three other doctors' books written by Drs. Cole, Jackson, and Thrall.

[Editor's note: For more information, see the book, *Prophethess of Health*, by Ron Numbers]

In 1883 she published “*Sketches from the Life of Paul*,” and in the preface there was found this statement: “The writer of this book, having received special help from the Spirit of God, is able to throw light upon the teachings of Paul and the application to our own time, as no other authors are

prepared to do.” This book was copied so strongly from “Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul,” by Conybeare and Howson, that Conybeare and Howson served notice upon “The Review and Herald Publishing Association,” that, unless the book was taken off the market, they would bring a suit against them for plagiarism. Mr. H. W. Kellogg who was then manager of the Publishing House informed Mrs. White that they would not undertake to publish any more copies of such, unless she would stand for the responsibilities of meeting the threatened suit. Needless to say, no more have been printed and her order for a new edition, which had just been previously booked, was withdrawn. Dr. Stewart published a booklet of eighty-nine pages in which he arranged parallel columns of quotations taken from Mrs. White's book, “*Sketches from the life of Paul*,” and the book by Conybeare and Howson just mentioned, and the quotations read like this: Conybeare and Howson's) “The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps immediately from the Agora.” (Mrs. White's): “The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in the rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps from the valley below.”

In the preface, where it is said “Having received special help from the Spirit of God”, why did they not speak the truth and write..... “having received special help from Conybeare and Howson”?

As this is only an introduction to some of the things which I have found out, I shall not say more here about this wicked plagiarism which is put down as the “Precious rays of light shining from the throne of God.” And I would never dare say or intimate that God was a plagiarist, would you?

This quote is astonishing in view of **Dr. Robert Olson's** denial of any knowledge of charges of serious plagiarism on the part of Ellen White as late as 1979. Walter Rea only discovered by 1982 what **Vowless** knew in 1933 and Canright knew in 1889. Since Canright may have been the single greatest enemy of Adventism, and since the Church had published so much material to attempt to refute his arguments, it strains the imagination to think that Dr. Olson knew nothing about Ellen White's problem with plagiarism.

1934 – Frank M. Wilcox's book, *The Testimony of Jesus*, is published by The Review and Herald Publishing Association, revealing inexcusable lying and deceit on the part of the author. If the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes** had not been discovered in 1974, we could look back at the life and ministry of Wilcox and say he was an honest soul who was simply deceived by the claims of Ellen White. However, Wilcox was one of most outspoken critics of Ellen White in that secret meeting. Here is what he said in those Minutes:

I would like to ask, Brother Daniells, if it could be accepted as a sort of rule that Sister White might be mistaken in details, but in the general policy and instruction she was an authority. . . It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing. Either the Lord has spoken through her or he has not spoken through her; **and if it is a matter of deciding in my own judgment whether he has or has not, then I regard her books the same as every other book published.** I think it is one thing for a man to stultify his conscience, and it is another thing to stultify his judgment. It is one thing for me to lay aside my conscience, and it is another thing for me to change my judgment over some view that I hold.

In his book on Ellen White, Wilcox stultifies his own conscience, presents himself as a staunch believer in her prophetic gift, and makes outrageous claims for her, like this one:

Are the writings of Mrs. White verbally inspired? Was she given the exact words in which her thoughts are expressed? She never made any such claim. Indeed, she states very positively that such was not the case. Nor did the pioneers in this movement ever believe or teach verbal inspiration for the writings of the messenger of the Lord.

It is amazing how much Wilcox “forgot” during the 14 years since the **1919 Bible Conference**. He lies through his teeth, and this fact is painfully clear. Here are a couple of those statements Ellen White made that Wilcox “forgot:”

1. “When writing these precious books, if I hesitated, the very word I wanted to express the idea was given to me” (*Selected Messages, vol. 3, pp. 51, 52*). 1907.
2. “....yet the words I employ in describing what I have seen are my own, unless they be those spoken to me by an angel, which I always enclose in marks of quotation” (*Review and Herald, Oct. 8, 1867, quoted in Selected Messages, vol.1, p. 37*).

Apparently Wilcox was willing to sell his soul and stultify his conscience for the sake of Adventism, his position, and his pay check.

1936 – A. G. Daniells, former General Conference President and one of the most vocal critics of Ellen White’s claim to be directly inspired in the **1919 Bible Conference**, publishes his defense of her inspiration, entitled ***The Abiding Gift of Prophecy***. He seems to have forgotten that he knew Ellen White was a fraud back in 1919. Perhaps he was trying to redeem himself for the destructive role he played in the Conference. To see what he said about Ellen White in 1919, access the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes with a Google Search. (Cited in E. F. Ballenger, ***Facts about Seventh-day Adventists***, posted at ex.sda.com.)

1938 - In the January 13 issue of the *Review and Sabbath Herald*, an article based on Elder W. A. Spicer's lectures given at the World's Education Conference held at Blue Ridge, NC on August 19th and 20th of 1937 presents his defense of Ellen G. White's extensive plagiarisms in her book, *The Great Controversy*. Among other excuses for her literary thefts, Elder Spicer said, “The carefulness among later writers in giving credit, did not obtain so essentially a generation or two ago.” This deception was exposed in the anti SDA / EGW publication, *The Gathering Call*, January-February 1938, pp.16-23, published by Edward S. Ballenger. (Courtesy Robert K. Sanders.) http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

Ballenger adds:

This is not true. It did obtain. In 1891 T. DeWitt Talmage, in his book FROM MANGER TO THRONE, gives credit to thirty-three authorities from whom he drew his material; and Edersheim, in his LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH, published in 1883, cites no less than 300 authorities. It was always recognized as a sin and a crime to use other people's thoughts, without credit. Some had tried to excuse Mrs. White's plagiarisms because of her youth and inexperience; but, when she wrote GREAT CONTROVERSY she was fifty-seven years old. She had already been writing nearly forty years.

Did Elder Spicer Tell the Truth?

Elder Spicer saw that when Mrs. White's attention was called to the fact that she had not given credit for some material that she used, "She immediately gave instructions to her helpers to go through her books, and mark every sentence or paragraph she had taken from those historians, and insert the proper punctuation for introducing a quotation. ... She saw to it herself that this was done for the next edition of the book." Notice, he says: "She immediately gave instruction." We have the first, the third, and the ninth editions of GREAT CONTROVERSY, and several editions after that which are not numbered; and not one of them gave credit for the facts and thoughts she used from other authors. She published many editions after her attention was called to her plagiarisms before she gave credit. It must have taken her helpers a long time to search out her plagiarized portions. GREAT CONTROVERSY was first published in 1884, and proper credits were not given until the edition of 1911, a period of 27 years. You can put all the confidence you care to on Elder Spicer's "immediately."

1938 – Former SDA, Edward S. Ballenger, publicly identifies the primary literary sources Ellen G. White plagiarized.

The writers from whom Mrs. W. borrowed freely were as follows:

D'Aubigne, whose *History of the Reformation* was published between 1835 and 1853. Wylie, whose *History of Protestantism* was published about 1875 or 1876. Conybeare and Howson, whose *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* was published in various editions, 1854, 1869, etc.

See Ballenger's article, "Does Elder Spicer Play Fair with Young Educators?" *The Gathering Call*, January-February 1938, pp.16-23, courtesy Robert K. Sanders of TruthOrFables.Com

1938 – J. H. Wierds finally gets the General Conference interested in studying his 283 page manuscript about the lunar calendar and its Sabbath-keeping implications. The GC appoints a research committee to investigate. The committee is not allowed to finish its work, so the existence of the problem was never acknowledged. (Source = 4 Angels Publications.com.) Amazingly Wierds' incriminating document has been "lost" by the General Conference. The vote to authorize the study of his manuscript took place on November 1, 1938. In an undated letter to Grace Amadon, committee member, M. L. Andreasen expresses concern that the "shifts" in when the weeks begin would cause utter confusion to the Church. Here is what he said, courtesy of the article, "The Lunar Sabbath and the Church" from the 4 Angel's Publications website:

If an explanation were possible, and the people were at last adjusted to the shift in the feast day and the stability of the seventh day, it might be supposed that in time they would get used to the arrangement. But they would no sooner have become accustomed to this, till another shift is made. Now they shift back to where they were before. . . . There is no uniformity, and just as the people get used to a certain arrangement the day is changed again. *Such is more than the common people can understand, and if we go to the people now with such a proposition, we must expect that confusion will result. And our enemies will not be slow to point out the difficulties and ring the changes on them.* (M. L. Andreasen, undated letter to Grace Amadon, Grace Amadon Collection, Box 2, Folder 4, Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, emphasis supplied.)

1939 – Grace Amadon – An Adventist woman who became well-respected astronomer is asked to do research in conjunction with the lunar calendar question. She continuously finds evidence that the lunar calendar is the one used by the ancient Hebrews to calculate their Sabbath days, but she doesn't like what she finds, and is always looking for a way to get out from under its telling implications. Many of her written statements testify to this struggle. Later her falsifications of the evidence were uncovered by expert astronomers and researchers. See:

www.4angelspublications.com/articles/Lunar_Sabbath_SDA_Church.php)

1939 – Howard C. Fulton, pastor of the Belden Avenue Baptist Church in Chicago, responds in writing to an inquiry by a certain Brother Keithley in regard to whether or not D. M. Canright recanted his rejection of Adventism before he died. Canright had been pastor emeritus of a Baptist church in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He says that he has a written statement from Canright's daughter that Canright's Seventh-day Adventist niece, who had cared for him during his last days in the hospital prior to his death, emphatically denied that he had recanted. Courtesy of the personal library of Robert K. Sanders of Truth or Fables.Com is a reproduction of that letter. Please scroll down to the next page to view it, as it takes up an entire page:

THE B BOOK
LOOD
LESSER HOPE

Belden Avenue Baptist Church

Belden Avenue and North Halsted St.
Chicago, Ill.

"Christ and the Bible Only and Always"

Howard C. Fulton, Pastor

CHURCH OFFICE, 2308 N. HALSTED ST.

PHONE, LINCOLN 2888

Nov., 9, 1939.

Dear brother Keithley,

So you are having inquiries about our good old brother Canright, well I used to have them quite frequently when I was pastor at Berean.

The dear old brother was true to the faith once for all delivered to the saints to the very end. He did not recant on his death bed.

I used to call on him before he died and was present and took part in his funeral services.

I have a statement from his daughter Mrs. Geniveve C. Dey, Hillsdale, Mich. to the effect that her cousin who was a devoted Adventist, and who was very kind to brother Canright in the hospital, declares in writing, that as much as she wishes it were so, that brother Canright repudiated his writings on his death bed, "THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO GROUND FOR ANY SUCH STATEMENTS AND SHE EVEN SAYS THAT SHE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHO IS TELLING SUCH A FALSEHOOD." Now this is the statement of Canright's niece who is an Adventist herself, and I have it in writing from Canright's daughter.

May be seeing you when we are home to grandpa's house for Thanksgiving Dinner.

Yours cordially,

H. C. Fulton

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW 1940 — 1959

1945 – **Harold E. Snide**, Bible professor at Southern Junior College (now Southern Adventist University), discovers serious problems with the Church's Sanctuary Doctrine and goes to the General Conference in Washington, DC to dialogue with Adventist leaders. He withdraws from the Church in 1945. (See Cottrell, "Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?")

1950 – **E. S. Ballenger** publishes *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists*. This book outlines the lies and deceptions of SDA leaders from the very beginning of the Advent Movement with a special emphasis on proving that the Whites covered up the fact that they taught the **Shut Door Doctrine** and did not work to save lost sinners for many years beyond what they claimed. Ballenger's book provides irrefutable evidence that after SDA leaders discovered the fact that the Whites had deceived the Church in regard to the cover-up, joined the Whites as active participants in the deception. In her suppressed very early writings, Ellen White claimed to have received the principles of the Shut Door Doctrine in vision from God. Like a number of other anti-EGW writers over the years, Ballenger discusses and documents the extensive plagiarism of Ellen White, complete with comparison studies. This book, or booklet, had to have been known to SDA leaders in the 1950's, since Ballenger published it as part of his anti-SDA, anti-EGW circulated publication, *The Gathering Call*, which he published for over 28 years. The information in this book was obtained through an extensive career in Adventist leadership which spanned decades before he discovered the deceptions of the Whites and the Church. That Adventist leaders were again confronted with the facts about the cover-up of the Shut Door teachings of the Whites in 1950's makes the White Estate's continued denials after the 1950's appear to be down-right "criminal." You can access Ballenger's *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists* at www.ex-sda.com. How is it possible that **Dr. Robert Olson**, as Secretary of the White Estate later on, had no knowledge of the existence of this book by **E. S. Ballenger**?

1950 – SDA historian and theologian, **Leroy Froom**, publishes *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers*, a four volume set on the history of Adventism. He betrays the fact that a number of key pioneers of Adventism knew about the **lunar Sabbath** concept through their association with William Miller. Froom listed the following SDA pioneers as ones who knew that the Karaite Jews kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar and that this concept is key to understanding how to calculate the "right" date for the 1844 cleansing of the sanctuary: Sylvester Bliss, Apollos Hale, Josiah Litch, Joshua V. Himes, Nathaniel Southard, Nathan Whiting, and others. (See Volume 4, p. 796.) [Editor's note: From this key admission it is clear that some of the most important Adventist leaders of all time had to know that the Church was not keeping the Sabbath according to the biblical model. Since the Sabbath in their minds is a moral law, their refusal to follow the "truth" as they saw it represented willful disobedience to what they would have understood as the plain will of God. Most likely the fear of reducing the membership and the titles of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was the primary motivator in this matter.

1951 – The Church publishes **Frank D. Nichol's** book, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*. This book represents the largest single collection of desperate attempts to explain away the failed prophecies of Ellen White and crazy things she said. Here is a classic example of Nichol's gift for explaining away the obvious:

From Chapter 24 of *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (F. D. Nichol, 1951):

Mrs. White wrote: "When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion."—*Testimonies*, vol. 1, p. 259.

"England did not declare war." "Her prophecy was a complete failure."

Again we need the context in order to see what Mrs. White is setting forth:

England is studying whether it is best to take advantage of the present weak condition of our nation, and venture to make war upon her. She is weighing the matter, and trying to sound other nations. She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home, and that other nations would take advantage of her weakness. Other nations are making quiet yet active preparations for war, and are hoping that England will make war with our nation, for then they would improve the opportunity to be revenged on her for the advantage she has taken of them in the past, and the injustice done them. A portion of the Queen's subjects are waiting a favorable opportunity to break their yoke; but if England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate a moment to improve

her opportunities to exercise her power, and humble our nation. When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion.”—*Ibid.*, p. 259.

Note the conditional character of these statements: “She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home.” “But if England thinks it will pay.” Then follows the sentence: “When England does declare war. . . .” It is evident that Mrs. White is here using the word “when” as a synonym for “if,” which is good English. In fact, if we do not thus understand the word “when” in this connection, we have an unusual situation— a series of problematical “ifs” is followed by a simple statement that England is going to declare war. Thus Mrs. White's last sentence would make pointless her preceding sentences.

A similar use of the word “when” is found on the preceding page in her work: “When our nation observes the fast which God has chosen, then will he accept their prayers as far as the war is concerned.” No one, least of all the critics, will argue that the word “when” in this connection introduces a simple statement concerning a future fact that will undebatably happen.

1951 – Francis D. Nichol, in his 1951 book, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, on p. 621, cites the very letter that **Skip Baker** photographed in 1980 which proved that Ellen White believed in the Doctrine of the Shut Door for much longer than she claimed to have believed it. Nichols betrayed this knowledge in a footnote that states, "This date is established by a letter from Mrs. White to Joseph Bates, written from Gorham, Maine, July 13, 1847." Why didn't Nichol's print this letter? His attempts to defend Ellen G. White's visions against the charge they taught Shut Door Doctrines, totally ignored the fact that Ellen did believe in the shut door as revealed in the 1847 Bates' letter. At this point in time the Shut Door meant that the door of mercy was closed to the world as taught and renounced by William Miller.

Credit to Cult Help Awareness and Information Library at:

http://www.culthelp.info/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=659&Itemid=8

1952 - Edward S. Ballenger, a former Seventh-day Adventist, provided a statement, witnessed and co-signed by SDA physician, **Dr. Charles D. Willis** of Riverside, California, that Fannie Bolton, one of Ellen White's literary assistants, told him that she wrote *Steps to Christ*— a book which credited Ellen White as its author. (The reproduction of this letter is courtesy of Robert K. Sanders and Truth or Fables.Com.

There is controversy about Fannie Bolton's claim to have written *Steps to Christ*. The White Estate says that she was committed to a mental institution several times, and a number of her statements suggest mental instability. However, the controversy surrounding her claims tells us a lot about how Ellen White's books were put together and drastically edited by her literary assistants. **It is easier to “prove” that Ellen White did not “write” the book herself than it is prove that Fannie Bolton wrote it.** The White Estate said that the book was largely compiled from her own earlier works. We know that Ellen had several literary assistants who extensively edited her work. Merritt G. Kellogg, a very credible witness with a reputation of being a very godly man and a good Seventh-day Adventist, reported that Fannie Bolton had told him that she wrote many articles that were published under Ellen's name in denominational papers. Merritt stated that Fannie expressed to him that she felt “great distress of mind” about this fact and felt like the people were being deceived about the inspiration of what she wrote. He also reported that SDA minister and leader, George B. Starr had been told the same thing by her. Your authors conclude that while we cannot prove that Fannie Bolton wrote *Steps to Christ*, we can prove that Ellen White did NOT write it. That she did NOT write the book is the case if you hold her to the standard of what people mean when they say something like, “I have written a book about the migration of Monarch butterflies,” or “I have written a book that refutes the myth that Ellen White was a prophet of God.”

1954 - George E. Mendenhall, an Evangelical scholar, publishes *Law And Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. He presented research which indicates that the 10 Commandments were modeled after the treaties of Israel's neighboring countries. In such covenants, a purely ceremonial regulation was placed in the very center of the actual list of requirements of the agreement-- a ritual that the subjected nation had to perform on a regular basis to help them remember the great

conqueror to whom they must do homage and exactly what he was requiring of them. His findings are ignored by Adventist leaders and scholars.

1955 – **Raymond F. Cottrell** and a special committee attempt to prepare a chapter on the **Sanctuary Doctrine** for the new **S.D.A. Bible Commentary**. The committee finds no biblical support for the doctrine and is in a quandary about how to approach the task the General Conference has given them to explain what Adventists believe with support from the Bible. (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1958 – The General Conference assigns Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell the task of revising the chapter on the Investigative Judgment (Sanctuary Doctrine) for the classic SDA book, **Bible Readings**. Here is Dr. Cottrell's explanation of what happened:

“In 1958 the Review and Herald Publishing Association needed new printing plates for the classic book, *Bible Readings*, and it was decided to revise it where necessary to agree with the *Commentary*. Coming again to the Book of Daniel I determined to try once more to find a way to be absolutely faithful to both Daniel and the traditional Adventist interpretation of 8:14, but again found it impossible. I then formulated six questions regarding the Hebrew text of the passage and its context, which I submitted to every college teacher versed in Hebrew and every head of the religion department in all of our North American colleges— all personal friends of mine. Without exception they replied that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14.” (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1959 – On May 5, 1959 a special issue of the *Review & Herald* showcases a beautiful painting and article designed to cover-up the fact that Ellen White taught the Shut Door Doctrine during her earliest years as a prophetess after claiming she had received such instruction in a vision from God; and that while she believed and taught this unfortunate doctrine, the Advent believers made no effort to seek and save lost souls. Ellen White taught until much later than she or the Church would like to admit, that the door of probation had closed for everyone except for their small band of Adventist believers. Deceptively, the *Review & Herald* painting shows Ellen White looking upward at a globe of light hovering over the Eastern U.S. and then shooting around the entire world. The article/painting falsely represents this November 1848 vision as containing instruction from God on how to reach the world with the Advent message through the publishing work. On page 39 they have recorded an explanation of this painting. Here is an extended quotation from E. S. Ballenger, *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists* (1950), posted at www.ex-sda.com:

Harry Anderson has sought, in this beautiful painting, to capture a scene in the early history of the Advent Movement. Mrs. E. G. White thus describes the scene she saw in her vision of the beginnings of the publishing work:

“At a meeting held in Dorchester, Mass., November, 1848, I had been given a view of the proclamation of the sealing message, and of the duty of the brethren to publish the light that was shining upon our pathway.”

“After coming out of vision, I said to my husband: 'I have a message for you. You must begin to print a small paper and send it out to the people. Let it be small at first; but as the people read, they will send you means with which to print, and it will be a success from the first. From this small beginning it was shown to be like streams of light that went clear round the world.' ” — *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White*, p. 125.

It was in July, 1849, that James White responded to this vision by starting the publication of *Present Truth*, which was shortly renamed *Review and Herald*. From this small beginning has indeed grown a world work, as Mrs. White forecast in vision.

In the background of this picture are shown James White and Joseph Bates taking notes.

We wrote to the Review & Herald Publishing House asking permission to reproduce this painting. They refused to grant our request.

THE EDITOR GUILTY

The most important portion of this description of the cover is found also on page 5 from the pen of the editor. In addition to quoting that portion referring to light going around the world, the editor also says: "James White believed that he had present truth to present to the world." This statement is represented as being taken from one of Mrs. White's earliest visions which was given her at Dorchester, Mass., Nov. 1848. The vision from which this was taken has never appeared complete in any of Mrs. White's publications. We have a complete copy of this vision which we expect to reproduce in the next issue of the *Gathering Call*. The length of it prevents our using it in this issue. That portion which relates to seeing the lights going around the world is not in the Dorchester vision.

Joseph Bates wrote this vision while Mrs. White spoke it; and *there is no reference whatsoever to light streaming clear around the world*. It is a disgrace to any people to publish such illustrations or such statements in regard to the Dorchester vision.

MRS. WHITE WAS 58 YEARS OLD WHEN SHE FIRST SAW LIGHTS GOING AROUND THE WORLD

The first time that Mrs. White gave utterance to seeing lights encircling the globe was when she was visiting Europe, in 1885 or 1886. It was first published in the RH July 26, 1887. If Mrs. White saw this in 1848, why was it not published until 1887, nearly 40 years later? In proof of this we reproduce her first publication of her seeing lights going clear around the world. It is found on page 379 of the old edition of *Gospel Workers*, published in 1892.

In my very girlhood the Lord saw fit to open before me the glories of heaven. I was in vision taken to heaven, and the angel said to me, "Look!" I looked to the world as it was in dense darkness. The agony that came over me was indescribable as I saw this darkness. Again the word came, "Look ye!" And again I looked intensely over the world, and I began to see jets of light like stars dotted all through this darkness; and then I saw another and another added light, and so all through this moral darkness the star like lights were increasing.

In this Dorchester vision Mrs. White saw that they should begin printing the message but she had no idea of printing the message for the world, for in that vision she stated that they had received the "shut door," which meant that they believed probation had closed.

Another illustration is presented in this Special on page 7. It represents James White and his wife together with other workers bowing around a stack of their first paper, the *Present Truth*, and asking God's blessing to go with it as they mailed it out to their friends. *Present Truth* was an 8-page paper which was edited by James White from July 1849 to November, 1850. The eleven issues were bound together and had a wide circulation in the early days. Mrs. White states that they bowed around every issue of this paper and asked God's blessing upon it. There was hardly a number of this paper that did not contain arguments trying to prove that probation had closed in 1844. One number is largely given to the shut door.

Mrs. White's Topsham vision given on Sabbath, March 24, 1849, contains the positive evidence that she believed and taught the "shut door." Those who have copies of this *Present Truth* will find the portion relating to the shut door at the bottom of col. 1, page 22. It is this portion of the Topsham vision that is omitted from all of Mrs. White's subsequent reproductions. James White, Mrs. White, Joseph Bates, Hiram Edson and others of the pioneers wrote for the *Present Truth* condemning the 1st-day Adventists and other churches for trying to save sinners, because God had rejected all of the world excepting the Advent believers.

MRS. WHITE ASKING GOD'S BLESSING ON THE SHUT DOOR

The inconsistency of these pioneers including James White and his wife bowing down and asking God's blessing to attend the contents of this document which was saturated with the teachings of the "shut door," and then a century later, trying to make all people believe that Mrs. White was shown in vision that they were called to publish and send the message clear around the world, is a shame to any people.

Quoted in E. S. Ballenger, *Facts About Seventh-day Adventists* (1950), posted at www.ex-sda.com

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW: 1960-1971

The Golden Age of Adventism continues during the 1960's. Canright seems forgotten. The Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Sanctuary Doctrine appear to be beyond question to the typical SDA pastor or lay member. However, top Adventist leaders still know there is a serious problem with the Sanctuary Doctrine. The best minds in the Church are secretly trying to find biblical support for this teaching. Adventism flourishes, membership increases dramatically, and Adventist education expands. Prophetic seminars utilizing bogus dates from "history" are used to deceive hundreds of thousands of people into thinking the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the true Church of Bible prophecy for the last days and that all other churches are Babylon. Adventists do not question Colossians 2:14-17, and if they ever do, they are told that the Sabbath in the third position is merely a reference to the monthly and annual ceremonial Sabbaths. No one seems to notice that the syntax of this passage forces it to target the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. The typical Adventist is ignorant of the fact that the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians was virtually immediate, making it impossible that sun worship or the Roman Catholic Church were responsible for the Christian adoption of Sunday as its day of worship. They have no clue that the Eastern Orthodox Church controlled the Western Church during the earlier centuries when Sunday observance became universal. The lunar Sabbath issue seems to have disappeared, and almost no one will hear about during this period of SDA history.

1960 – Meridith Kline publishes "The Two Tables of the Covenant," in the *Westminster Theological Journal* 22 (1960), pages 133-146. This highly respected Evangelical scholar presented additional research which supported the **1954** findings of **George E. Mendenhall** that the 10 Commandments covenant between God and Israel was modeled after the covenants made between the countries of the Middle East in that a ceremonial requirement was always placed in the middle of the actual laws that governed what a subjected nation must do for the conquering king. As in 1954, Adventists and scholars ignore his findings.

1961 – The General Conference president gives **Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell** the task of solving the Investigative Judgment problem. Cottrell sends a questionnaire out to a large number of Adventist scholars and theologians to poll their opinions. The analysis of Cottrell's survey indicates there is widespread concern that the doctrine cannot be supported from the Bible alone. The General Conference orders the formation of a top secret committee. The committee's task is to meet until it can find the biblical support the Church needs to validate the Sanctuary Doctrine/Investigative Judgment concept. The committee includes an elite group of SDA Bible scholars and theologians. (See Cottrell, "The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?").

1966-1967 (CIRCA) - Kerry Wynne, a student at Pacific Union College, interviews **Dr. Robert Olson** regarding Wynne's interest in preparing for the Seventh-day Adventist ministry. Dr. Olson is Chairman of the Religion Department at this time, prior to assuming his duties a few years later as Secretary of the White Estate. Wynne questions Dr. Olson in regard to some doubts he has about Ellen White, including charges that she is a false prophet. Dr. Olson explains that these charges stem mostly from a disgruntled apostate Seventh-day Adventist leader by the name of D. M. Canright, who left the Church because he felt his talents were not adequately appreciated by Ellen and James White. He says that Canright was a bitter man and that his charges against Ellen White were based on the desire to seek revenge. (It has been many years since this interview, and Wynne is only claiming to recall the gist of what Dr. Olson said.) He suggested that to allay his fears he should go to the Pacific Union College Library and check out the book, *The Life of Mrs. E.G. White*, by **D. M. Canright**. Wynne follows Dr. Olson's advice, checks out the book, and reads it quickly. Canright's tone seems a bit angry, and Wynne, unable to grasp the full implications of what he was reading, decides that Dr. Olson is right. Wynne concludes that Ellen White is a true prophet of God and continues in this belief until he reads the *People Magazine* story about the Fox Sisters. (See 1999.) Since Canright

made a big deal about Ellen White's plagiarism in the book that Dr. Olson recommended, this brief interview nearly proves that Dr. Olson knew of her plagiarism when he denied any knowledge of such charges just prior to the exposure of her extensive plagiarism by Walter Rea. (See 1979.)

1968 – The secret Sanctuary Doctrine committee disbands without reaching any conclusion. The committee studied 48 papers by competent SDA Bible scholars and theologians. The total failure of the committee to find support for the doctrine is kept secret. The existence of this secret committee will not be known until Dr. Cottrell retires from the Church and can write and speak what he wants without fear of losing his employment with the Church. (See Cottrell, "The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?").

1971 – The Church publishes the epic, ***Movement of Destiny***, by **Leroy Froom**. He concedes that a massive cover-up of Ellen White's writings related to the Gospel versus the legalism crisis of 1888 had been deliberately perpetrated by the Church. This confession, made under pressure from some elements from within the Church who had heard of the existence of these writings, is astonishing. However, Froom is far from honest with his readers. He still maintains that the documents in question no longer exist when he knows they are locked away safely in the vault. (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, article "White Estate.") According to insider Norris, Froom conspired with Arthur White to cover up what Ellen White actually said about Gospel related topics and the Investigative Judgment. In fact, as Froom lay dying he called his son to his side and ordered him to burn boxes of his research that he had utilized in the writing of ***Movement of Destiny***. Norris says, "Scholars have long known that this large book, which claims to be the official story of 1888, is fiction."

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW: 1972 TO 1983

1972 - By 1972 it is apparent to WWCG leaders and followers that the European Union prophecies of Herbert W. Armstrong, the Church's prophet and founder, cannot possibly come true for at least another 20 years. The Church's leaders and followers become suspicious that Armstrong is not a prophet like he claims to be. (Wikipedia article, "Grace Communion International") Note another interesting parallel between Adventism and Armstrongism. Absolute proof that their respective prophets were frauds surfaced about the same time—only two years apart. Also observe, as we have already pointed out, this revelation of their respective deceptions appears to have created the environment of hypocrisy on the part of church leadership that led to an explosion of financial and moral corruption within less than 10 years.

1972 – *Time* Magazine reports (May 15th edition) that The Worldwide Church of God's **Herbert W. Armstrong** said that Garner Ted [his son] was "in the bonds of Satan," but observes that the elder Armstrong did not elaborate on the subject. *Time* speculates, however that Herbert was forced to come to grips publicly with Garner Ted's alleged continuing problems with gambling and adultery, including his sexual escapades with Ambassador College coeds. **Garner Ted Armstrong** was soon relieved of his star role within the church. (Wikipedia article, "Grace Communion International")

1972 (AUTUMN) – SDA historian, denominational leader, and former employee of Dr. J. H. Kellogg in the later years of the doctor's life, **Alonzo H. Baker**, publishes an article in the Autumn edition of *Spectrum*, "My Years With John Harvey Kellogg," that shows that Dr. Kellogg remained a Christian and Sabbath-keeper until the day that he died, thus providing proof that Ellen White's claim that God showed her that Kellogg was a Pantheist was fraudulent. He also reports that he saw, with his very own eyes, the testimony (letter) from Ellen White in which she stated that God had showed her that he was constructing buildings in Chicago that he never built.

1974 – (Some authorities say 1975) – **Dr. F. Donald Yost** receives special permission to do research in the vault at the General Conference in Washington, DC. In the very back of the vault he finds a brown package hidden under a pile of dust. He opens it up and finds the stenographer's transcript of a secret meeting of top SDA leaders at the 1919 Bible Conference. He removes the package from the vault. In reading it he discovers that almost without exception, each key Adventist leader expresses his or her conviction that Ellen White is essentially a fraud. This amazing document will be published 5 years later (1979) in *Spectrum*, Volume 10, No. 1. (*Spectrum* is a liberal Seventh-day Adventist related independent publication that is

barely tolerated by the Church.) These leaders discuss whether the Church should tell the truth about her or continue the cover-up including the pros and cons of either choice. If a cover-up plan is to be implemented, they wrestle with the problem of how they would keep the truth about her from their seminary students.

1974 – Andrews University history professor **Donald R. McAdams** publishes *Ellen White and the Protestant Historians*. His work exposes Ellen White’s extensive plagiarism of a host of Protestant writers and historians. He wrote his book, he said, because his students complain that her account of history often differs with that of accepted historical sources. In March he sends a letter to Arthur White, then director of the White Estate, detailing his findings. McAdams’ findings are disturbing:

What we find when we examine the historical portions of the *Great Controversy* (those events from the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. through the French Revolution) is that entire chapters at the time are simply selective abridgments of protestant historians. ... In the samples I have examined there is not one historical fact in her text that is not in their text. [pp. 16, 17]

What we find when we examine the historical portions of the *Great Controversy* is that large sections are selective abridgments and adaptations of historians. Ellen White was not just borrowing paragraphs here and there that she ran across in her reading, but in fact following the historians page after page, leaving out much material, but using their sequence, some of their ideas, and often their words. In the examples I have examined I have found no historical fact in her text that is not in their text. The hand-written manuscript on John Huss follows the historian so closely that it does not even seem to have gone through an intermediary stage, but rather from the historian's printed page to Mrs. White's manuscript, including historical errors and moral exhortations. The material taken from the historians is not an insignificant part, but, if my samples are characteristic, a substantial part of the book. – Dr. Donald McAdams, unpublished manuscript, “Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians: The Evidence from an Unpublished Manuscript on John Huss,” p. 19.

1974 – Andrews University history professor **Donald R. McAdams** also finds extensive evidence that Ellen White got her concept, most of her material, and her theology for her book, *The Great Controversy*, from a book written much earlier by an early First Day Advent writer by the name of **H. L. Hastings**, entitled *The Great Controversy Between God and Man—Its Origin Progress and End*. He notes that even her chapter titles have similar names and an almost identical order. (Cited in **Douglas Hackleman’s**, “Ellen White’s Habit,” referencing McAdams, *Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians*, 1974.)

1975 – The events prophesied to take place in **Herbert W. Armstrong’s book, 1975 in Prophecy**, do not come to pass as foretold. Both the leaders and the membership of **The Worldwide Church of God** suffer severe disillusionment as perceptive individuals learn that their prophet is a fraud. (*Wikipedia* article, “Grace Communion International”) This event probably fostered the hypocrisy of the WWCG’s leaders, which may have created conditions suitable for the growth of the corruption that broke loose in 1979.

1976 – **Dr. Ronald Numbers**, then a professor at the Church’s medical school, Loma Linda University, publishes his blockbuster book, *Prophetess of Health*. He outlines conclusive evidence that proves Ellen White got her ideas about health reform from other authors who wrote about health issues and who preceded her by as much as 20 years— in particular a certain Dr. Jackson. He demonstrates that the larger problem is that she lied when she claimed that she had received this information in visions from God. The Church has no answer for his charges because the evidence is compelling.

1977 – **Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi** publishes his iconoclastic scholarly defense of the Sabbath, *From Sabbath to Sunday*. He concedes that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance by 140 AD., proving that Ellen White lied when she claimed that God had showed her in vision that the Roman Catholic Church and the pope had “changed the day.” He concedes that the Sabbath mentioned by St. Paul in Colossians 2:14-17 is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue, flatly contradicting traditional SDA teaching on this point. The ramifications of these astonishing concessions to the anti-Sabbatarians are profound: (1) it contradicted Ellen White's claim that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross. (2) It required the necessity for Bacchiocchi to teach that the Sabbath and the other Jewish ordinances listed by Paul were not the “shadows”

which Paul referred to but instead were the extra rules and regulations of the Judaizers, created by them to make the observance of this set of Jewish ordinances more rigorous. (3) Concept #2 forced Bacchiocchi to develop the theory that Paul validated all the ordinances in Paul's list of Jewish ordinances for continuance into the Christian era, rather than indicating that they were to be discarded as mere "shadows." Concepts #2 and #3 combined forced Bacchiocchi to adopt the unenviable position to conclude that Christians must keep the Jewish dietary laws and annual and monthly sabbath feast days if they are going to believe that Colossians 2:14-17 does not abrogate the Jewish Sabbath. This book launches the current anti-Sabbatarian movement by its colossal failure to defend the Sabbath in a believable way.

1978-1979 – Researcher Tom Norris discovers the suppressed writings of Ellen White related to the 1888 debate between the Gospel and legalism in the vaults of the newly formed General Conference Archives. These documents prove that Ellen White's son, **Arthur White**, had been hiding thousands of documents about this 1888 debate over righteousness by faith that tell a very different story about Ellen White from what Froom and the White Estate had been teaching about her. Furthermore, the discovery uncovers some of the actual documents from this 1888 debate that the White Estate and the *Review* claimed no longer existed. Here is what Norris says:

More than that, there were thousands of rare Ellen White documents from the 1888 period that were discovered hidden in the White Estate. Here was a large and stunning collection of 1888 materials that had been deliberately hidden from the church all these years. No wonder Arthur White tried to keep the White Estate off limits to any researchers or scholars. He, and Froom, and others, had been perpetrating a massive fraud on the Adventist Community. Although this historic discovery took place in 1978-79, just before Glacier View, the leaders were in no mood to admit that such a major scandal was taking place. Besides, the conservatives were in control and such a discovery would destroy their agenda to eliminate the evangelicals and promote their legalistic version of Ellen White's theology that they had so badly misunderstood." (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, White Estate.)

1978 – Ingemar Linden publishes *The Last Trump*. A former Seminary Bible and homiletics teacher, his book proves Ellen White had taught the Shut Door Doctrine much later than she admitted, contrary to the denials of the Church, and supported his claim by quoting from previously unreleased portions of a letter Ellen White had written to **Joseph Bates** on July 13, 1847. This upset **Arthur White**, who was director of the White Estate at the time. Notice that SDA leaders continued to deny that Ellen White taught the Shut Door Doctrine long after Linden proved she had taught it. (See **Douglas Hackleman**, "Ellen White's Habit.")

1978 – The Worldwide Church Of God disfellowships **Garner Ted Armstrong**, the son of **Herbert W. Armstrong**, a final time because of his adulterous behavior, including allegations that he frequently had sex with co-ed's at the Church's Ambassador College, and as the result of his rivalrous contentions with his father's favorite younger leader, **Stanley Rader**.

1979 (JANUARY) – Dr. Robert Olson, then Secretary of the White Estate, states there is nothing to the rumors that Ellen White borrowed extensively from other authors. He lies. Dr. Olson has had access to the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes** since they were discovered in 1974 or 1975. In the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes**, the delegates discuss the length and breadth of Ellen White's plagiarism, including her wholesale copying of a book by two English authors and re-labeling it **Sketches from the Life of Paul**. The delegates mention how she lifted virtually the entire book from these authors yet claimed that God had given her the information in vision. Walter Rea documents the presentation during which Dr. Olson made this deceitful statement in his book, *The White Lie*. Keep in mind that the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes had been available to Dr. Olson since 1974 or 1975 and it would have been the single most important document he had ever seen since it proved these early SDA leaders knew Ellen White was a fraud:

At an afternoon presentation by Olson in January 1979 at Loma Linda University in California, someone in the audience asked about Mrs. White's borrowing from published sources. Olson's reply was to the effect that there was nothing to it, that all of her writings were her own. He then volunteered that there was some minister in Southern California making waves with allegations about borrowed material for her key book, *The Desire of Ages*, but that there was nothing to these rumors.

To say that I was in a state of shock after the meeting is to put it mildly. My file at that very time already held several letters from that same Olson encouraging me to keep sending him my comparisons of Ellen with her contemporaries. Furthermore, he had personally talked with me when he was in California only a short time before and had sought my promise that I would not publish any report on my work until he and the White Estate staff had been given additional time to survey the material.

I had agreed to his request, and the fact of the agreement had been recorded in the in-house memo that he wrote afterward and that I held in my files. (*The White Lie*, Introduction)

1979 (FEBRUARY) – Andrews University theology student, Aage Rendalen demonstrates that Ellen White's son, Willie White, did not believe in the testimonies of his own mother, and cites the the A. R. Henry Libel Case. See the paper, “Mrs. White Vs. The Facts: A Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Course THST 616, Doctrine of Revelation and Inspiration,” pp. 9-10, by Aage Rendalen, Andrews University Theological Seminary, February 1979.

1979 (APRIL) – The Worldwide Church Of God’s corruption problems break loose as **Mike Wallace** of the CBS program **60 Minutes** interviews the Church’s legal and financial adviser, **Stanley Rader**, before a national audience. Wallace presents documentary evidence of lavish secret expenditures, conflict of interest insider deals, posh homes and lifestyles of Church officials, and the heavy involvement of Stanley Rader himself in financial manipulation. Rader abruptly terminates the interview. This interview was aired April 15, 1979. Garner Ted Armstrong had blamed Stanley Rader for his two-time ousting from his father's church. Garner Ted and other former and discontented members of the Worldwide Church of God prompted the State of California to investigate charges of malfeasance by Rader and others who were connected with WWCG’s Ambassador International Cultural Foundation (AICF) which had been founded in 1975 as a tax-exempt world-wide charitable organization. In this year California Attorney General George Deukmejian brought civil charges against the Church, and the Church was placed into an investigative financial receivership for one year. Note these interesting facts: (1) As we have reviewed, this financial corruption broke out about the same time and apparently for many of the same reasons that caused financial corruption to break out in the Seventh-day Adventist Church at this time, including the increasing hypocrisy that developed as the top leaders in both churches came to realize that their respective prophets were frauds. (2) Both churches started tax-exempt, world-wide charities that got into serious legal trouble. The problems with the Adventist Development and Relief Agency in later years were virtually identical. A tax-free charitable organization appears to give religious organizations a blank check to take government money and other funds and cause the money to disappear without doing anything to help the people for whom it is intended. It makes for a lot of good-paying jobs and expense accounts.

1979 (MAY) – *Spectrum* Magazine publishes the **1919 Bible Conference Minutes** in its May issue. This event provided absolute proof that Adventist leaders had known for certain that Ellen White was a fraud for a very long time. The Church admits nothing and continues to present her as a true prophet.

1979 (SEPTEMBER) - Robert Olson, Secretary of the White Estate, publishes a short paper about the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes. (See Olson, Robert W., “The 1919 Conference and Bible and History Teachers’ Council.” Washington, DC: Ellen G. White Estate, September 24, 1979.. Heritage Room DF [BIBLE CONFERENCE – 1919]). After 1979 there is no excuse for the SDA Church to continue to promote Ellen White as a true prophetess, to continue to deny that she was guilty of plagiarism on a massive scale, and to evade the issue that whether she plagiarized or not,— she lied about the sources of her material. While we are not certain when the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* fell into Dr. Olson’s hands between the time of its theft from the vault in 1974 and its publication by *Spectrum* in May of 1979, Dr. Olson’s 1979 article proves that he had full access to it by no later than 1979.

1980 – Skip Baker, then General Conference Photographer, convinces vault official, Ron Graybill, to release the 1847 letter Ellen White wrote to **Joseph Bates**. Baker is shocked by its release to him. He makes numerous photographs of the letter. He notes the letter clearly proves that Ellen White believed in and taught the Shut Door Doctrine as late as 1847— a fact that Adventist leaders had vehemently denied for well over 100 years. He discovers that much of the letter had been intentionally mutilated to keep the contents beyond page 3 from being legible. However, there is enough damaging evidence on the first page to prove that she taught the Shut Door at the time. To see a photograph of this letter, access it at:

1980 – Dr. Desmond Ford, guest professor of religion at Pacific Union College and on loan at the time from Avondale College in Australia, is put on trial at Glacier View Ranch near Denver, Colorado, for his views on the **Sanctuary Doctrine**. He had disclosed in a forum lecture at Pacific Union College that he cannot find biblical support for this doctrine and that its teachings appear to be fundamentally anti-Gospel. About 40 top SDA theologians and biblical scholars are present at the trial. They vote unanimously in favor of six of his eight points. Ford is defrocked and forced to earn a living outside of Church employment. **Neal C. Wilson**, then General Conference president, flies back to General Conference Headquarters in Washington, DC and announces that the Glacier View Committee unanimously agreed that Dr. Ford's views are wrong and that he should be defrocked. (See Cottrell, "The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?").

1980 - News that an Adventist pastor, **Dr. Walter Rea**, had found evidence of plagiarism in the writings of the Church's prophetess, Ellen G. White, reaches the ears of **John Dart**, the religion editor of the *Los Angeles Times*. Dart interviewed Dr. Rea in his home, and very quickly publishes a story with banner headlines that read, "Plagiarism Found in Prophet Books," (October 20, 1980). The story is syndicated to 1,000 newspapers and reported on worldwide radio and TV. Dr. Rea is fired from the Church in November. (See Walter Rea, *Pirates of Privilege*, p. 76 in the spiral-bound edition available from Dr. Desmond Ford's, Good News Unlimited organization in Australia.)

1980 – The Church forms a committee in Glendale, California to study the evidence they already have that Ellen White borrowed extensively from the writings of other authors without giving credit to her sources. Eighteen key scholars from across the country met to examine the evidence. They receive orders to work with Dr. Rea in their study. The committee concludes that the evidence is alarming and that further study is needed. Unfortunately, the committee acts without the consent of the Church's high administrative council, **PREXAD**. PREXAD blocks any further activity by the Glendale Committee and announces its own plan to deal with the issues. (See Rea, *Pirates of Privilege*, p. 75 of the spiral bound edition from Good News Unlimited.)

1980 – Dr. Donald R. McAdams, SDA history professor from Andrews University, tells the Glendale Committee:

*If every paragraph in the book **Great Controversy**, written by Ellen White, was properly footnoted, then every paragraph would have to be footnoted.*

1981 – Circa 1981 – A group of about 40 SDA biblical scholars and theologians sign a statement which came to be known as the "**Atlanta Affirmation**." This document, sent to General Conference President, **Neal C. Wilson**, rebukes him for lying about what happened at Glacier View and for the way he treated Dr. Ford both before and after the Glacier View trial. (See Cottrell, "**The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?**")

1981 – Robert D. Brinsmead, a highly controversial independent Seventh-day Adventist theologian with a large following in the United States in earlier years, publishes his classic paper, "**Sabbatarianism Re-examined**." Brinsmead's paper, the writing of which is evidently prompted by his keen perception that Dr. Bacchiocchi's 1977 book came closer to destroying the case for Sabbatarianism than to defending it, refutes Bacchiocchi's fanciful Sabbath theology and painfully exposes the impossibilities of Sabbatarianism. A brilliant writer, Brinsmead disproves the entire Sabbath concept with the most up-to-date scholarly research and lock-step logic.

1981 – The Church's Davenport Scandal breaks loose with the bankruptcy of SDA physician and real estate developer, **Dr. Donald J. Davenport**. This scandal exposes Adventist corruption on an unimaginable scale, including bribery, kick-backs, illegal conflicts of interest, and cover-up. Many Church entities are shown to have been involved— state and regional conferences, Adventist institutions like Pacific Union College, and a wide variety of Adventist leaders, including the General Conference president and six union conference presidents. The Davenport Scandal shows Adventist leaders behaving as if they do not believe in Heaven or Hell, or the unique SDA doctrines of the Investigative Judgment, the inspiration of Ellen White, and the Sabbath.

1981 – Dale Ratzlaff, who is later to be described by SDA Bible professor **Judd Lake** as the "fountain head of all [SDA] critics," leaves the Church because he cannot find biblical support for the Church's Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment (Sanctuary Doctrine). He continues to keep the Sabbath for a while and later writes his devastating critique of the Investigative

Judgment entitled **Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists**. Later, he will publish a comprehensive anti-Sabbatarian book entitled **Sabbath in Crisis**, which is now renamed **Sabbath in Christ**. (See also 1990) His book on the Sabbath will later become one of two documents written by former SDA authors that influence **The Worldwide Church of God** to turn its back on the Sabbatarian heritage it had shared with Seventh-day Adventists from the very beginning. (See also 1995.)

1981 - The General Conference presents the **Ramik Report**; the findings of a Roman Catholic lawyer hired by the Church to investigate the claim that Ellen White was a plagiarist. Attorney Ramik finds that Ellen White is not guilty of plagiarism and that her borrowing of the ideas of others was not extensive and exact enough to constitute plagiarism. This would be farcical were it not so pathetic. Lawyers do not make a determination of innocence or guilt; they defend a client as best they can in court, and the court makes the determination. This scenario has Ramik acting as judge and jury, acquitting his own client of any wrongdoing. "Ladies and gentlemen of the SDA, I find my defendant, the late Ellen White, innocent of the charge of plagiarism. Case dismissed. Make your check payable to Dillar, Ramik & Wight, Ltd."

The Ramik Report fails to address the real question, "Is Ellen White a liar?" Ramik apparently did not research to see where Ellen White repeatedly claimed that God had shown her something in vision that she had copied from a human writer. The Church failed to have Ramik address the real problem, and that is that true prophets of God do not lie. Of course, Ramik was not hired to determine the credibility of his client.

1982 – SDA physician, **Dr. Donald Davenport's** Ponzi scheme collapses, bilking numerous Adventist institutions and individuals out of mega-millions of dollars. Many SDA institutions lost all of their investment funds, and in many cases they lost money that had been designated as tithes.

1982 – **Robert D. Brinsmead** publishes another block-buster paper on the Sabbath, "**A Digest of the Sabbath Question.**" This paper provides additional scholarly proof for the points he made in his 1981 paper and is written in his usual brilliant style. These two papers confront SDA leaders with biblical and historical evidence that prove that Sabbatarianism is impossible— not merely questionable.

1982 - **Dr. Walter Rea** publishes his block-buster anti-Ellen White classic, **The White Lie**. Extensively-researched book explains the extent of her plagiarism with many specific examples, and it details the cover-up of the Ellen White problem by Adventist leaders. Rea's book effectively destroys the Ellen White myth, and Adventist leaders should have raised the "White" flag of surrender and repudiated the Church's claim that she was a prophet of God. Rea eloquently demonstrates that the biggest problem with Ellen White was not simply her plagiarism, but that she repeatedly lied every time she made the blasphemous claim that God gave her the information she copied.

1982 – The Ellen G. White Estate in conjunction with the Ministerial Association of the General Conference and the SDA controlled Biblical Research Institute publish the paper, "**The Truth About the White Lie.**" The paper put a nice spin on the interpretation of the events surrounding the problems with Ellen White's copying. It was revised in 1999. Since it is the 1999 edition that your authors have access to, see 1999 for examples of bold-faced deception in this document.

1982 – The Church commissions **Dr. Fred Veltman**, then head of the religion department at Pacific Union College, to study the charges of Walter Rea that Ellen White had plagiarized most of the material she put into her book, **The Desire of Ages**. Dr. Veltman launches an eight-year study focused on this one book.

1982 – **D. A. Carson** (editor) publishes **From Sabbath to Lord's Day**, a collection of scholarly papers written by his team of biblical scholars to answer Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's book, **From Sabbath to Sunday**. This project, which took his team many years to complete, relates the discovery that Moses clearly worded Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 in such a way as to indicate that the Sabbath Ordinance was not instituted at Creation— that it was given to the followers of God for the first time with the giving of the manna at the time of the Exodus, and that the newly given Sabbath Commandment was merely modeled after Creation Week. The Carson scholars also added greatly to our understanding of why Christians "abandoned" Sabbath-keeping and embraced Sunday observance. Their findings provide additional evidence that any variation of the apostasy-conspiracy approach— whether it be Ellen White's Roman Catholic Church theory, Samuele Bacchiocchi's Jewish Persecution Theory, The Dual Day Theory proposed by the General Conference, or Strand's Out Of Easter Theory, does not fit the facts. Note that Dr. Bacchiocchi never addressed the Hebrew linguistics problems in any of his subsequent books on the Sabbath. Note also that the Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholars who attempted to develop more respectable theories

to replace Dr. Bacchiocchi's "New Sabbatarianism" failed to even mention them also, much less try to refute them. They simply ignored them. Proper scholarship demands that one examine any and all relevant evidence, and address it accordingly.

1983 – The Church fires **Dr. Ron Graybill**, a research assistant for 13 years and the Associate Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, after his Johns Hopkins University doctoral dissertation, "**The Power of Prophecy: Ellen G. White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century**," was leaked out. Without his consent or knowledge, copies of the dissertation, which he had placed on a five-year embargo, are circulated to Adventist leaders throughout the world. He had taken the liberty to use material that the White Estate had placed in a top secret category. It is highly significant to observe that someone who had unlimited access to Ellen White's entire collection of writings for over 13 years finally determined that she was a fraud. His paper was skeptical of her prophetic gifts, her character and integrity, and he provided evidence that suggested that she produced her visions whenever necessary to maintain her authority. (See Walter Rea's book, *Pirates of Privilege*, p. 72-73, spiral bound edition available from Dr. Desmond Ford's Australian organization, Good News Unlimited. This book is also available at various websites, including SCRIB-D.)

Later we will have more to say about how the release of this damaging evidence to select Church leaders made them accountable to stop the Ellen White fraud, but that no such thing happened.

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW: 1984 TO 1990

By the end of the 1980's, Adventist leaders have proof to the point of over-kill, thanks to the publication of D. A. Carson's 1982 book, *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, that its Sabbath doctrine is biblically and historically impossible, the primary proof for such being the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis and Exodus, including the Exodus story. They have known that Ellen White was a fraud since 1919—a fact proven by the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* and the plagiarism of Dr. Walter Rea as published in his 1982 book, *The White Lie*. Despite the unraveling of any credibility for their special doctrines, Adventist leaders show absolutely no interest in renouncing their false teachings and joining the larger Christian community. Additional revelations of SDA deceptions and cover-ups continue to surface, but leadership is unmoved. The Church quietly acknowledges that Ellen White lied about the sources of information she had claimed came straight from the throne of God in vision, but still refuse to renounce her as a false prophet.

1984 – Walter Rea's 1984 book, *Pirates of Privilege*, is not published. Earlier, Rea had been fired in November of 1980 for uncovering the fact that Ellen White plagiarized the writings of other authors while claiming that she got that information in visions from God. He was 60 years old at the time the Church fired him, and had served the Denomination faithfully for many decades. Adventist leaders attempted to deny him his retirement benefits as well. Dr. Rea took the Church to court and won back his retirement benefits. However, he was forced to agree not to publish *Pirates of Privilege* in order to have his retirement benefits reinstated. Thus, every cent paid by the Church to Walter Rea after his firing represents, in a real sense of the word, out-right bribery in the form of "hush money." Truth became the true victim of the Church.

Read *Pirates of Privilege* at: www.truthorfables.com

1984 – Robert Olson, in his *Advent Review* (February 23, 1984) article, "Ellen G. White's use of Historical Sources in *The Great Controversy*," concedes:

There is no question in Ellen G. White's mind about the overall inspiration of *The Great Controversy*, although possibly 50 percent or more of the material was drawn from other sources.

1986 – Adventist seminary student, **Bruce Weaver**, discovers a newspaper account of a wild meeting at **Israel Dammon's** home and a transcript of the court record. It shows that Ellen White lied about her participation in the same fanaticism that she condemned later. (See Bruce Weaver's story at Ellen White Exposed, taken from *Adventist Currents*, Vol. 3, Number 1, 1988.) See also 1874. His article can be found at the following link: <http://www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/israel.htm>

1986 – The transcript of a 1907 meeting between Kellogg and two General Conference officials is released to the public. This transcript, recorded by a stenographer, documents what was said when they came to excommunicate him. This document, "Interview at Dr. J. H. Kellogg's House, October 7, 1907 Between **Geo. W. Amadon**, **Elder A. C. Bordeau**, and **Dr. J. H. Kellogg**" provides evidence that the source of information in her testimonies was of human origin, that her opposition to Dr.

Kellogg's book, *The Living Temple*, was based on her concern for financial gain, and that the Chicago Buildings Vision was a serious blunder. Additionally it furnishes evidence that her son, Willie White, did not believe his own mother's testimonies were inspired. This material is so devastating to the view that Ellen White was an inspired prophet of God that Adventist leaders have suggested that the transcript is not genuine. Also, SDA apologists warn Church members not to read the document because its sophistries can lead them away from the "TRUTH". One of the common methods employed in cults is the control over information, telling people what sources of information they can, and cannot, avail themselves.

1987 – The White Estate publishes a shoddy, disorganized, and difficult-to-read release of hundreds of Ellen White's writings related to the Gospel versus legalism debate of 1888. There is no acknowledgment that the very fact that these documents actually exist represents a huge scandal. The released document is so shoddy that it suggests that the Church deliberately made it so difficult to study that few people would have the courage to struggle through it. Tom Norris, the Adventist researcher who, earlier, had been given unlimited access to these documents, says this regarding this event:

“The late publication of this large collection of 1888 materials from the White Estate proves that they were hiding and suppressing Ellen White's writings, and acting in bad faith all during the Righteousness by Faith debates of the 1970's and even during Glacier View, and beyond. Arthur White was indeed guilty of misleading and deceiving generations of SDA's, including the scholars and the critics about Ellen Whites Gospel theology and her role in 1888. And thus the SDA leaders have been caught perpetrating a massive fraud about Ellen White and the fundamentals of Adventist theology. Here is the largest scandal that the denomination has ever faced, and yet few today are even aware that such a scandal exists because it has never been acknowledged, much less confessed or explained. And thus this massive fraud is still ongoing in nature even though the White Estate managed to publish the hidden documents some time ago.” (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, White Estate.)

WHAT ADVENTISTS KNEW: 1990 – PRESENT

1990 – Dr. Fred Veltman completes his study of the *Desire of Ages*. He concludes that Ellen White had plagiarized the vast majority of her material from other writers, including writers of religious fiction, and that there is hardly a single idea that is unique to Ellen White in the *Desire of Ages*. His findings are published in the December 1990 issue of *Ministry* (pp. 11-14). Amazingly, Dr. Veltman concedes that he has no explanation for her lying about receiving direct, divine inspiration for things that she copied from the writings of others.

Dr. Veltman named the books she copied and questioned her honesty. In earlier editions of *The Great Controversy*, she had essentially claimed that God was the Source of most of her information. As more and more well-read individuals noticed that she had copied large sections of the work of other writers, she was forced to claim less influence from divine revelation and more from human sources. On our historical time line you can see the evolving claims about the level of inspiration she claimed for its content. Here is Dr. Veltman's response to a key question he was assigned to answer in his study:

3. How do you harmonize Ellen White's use of sources with her statements to the contrary? Do you think the introductory statement to *The Great Controversy* constitutes an adequate admission of literary dependence?"

I must admit at the start that in my judgment this is the most serious problem to be faced in connection with Ellen White's literary dependency. It strikes at the heart of her honesty, her integrity, and therefore her trustworthiness.

As of now I do not have - nor, to my knowledge, does anyone else have - a satisfactory answer to this important question. The statement from *The Great Controversy* comes rather late in her writing career and is too limited in its reference to historians and reformers. Similar admissions do not

appear as prefaces to all her writings in which sources are involved, and there is no indication that this particular statement applies to her writings in general.

See: http://www.truthorfables.com/Desire_of_Ages_Veltman.h

You can find the entire **Veltman Report** by accessing:

http://www.truthorfables.com/Desire_of_Ages_Veltman.htm

1990 – Dale Ratzlaff publishes his anti-Sabbatarian book, ***Sabbath in Crisis***. As you may recall, Ratzlaff had left Adventism in 1980 because he could not find biblical support for the Sanctuary Doctrine. He remained a Sabbath-keeper for several years after his apostasy from the Church. Eventually he began to look into other Adventist doctrines, including the Sabbath. Among the sources he studied were the Brinsmead papers. As a result of this study, he rejected Sabbatarianism and began to work on *Sabbath in Crisis*. This book has now been re-named ***Sabbath in Christ***. Ratzlaff's book appears to be one of the most complete treatises on the impossibilities of Sabbatarianism available today. Together with the Brinsmead papers, *Sabbath in Crisis/ Sabbath in Christ* has led the way in forging the current anti-Sabbatarian movement that is threatening the very existence of Adventism, particularly in North America.

1994 – George R. Knight, SDA theologian and author, re-prints Thomas M. Preble's 1845 pro-Sabbatarian tract in his 1994 book, ***1844 And the Rise of Sabbatarian Adventism***, compiled and edited by George R. Knight, 1994, and published by Review and Herald Publishing Association, ISBN 0-8280-0850-7. Interestingly, it seems he did not let his readers know that Preble studied his way out of Adventism and became a major force in opposition to the three distinctive doctrines of Adventism—the Sabbath, Ellen White, and the 1844 sanctuary doctrine. Perhaps Knight didn't know Preble apostatized later.

1995 - Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi publishes *The Sabbath in the New Testament*. In this new book he appears to have opened to the possibility that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-17 was a reference to a ceremonial sabbath feast day-- perhaps an annual one - in essence, a return to the traditional SDA position on this text. He seems to have traded the difficulties of his iconoclastic views for the impossibilities of the traditional Adventist interpretation of this passage. By now, however, the damage has already been done. His 1977 views have already helped to launch the new anti-Sabbatarian movement that is challenging the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

1995 – The Worldwide Church of God renounces Sabbatarianism after studying the writings of former Adventists, Robert D. Brinsmead and Dale Ratzlaff. This repudiation of Sabbatarianism represents one of the most significant events in the history of modern Christianity. Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church and The Worldwide Church of God ultimately developed out of one group of Advent believers immediately after the Great Disappointment of 1844, the implications of this development are devastating to Adventism.

1995 – Robert Folkenberg, Sr., then General Conference President of SDA, responding to agitation about the **lunar Sabbath** (which began to emerge in California and Washington) commissions a study group to investigate the lunar calendar/Sabbath issue. The committee consists of five scholars from the seminary at Andrews University plus a representative from the Ministerial Department of the North American Division, plus **Robert M. Johnston**, Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins, at the seminary at Andrews University, who was chosen to chair the committee. There is evidence that three of the five members from Andrews University were convicted that the lunar Sabbath was biblical and became sympathetic to the idea that the Church needed to reform its practices accordingly. The committee was shut down and its findings suppressed. (See 4 Angels Publications web-site.)

1997 – Dirk Anderson switches his website devoted to defending Ellen White to exposing her as a fraud after Dale Ratzlaff challenged him to read D. M. Canright's 1919 book, ***Life of Mrs. E. G. White, Seventh-day Adventist Prophet— Her False Claims Refuted***. Since 1997 Brother Anderson's anti-EGW website has become the repository of one of the largest collections of original documents as well as research papers written by Dirk Anderson and others, exposing the fraudulent claims of Ellen White and the Church's cover-up of its knowledge that she was a fraud.

You can read Dirk Anderson's story at: <http://www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/archive/testimony.htm> His research is so devastating to Adventism that the Seventh-day Adventist Church successfully brought legal action against him that forced him to give up his original Internet domain name. This tactic made it more difficult for Internet users to find his website.

1997 – Robert K. Sanders, who left Adventism some years prior to 1997 after discovering problems with Ellen G. White and the Sanctuary Doctrine, launches his anti-SDA, anti-Ellen White, and anti-Sabbatarian website, **Truth or Fables**. Since 1997 Truth or Fables has provided a substantial collection of anti-SDA documents not available anywhere else, including well-researched biblical studies by Sanders and others who exhaustively deal with the problematic teachings of Adventism. Sander's website also features a collection of documents that deal with the extensive corruption which has plagued the Seventh-day Adventist Church since the 1970's. His ministry includes a small panel of experts who dialogue directly with individuals who have specific questions about Sabbatarianism, Ellen White, and other SDA issues. His ministry helps many people throw off the deceptions of Adventism and embrace the Gospel of Jesus as outlined by Paul in his writings. Go to TRUTH OR FABLES and read his testimony at: http://www.truthorfables.com/My_Testimony.htm

1998 – Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi publishes ***Sabbath under Crossfire*** in response to the growing threat of the new anti-Sabbatarian movement that he inadvertently started by his catastrophic embarrassment of Sabbatarianism represented by his book, ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, back in 1977. Bacchiocchi ignores the newer key arguments of the anti-Sabbatarians, such as the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story; the improved understanding by scholars of the diversity in the Early Church, and the similarity between the structure of the 10 Commandments and the treaties of Israel's neighbors. More importantly, as you will recall, he brought further embarrassment to Adventists by enlarging on the requirement that Christians must keep the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbath feast days, and monthly sabbath feast days, in addition to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. Significantly he appeared to have modified his position that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-17 was a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue, allowing the possibility that it was a reference to ceremonial events that lasted an entire week (*Sabbath Under Crossfire*, 1998). (See also **1995** for another modification in his view of Colossians 2:14-17.)

1998 – Revelation of disgusting financial corruption at the tax-exempt Adventist Relief and Development Agency comes to light, thanks to General Conference whistle-blower and chief financial officer, David Dennis, who uncovered the scandal. Millions of dollars of government funding and private donations fail to make it to their intended recipients. This organization created a lot of nice jobs for Adventists and provided more than generous expense accounts to pay them well for mismanaging the funds. **Note the parallel, here, with the financial scandal that corrupted The Worldwide Church of God's charitable and cultural organization, which surfaced in 1979.**

1999 – The Truth about the White Lie is revised and re-released. This document was prepared by the staff of the Ellen G. White Estate in cooperation with the Biblical Research Institute and the Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. First published August 1982. Revised January 1999. An excerpt follows:

FROM THE CHURCH'S PUBLICATION: THE TRUTH ABOUT THE WHITE LIE:

It has been rumored that Ellen White was threatened with a lawsuit for her literary borrowing, from Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul*. What are the facts?

In spite of A. G. Daniell's faulty memory in this regard, Mrs. White was never accused of plagiarism by the British authors Conybeare and Howson, nor was she threatened with a lawsuit, nor was her book withdrawn because of criticisms of its use of sources. In the 1890's there was a letter of inquiry about *Sketches from the Life of Paul* addressed to the Review and Herald Publishing Association by one of the several American publishers of Conybeare and Howson, the T. Y. Crowell Co. of New York. Large quantities of Conybeare and Howson's book had earlier been purchased from the Crowell Co. to give away as prizes to those who would secure subscriptions to the *Signs of the Times*. W. C. White, the only source of information about this letter, "indicates that it was written in a kindly spirit" and contained "no threats of prosecution, nor any complaints as to plagiarism.

When the Crowell Company was quizzed about the matter some thirty years later, they replied:

We publish Conybeare's *Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul*, but this is not a copyrighted book and we would have no legal grounds for action against your book and we do not think that we have ever raised any objection or made any claim such as you speak of.

Like many of Ellen White's books, *Sketches From the Life of Paul* was out of print for some time while Mrs. White worked toward enlarging it into *The Acts of the Apostles*, but aside from scurrilous speculation and faulty memories, **there is no evidence that this had anything to do with any alleged criticism of Ellen White's use of Conybeare and Howson.**

A little research from the anti-SDA, anti-Sabbatarian author, Max Chugg, clearly demonstrates the perfidy of the above White-washing:

REBUTTAL FROM “THE TRUTH ABOUT THE WHITE LIE REFUTED”

A. G. Daniells was the president of the General Conference and when he made his comments about this book, he was speaking as Moderator at the 1919 Bible Conference. Are we asked to believe that this man would be asked to chair such a meeting if he was prone to memory failure? And even if he was, he gave ample opportunity to those prominent Adventists at the meeting to disagree with him.

His remarks were:

Yes, and now take that “Life of Paul,” I supposed you know all about it and knew that claims were put up against her, charges made of plagiarism, even by the Authors of the book, Conybeare and Howson, and were liable to make the denomination trouble because there was so much of their book put into the *Life of Paul* without any credit of quotation marks I found it out and I read it with Brother Palmer when he found it, and we got Conybeare and Howson, and we got Wylie's *History of the Reformation*, and we read word for word, page after page, and no quotations, no credit, and really I did not know the difference until I began to compare them. I supposed it was Sister White's own work. The poor sister said, “Why, I didn't know about quotations and credits. My Secretary should have looked after that, and the publishing house should have looked after it.

<http://www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/rea/truth.htm>

This account of the matter by the White Estate and SDA Church is a White Lie itself. Conybeare and Howson were British authors, and they had a publisher in England. It was the English publisher and the authors themselves who threatened the lawsuit! This is the same White Estate that we have to face when it comes to finding out the truth about anything.

1999 – *People Magazine* publishes an article about the **Fox Sisters**, who started the Spiritualist Movement in the mid 1800's. This information calls into question Ellen White's integrity with her comment about being shown in vision that the “rappings” were not the result of “human trickery.” The article tells the story about how these sisters confessed, decades later, that they made up the story about the rappings at their farm house and that they deceived people during their séances by tying a string to their toes which activated a rock placed against the wall. After touring the country for decades giving lectures and séances, they toured the country lecturing about how they had managed to deceive everyone. **The author of the article uses exactly the same words as Ellen White, just turned around**, stating that the Fox Sisters confessed that their spirit manifestations **WERE THE RESULT OF HUMAN TRICKERY**. Whether there was a supernatural component to what the Fox Sisters were doing, this *People Magazine* article brings to mind the fact that Ellen White said in the **Great Controversy** that Spiritualism would soon pervade all the main-line churches and that it would be considered a sin to talk against the spirit manifestations within these churches. Nothing of the sort has happened. Even more strangely, an eye-witness to one of Ellen White's early visions observed the phenomena of table tipping— a term synonymous with Spiritualism at the time.

See this link for the story of the Fox Sisters: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/egw54.htm

2002 – Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell, widely acknowledged to be the greatest Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, presents his paper, “**The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?**” at the San Diego Forum on February ninth. His presentation exposes not only the impossibilities of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment, but the perfidy of Adventist leaders spanning over many decades of Church history. Wisely, Dr. Cottrell waited until his retirement from the Church to present this paper. There is no question but that he would have been fired if he had presented his views while being actively employed by the Church. It is possible that we would never have known about this scandalous cover-up if it had not been for his willingness to reveal what happened after his retirement.

2004 – An “Independent” SDA-related ministry satellite broadcaster **3ABN**, opens the floodgates to a huge scandal when its governing board dismisses the organization's key figure's wife, Linda Shelton, alleging sexual misconduct. This event led to scrutiny of financial and other irregularities, which would later come to nearly threaten the existence of this very large pro-SDA broadcasting network.

2006 – Laura Lee Vornholt-Jones, hearing about the lunar Sabbath concept from influences outside of Adventism, begins researching the subject and discovers a reference to the Grace Amadon Collection. (Grace Amadon was a committee member appointed in 1939 to the committee established by the General Conference to explore the lunar Sabbath Question. She had collected a large number of documents, including letters and papers, related to her work with the committee.) Vornholt-Jones pooled financial resources with friends and family and purchased everything from the collection that was copyable.

2007 – In October of 2007, **Laura Lee Vornholt-Jones** and her associated family and friends published the results of their research in ***The Great Calendar Controversy***. They mailed copies of their new book SDA church leaders in the Pacific Northwest, including the North Pacific Union.

2007 – In December of 2007, someone in Canada sent copies of ***The Great Calendar Controversy*** and three hundred pages of documents copied from the Grace Amadon Collection along with a request for an investigation to a wide variety of Adventist leaders including Elder Jan Paulsen, then president of the General Conference; Orville Parchment, then vice president of the General Conference; Dr. Angel Rodriguez, head of the Bible Research Institute; Elder Don Schneider, president of the North American Division; Elder Dan Jackson, president of the Canadian Union Conference; Dr. Denis Fortin, Dean of Theology at the seminary at Andrews University; Dr. Jacques Doukhan of Andrews University; Elder Doug Bachelor, director of Amazing Facts, headquartered in Sacramento, California; and others. PDF copies were also mailed to 600 Adventist leaders throughout the world. Also, in this same month hard copies of the book were mailed to all the SDA pastors and conference leaders in Canada.

2007 – Plans to merge two huge SDA “independent” ministries, **Amazing Facts** and **3ABN** are scrapped by the Church due to the growing scandal at 3ABN.

2007 – Dr. Jacques Doukhan, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis at Andrews University, lectures to a group of Adventists in Spokane, Washington. He states that when the biblical, lunar Biblical calendar is used, the Sabbath will “fall differently.” This lecture began another wave of agitation about the lunar calendar/Sabbath concept that, in turn, led to the excommunication of a number of Seventh-day Adventists who were among those who began asking the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to consider the matter and reform the Church.

2007 – The Church publishes its first “scholarly” attempt to defend its Sabbath doctrine in 30 years, almost certainly timed to commemorate the 30-year anniversary of the publication of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's 1977 book, ***From Sabbath to Sunday***. The author is **Dr. Skip MacCarty**, Associate Pastor of the Pioneer Memorial Church at Andrews University where the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary is located. This author takes his readers on a theological wild goose chase to bring them around and around to accept, hook, line, and sinker, the convoluted theological gymnastics of his predecessor, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi. MacCarty ignores the impossibilities of the arguments in defense of Sabbatarianism in regards to the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story and the biblical prerequisite of circumcision for Sabbath-keeping, and slicks over the impossibilities of Colossians 2:14-17 in the same manner as Bacchiocchi. However, MacCarty fails to spell out to his readers that what he and Dr. Bacchiocchi teach about Colossians 2:14-17 absolutely requires Adventists and Sabbatarians to keep all the Jewish ordinances mentioned by Paul, including the Jewish dietary laws and annual and monthly sabbath feast days. He states that a

discussion of Early Church history is beyond the scope of his book, and for good reason. The facts of the history of the Early Church are devastating to Sabbatarianism.

2008 - The Andrews University Press publishes a book by SDA scholar, **Dr. Ron du Preez**, entitled ***Judging the Sabbath: Discovering What Can't Be Found in Colossians 2:16***, which refutes Dr. Bacchiocchi's and Dr. MacCarty's concession that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-16 is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. Du Preez looks at Old Testament texts that list sets of Jewish holy day classifications and concludes that St. Paul is merely teaching against the animal sacrifices that are associated with this list of holy days. He confines his discussion only to Colossians 2:14-17, ignoring the problems associated with the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis and Exodus which rule out the possibility of a Sabbath commandment at Creation and that Sabbath observance is dependent on the ordinance of circumcision. Du Preez' pivotal argument is invalidated by the research of Evangelical scholars. He ignores the extreme difficulty with the concept that St. Paul would be teaching the first Christians not to judge each other on the basis of whether or not they were offering animal sacrifices on Jewish holy days.

2009 – The Church has beefed up its propaganda campaign to defend Ellen White, but it is unable to defend the Sabbath doctrine in any kind of meaningful way. The only defense for the Sabbath “left” to Adventists is that it supposedly was given to the entire world at Creation— an argument invalidated by the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation story in Genesis, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, as well as the exegetical context of the Creation account itself. The propaganda effort to defend Ellen White seems to be focused on technicalities and ignores the problem that she told a falsehood when she claimed direct, divine inspiration from God for the things she copied! A visit to www.ellenwhite.info will give you an excellent sampling of this propaganda. Here are some highlights:

Her nearly total plagiarism of Conybeare and Howson’s book on the life of the Apostle Paul, which Ellen White called ***Sketches from the Life of Paul***, is defended with the excuse that copyright laws were different in her day and that the **Conybeare and Howson** book was in the public domain. There is no mention of the fact that she said in her introduction to the book that God had revealed the information she put in the book to her in vision.

Her accusation of plagiarism of multiple sources for the ***Desire of Ages*** is defended with a few short comparison clips and the explanation that her critics make too much out of the similarities they noticed. This fanciful defense is in total denial of the Seventh-day Adventist Church’s official eight-year study of plagiarism in this book by Dr. Fred Veltman, who, after eight years of exhaustive study at Church expense, said these things:

In practical terms, this conclusion declares that one is not able to recognize in Ellen White's writings on the life of Christ any general category of content or catalog of ideas that is unique to her. We found source parallels for theological, devotional, narrative, descriptive, and spiritual materials, whether in reference to biblical or extra-biblical content.

QUESTION - “How do you harmonize Ellen White's use of sources with her statements to the contrary? Do you think the introductory statement to *The Great Controversy* constitutes an adequate admission of literary dependence?”

ANSWER - I must admit at the start that in my judgment this is the most serious problem to be faced in connection with Ellen White's literary dependency. **It strikes at the heart of her honesty, her integrity, and therefore her trustworthiness.** . . . As of now I do not have - nor, to my knowledge, does anyone else have - a satisfactory answer to this important question. The statement from *The Great Controversy* comes rather late in her writing career and is too limited in its reference to historians and reformers. Similar admissions do not appear as prefaces to all her writings in which sources are involved, and there is no indication that this particular statement applies to her writings in general.

See: truthorfables.com/Desire_of_Ages_Veltman.htm

Therefore, www.ellenwhite.info, fails to disclose that the real problem with Ellen White's wholesale copying of Conybeare and Howson's book, *Sketches from the Life of Paul*, in that she lied when she claimed that God directly revealed this information to her when she actually copied it from a human source.

2009 – The first Seventh-day Adventists members are disfellowshipped by the Church for their belief in the lunar Sabbath concept. These are members in the Upper Columbia Conference, the same conference whose pastors had listened to Andrews University professor, Jacques Doukhan concede in a worker's meeting that the Bible calendar—the lunar calendar—would cause the Sabbath to fall at other times than it does according to a fixed calendar.

2010 – Robert Folkenberg Jr., son of the former General Conference President and at the time president of the Upper Columbia Conference, summons the Vornholts to a meeting and offers them three options: (1) Cease to believe in the lunar Sabbath and believe again in the fixed Sabbath. (2) Withdraw their memberships. (3) Be disfellowshipped. On May 25, 2010, the Vornholts were disfellowshipped.

2010 - The arrest of former 3ABN president **Tommy Shelton** is announced by Fairfax County, Virginia Police on March 16, 2010, following a two-year investigation of allegations that he molested children while pastoring churches previous to 2004. Subsequently, Tommy Shelton pleads guilty to child molestation on July 19, 2010. However, we note that the molestations did not take place in Seventh-day Adventist Churches.

After reviewing the extent of deception of the Church from the very beginning of the Advent Movement, it is difficult to comprehend why "truth" needs so many lies to protect and defend it. We now know that, not only did Adventist leaders cover-up the truth about the impossibilities of the Sabbath Doctrine, the fraudulent claims of Ellen White, and the absurdities of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment, but they also misused the writings of their own prophetess to force the Church into submission regarding legalism. It should not come as any surprise then, that the Adventist leaders, since the unprecedented events of 1995 in regard to **The Worldwide Church of God**, have shown no interest whatsoever in fundamental doctrinal reform.

While there seems to be corruption of one degree or another in Christian churches, the degree of it in Adventism and Armstrongism is way out of proportion to their relatively small sizes. This phenomenon of Adventism and Armstrongism is consistent with our view that when church leaders have to live a life of hypocrisy on a day-to-day basis— knowing that almost nothing they teach is the truth— an environment favorable to the development of moral and financial corruption is created.

CHAPTER NINE

More On Ellen White And The Supernatural

Once when we were going to the place of prayer, we were met by a slave girl who had a spirit by which she predicted the future. She earned a great deal of money for her owners by fortune-telling. This girl followed Paul and the rest of us, shouting, "These men are servants of the Most High God, who are telling you the way to be saved." She kept this up for many days. Finally Paul became so troubled that he turned around and said to the spirit, "In the name of Jesus Christ I command you to come out of her!" At that moment the spirit left her. When the owners of the slave girl realized that their hope of making money was gone, they seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the marketplace to face the authorities.

(Acts 16:16-19, NIV from Bible Gateway.Com.)

Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the LORD, that steal my words every one from his neighbour. Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the LORD, that use their tongues, and say, He saith. Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the LORD, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the LORD.

(Jeremiah 23:30-32 from the King James Version)

FREEMASONRY: THE REAL ROOT OF ADVENTISM

In the Chapter One over-view, a black obelisk, erected by Ellen White over the tomb of James White, violates the sky above the tomb of James and Ellen White with its symbol of phallic power. When she died many years later, she was buried alongside her husband and under this vile symbol. It is almost impossible that the Whites did not know that the obelisk is a key symbol in pagan fertility systems of worship and Freemasonry. This fact is extremely interesting since two of the people most influential in shaping her religious views had been high level Masons earlier in their lives. Elsewhere we discussed the crazy prophetic charts that William Miller developed to prove that Jesus would return in 1843/1844. Ellen White praised his prophetic charts and said that God showed her that God would not have anything about his charts changed. William Miller was one of those persons. He resigned from his top-level position in Freemasonry after he "discovered" Bible prophecy. (See **Sylvester Bliss**, *Memoirs of William Miller*, pp. 21-22.) **Joseph Bates**, who was primarily responsible for Ellen White's adoption of the Sabbath, had a Masonic background as well. Ellen White stated that Joseph Bates had once been a Freemason. (See *Church History*, 17: Joseph Bates, 1.) We also touched on the incident where one or more of the Battle Creek physicians, Dr. William Sadler, determined that she was a remarkable spirit medium and went on to found the Urantia Society, which is the largest and most-respected Spiritualist organization in America. It is now time to delve deeper into the sordid aspects of Ellen White's prophetic claims.

We also mentioned that the work of Freemasonry is to corrupt the Gospel of Jesus Christ. William Miller was a Mason of the highest degree, having resigned from his Masonic lodge less than a month after he began lecturing about the Second Coming of Christ (David L. Rowe, *God's Strange Work, William Miller and the End of the World*, Rowe: 2008, p. 94, from the Washington Association Minutes of 1828.) The researchers at Jesus Freedom.Net observe that Miller never seems to have repented of his Freemasonry days, having said in a letter to Truman Hendryx dated April 10, 1823 (Miller Letters).

[I never said nor practiced anything knowingly to injure my country, the Church of Christ, or my fellow creatures.](#)

This is a surprising claim from a Mason like Miller. According to biographer **Sylvester Bliss**, William Miller had advanced to the highest degree of Freemasonry (*Memoirs of William Miller*, published by **Joshua V. Himes**, 1853, pp. 21, 22.) Miller biographer **David L. Rowe** says that Miller rose in rank to Grand Master (*God's Strange Work, William Miller and the End of the World*, Rowe, 2008, p. 27). It is surprising because a 33 degree Freemason who left the Masonic secret society, states in his 1923 book, **The Lost Keys of Freemasonry**, edition 2006, originally published in 1923:

When the Mason learns that the key to the warrior on the block is the proper application of the dynamo of living power, he has learned the mystery of his Craft. The seething energies of Lucifer are in his hands and before he may step onward and upward, he must prove his ability to properly apply energy. (pp. 50,51.)

Few people have created as much confusion in the Christian world as William Miller. Out of his legacy came the Church of God Seventh-day, Adventism, the Jehovah Witnesses, and from the Church of God Seventh-day, as an off-shoot, The Worldwide Church of God. Since Freemasonry developed out of Jewish mysticism and Gnosticism, the over-emphasis on achieving purity of the soul through law-keeping, including Sabbath-keeping, is not surprising. The early Christianity-related Christian cults of both Ebionism and the Gnosticism developed out of the group of Jewish Christians that clung to Sabbath-keeping, as is documented elsewhere in this book. With the single most important goal of Freemasonry being the corruption of the Gospel of Christ, it is even more concerning to note that both James White and their son, Edson White, were practicing Masons. This fact proves that that James White remained a Freemason long enough after the founding of the Seventh-day Adventist Church to bring his own son into this secret society. The fact that both her husband and one son were practicing Masons through a good part of their Adventist lives explains how she gained enough knowledge of Masonic secret rites to pull off one of her greatest deceptions.

On December 13, 1892, Ellen White met with a recent Australian convert to Adventism, **N. D. Faulkhead**, with the purpose of persuading him to give up his involvement in Freemasonry and to devote himself full-time to the Advent work. In a 50-page letter she read to him an account of what he had experienced in the last meeting he had attended at the Masonic Lodge. The story is lauded in the SDA book, *Believe His Prophets*, Chapter 8, pp. 127-129.

In this meeting she told him where he sat, the kind of seat he sat on, the position that he occupied in the lodge, and the attitude that he manifested in transacting its business. Then she made a secret Masonic sign with her hand, and then she said, "The angel gave me this message for you, but I cannot relate all that was given to me." Faulkhead, stunned by the detail and accuracy of the information, said, "Why, Sister White! Do you know what you have done? You have given the secret sign that is known only to Masons." Then she added that in the meeting someone had addressed him as "Worshipful Master." The account of this incident states that she made another secret sign with her hand, and Faulkhead "turned deathly pale," responding that she had given him the sign of a Knight Templar. Later Ellen White would claim that her attending "angel" had revealed to her the sign of a Knight Templar (*Ellen G. White*, Volume 4, "The Australian Years 1891-1900," by Arthur White, p. 52 / N.D. Faulkhead, Oct. 5, 1908). As a result of this "divine" revelation of his wrong-doing, the story ended with his resignation from the Masons.

Unfortunately, an 1896 photo of the members of his Masonic Temple shows him in the picture. He was still a Freemason as of 1896. Beyond this, upon Faulkhead's death in 1923, the Freemasons conducted his graveside ceremony (Milton R. Hook, *Letters to Aussie Colonials: Case Studies from the E.G. White Letters*, pp. 2,3).

As the researchers at JesusIsFreedom.Net observe, "Ellen White spent virtually all of her ministry surrounded by Masons who assisted her to continue 'the dark agenda' of corrupting the Gospel with its Gnostic law-keeping." They further observe, "It is embarrassing to know that while Mrs. White was supposedly presenting herself as a prophet to lead congregations, she was also participating with secret societies in the unfruitful deeds of darkness." Then they quote Galatians 3:10-14, "All who rely on observing the law is under a curse, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything written in the Book of the Law."

The evidence that Ellen White and her family were steeped in Freemasonry is abundant and embarrassing. Once one knows what to look for, the secret hand signs of Masonry are easy to spot. **These hand positions are not natural, and you do not see ordinary people pose for photographs with their hands in Masonic-like positions.** Consider this evidence:

A photograph of the Adventists who attended the camp meeting at Hornellsville, NY shows James White standing behind Ellen showing one of the Masonic hand positions.

In an undated photo which included Edson and Ellen White, Edson is displaying the "Sign of the Master of the Second Veil."

1873 (Circa?) In an undated photo of Ellen White, she displays the hand position of the "Sign of the Fellow Craft."

1874: Ellen and James White conceived and commissioned a lithograph entitled, "The Way of Life." On a large tree positioned to the R hand side of Christ hanging on a cross (L side of lithograph), there is the Masonic All-Seeing Eye placed where the trunk of the tree turns in to its branches. This lithograph is located at Loma Linda University.

A White Estate photo of SDA Elder William C. Gage, a manager at the Review and Herald Publishing Company, shows Elder Gage displaying the Masonic hand position of The Sign of the Master of the Second Veil. (This photo was likely taken around the turn of the century.)

A photo of Nathaniel C. McClure, who was twice president of the California Conference (1890-1891 and 1894-1896), shows him displaying The Sign of the Master of the Second Veil.

In a photo of Ellen White posing with a group of over 20 leadership ministers at the Reno, Nevada Camp Meeting, SDA leaders Arthur Hickox, N.C. McClure, John Norton Loughborough, and two Masons known as L.A. Scott and "Derrick" display the Masonic Master of the Second Veil" hidden hand sign. This hand sign is displayed by members of the Satanic Fraternal Cult of Freemasonry.

THE OCCULT AND MASONIC IMPRINT ON THE WRITINGS OF ELLEN WHITE

Ellen White used extensive Masonic imagery in her writings, the most notable expression being the "all-seeing eye of God." See the following for extensive documentation of this fact:

<http://www.jesuisfreedom.net/seventh-day-adventists-symbols.html>

Her connection with occult influences came when she claimed that God showed her that the New Jerusalem would descend through a major opening in the constellation of Orion. The connection with the occult is unmistakable. Here is what the **Jesus Is Freedom.Net** Organization observes about its occult connection:

So, just who is the "god" of Ellen G. White and her faithful Seventh-Day Adventist (SDA) followers? That's the question, and the answer can be found on page 41 of Ellen G. White's *Early Writings*. See: (<http://www.gilead.net/egw/books2/earlywritings/ewindex.html>):

"Dark, heavy clouds came up and clashed against each other. The atmosphere parted and rolled back; then we could look up through the open space in Orion, whence came the voice of God. The Holy City will come down through that open space."

What you have just read is an excerpt from Ellen G. White's, "Shaking Of The Powers Of Heaven," and it's through this same "prophetic utterance" that we can come to grips with what Ellen G. White "believed in" and what her SDA Church is being taught through her teachings.

Ellen G. White proclaimed that God would both "speak" through and "bring down the Holy City" through the "open space in Orion". However, the following three Scriptures are the only mention of the constellation "Orion" in the entire Holy Bible:

"Which maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south." (Job 9:9 KJV)

"Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? "
(Job 38:31 KJV)

"Seek him that maketh the seven stars and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night: that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth: The LORD is his name: "
(Amos 5:8 KJV)

So, what does it all mean? Just what is the true spirit behind this constellation called Orion?

Orion — Hebrew, “the fool”; in Job 38:31 he appears fettered with “bands.” The old legend represented this star as a hero, who presumptuously rebelled against God, and was therefore a fool, and was chained in the sky as a punishment; for its rising is at the stormy period of the year. He is Nimrod (the exceedingly impious rebel) among the Assyrians; Orion among the Greeks. Sabaism (worship of the heavenly hosts) and hero-worship were blended in his person. He first subverted the patriarchal order of society by substituting a chieftainship based on conquest (Gen.10:9, Gen.10:10). (Jamieson, *Fausset And Brown Commentary*)

Now with that in mind, it shouldn't be too hard to figure out that the spirit of Nimrod/Orion is about as evil as they get. You might even call him the forerunner of the Antichrist!

See the article, “Ellen G. White, Seventh-Day Adventist, and The Antichrist” at:

<http://www.fmh-child.org/SDA.html>

Ellen White also used New Age imagery and language at times in her writings—amusing in view of her allegation that Dr. Harvey Kellogg's book, *The Living Temple*, was full of Pantheism. She quoted Fannie Johnson, a New Age writer contemporary to her, in the March 1, 1871 and May 1, 1981 edition of the *Health Reformer*, referring to this Earth as “Mother Earth.” The credits for this research go to Gary and Lisa Ruby's website, Liberty to the Captives, in their article, "Seventh-day Adventism and the New Age Movement: New Age/Occult Marking on Ellen G. White's Writings-- "Mother Earth," "Vital Force."

See <http://libertytothecaptives.net/default.htm>.

May has come, with all her beauties of the sunshine, clothing nature with a glorious dress. Mother earth has laid off her brown mantle, and wears her cheerful robes of green. The trees and shrubs upon the lawn are decorated with their opening buds and flowers of varied tints. The peach and cherry are covered with blossoms of pink and white, and the pure music from a thousand of nature's happy and cheering songsters, unite to awaken joy and thankfulness in our hearts. (*Health Reformer*, “The Beautiful May,” May 1, 1871, paragraph 1)

The trees, shrubs, and flowers, will soon be attractive to the eye, inviting all who delight in the beauties of nature to enjoy life out of doors. The flowers and green foliage have not appeared, but mother earth has thrown from her bosom her white mantle, and she even now bears a cheerful aspect in the bright sunshine and shadows. All should now seek employment some hours every day out of doors. (*Health Reformer*, March 1, 1871 par. 3)

Again, the source of this information is that of Gary and Lisa Ruby, quoted word for word what Ellen White quoted from the New Age writer, Fannie Johnson:

Ellen G. White chose Beltane (the highest holiday in Druid witchcraft) as the time to cite a lengthy passage by Fanny B. Johnson that contains New Age terminology and teaches New Age doctrine:

Lovely May is here. Enjoy her, all you who can, while she is with us. Read what Fanny B. Johnson, in *Laws of Life*, says under the caption, {HR, "The Beautiful May" May 1, 1871 par. 4}

Mrs. White endorsed Fanny Johnson's highly New Age passage in which she urged Mother Nature's children to "come out of doors, and take part in the grand entertainment which she has gotten up with wondrous skill, taste, and power:"

IN BEHALF OF OUR GOOD MOTHER NATURE, I HEREBY INVITE AND ENTREAT ALL HER CHILDREN WITHIN SOUND OF MY VOICE OR SIGHT OF MY PENTRACES TO COME OUT OF DOORS, AND TAKE PART IN THE GRAND ENTERTAINMENT WHICH SHE HAS GOTTEN UP WITH WONDROUS SKILL, TASTE, AND POWER. {HR, May 1, 1871 par. 5} (Emphasis added)

Johnson presented Mother Nature (not the Lord Jesus Christ) as the way for poverty-stricken, burden-bearing human beings to escape from their condition:

MOTHER NATURE WILL TAKE YOU IN HER LAP, WILL WOO YOU WITH THE BREATH OF APPLE BLOSSOMS AND CLOVERS, WILL FAN YOUR CHEEK WITH PERFUME-LADEN AIRS, WILL SOOTHE YOU TO SLEEP WITH DROWSY HUM OF BEES, AND MURMUR OF STREAMS, AND RUSTLE OF MYRIAD FLUTTERING LEAVES, WILL WAKEN YOU WITH JOYOUS VOICES, WILL TAKE AWAY FROM YOUR SPIRITS THE PEEVISHNESS AND LITTLENES THAT IS SURE TO GATHER IN A NARROW ROUND OF CARE, AND PUT IN THEIR PLACE SOMETHING OF HER SPIRIT OF CHARITY, AND LARGENESS, AND HARMONY, AND BRING YOU INTO SYMPATHY WITH THE DIVINE.

THERE WAS NEVER BETTER CHANCE FOR POVERTY-STRICKEN, BURDEN-BEARING HUMAN BEINGS TO ESCAPE FROM THEIR CONDITION AND INDULGE IN LUXURIES FURNISHED WITHOUT MONEY AND WITHOUT PRICE. I PROMISE YOU NATURE WILL SHOW NO FAVORS ON ACCOUNT OF WORLDLY DISTINCTIONS. SHE WILL MINISTER NO MORE GRACIOUSLY TO THE QUEEN OF A REALM THAN TO HER HUMBLEST MENIAL, PROVIDED THAT MENIAL BE LOYAL TO HERSELF. BUT TO THOSE WHO LOOK UPON HER WITH "LOVERS' EYES" SHE MUST OF NECESSITY BE PARTIAL. SHE SHOWS THEM WONDROUS THINGS IN HER PAGES, AND REVEALS HERSELF TO THEM AS SHE CANNOT TO OTHERS. {Health Reformer, May 1, 1871 par. 6} (Emphasis added)

Ellen G. White did not disclaim any of Fanny Johnson's New Age teachings or warn her readers to refrain from being wooed by the devil in Mother Nature's garb. An ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ would contradict Fanny Johnson and insist that Jesus Christ's invitation to the weary is the only one that is valid:

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matthew 11:28)

The Lord Jesus Christ offers the only legitimate spiritual rest but the devil seeks to ensnare the weary with a counterfeit rest via Ellen G. White's endorsement of Johnson's "Mother Nature," who is known to New Agers as Earth Mother, or Gaia.

Again, keep in mind that what you read above was researched by Gary and Lisa Ruby, citing Ellen White's entry in the *Health Reformer* of 1871 in which Ellen White quoted secular author, Fannie Johnson, without bothering to call attention to her dangerous New Age-like, occult sentiments. Your authors are in agreement with Gary and Lisa Ruby. A true prophet of God would have condemned the blasphemous giving of the power of the True Creator-God to Mother Earth, or Gaia and New Ager's call their planet-god now.

As the Ruby's point out, Ellen White also used occult terminology in her writings. Their study focuses on one particular term: "Vital Force." Quoting them, they observe:

Ellen G. White favored the occult term, "vital force." Vital Force is a foundational concept in New Age doctrine. Vital Force is another name for Chi which is commonly known in the West as life force, vital force, universal energy, subtle energy, etc.

Chi (also ki, qi or ji) - A "life force" pervading the universe that sustains the body & the material world.

These terms & concepts come from Eastern beliefs but are most prominently used in the martial arts and in alternative healing. Both ki & chi can be seen in the following terms: Aikido, Tai Chi, Reiki (energy healing). This force may also be known as the life force, vital force, the vital energy, bioenergy, universal life force, or universal energy. The belief in such a force is at the heart of occultism and is also found in New Age beliefs.

New Agers believe that Vital Force (subtle energy) is a nonmaterial force that sustains life:

Vital force (bioenergy, cosmic energy, cosmic energy force, cosmic force, cosmic life energy, cosmic life force, elan vital, energy of being, force of life, force vitale, inner vital energy, internal energy, life, life energy, life force, life force energy, life power, life source energy, nerve energy, nerve force, personal energy, spirit, subtle energy, universal energy, universal life energy, universal life energy power, universal life force, universal life force energy, universal life principle, vital cosmic force, vital element, vital energy, vital energy force, vitality, vital life force, vital life force energy, vitalistic principle, vitality energy, vital life spirit, vital magnetism, vital principle, vital spirit): An alleged nonmaterial "force" that sustains life. (2)

Subtle Energy, vital force, universal life force, etc. (demon spirits) can be manipulated and sent on assignment to perform lying wonders (2 Thess. 2:9) via various forms of witchcraft that are often disguised as alternative medical treatments—such as Reiki and acupressure. Man cannot control or manipulate God (or healings from God)—ever.

Man can manipulate demons (which disguise themselves under sophisticated and scientific-sounding terms) if he submits to the occult methodology necessary for their cooperation but the result of such sin (even if it is engaged in under the guise of New Age alternative medicine) is eternal destruction in the Lake of Fire.

Examples of Ellen G. White's use of the term, "vital force."

Please note that Mrs. White used the term, "vital force" in the same manner New Agers do today:

God has endowed us with a certain amount of vital force. He has also formed us with organs suited to maintain the various functions of life, and He designs that these organs shall work together in harmony. If we carefully preserve the life force, and keep the delicate mechanism of the body in order, the result is health; but if the vital force is too rapidly exhausted, the nervous system borrows power for present use from its resources of strength, and when one organ is injured, all are affected. [*The Ministry of Healing*, pg. 234] (Note: in this passage Ellen G. White teaches that God gives vital force.)

Food should not be eaten very hot or very cold. If food is cold, the vital force of the stomach is drawn upon in order to warm it before digestion can take place. [*The Ministry of Healing*, pg. 305]

Sometimes the result of overeating is felt at once. In other cases there is no sensation of pain; but the digestive organs lose their vital force, and the foundation of physical strength is undermined. [*The Ministry of Healing*, pg. 306]

These unpleasant symptoms are felt because nature has accomplished her work at an unnecessary outlay of vital force and is thoroughly exhausted. The stomach is saying, "Give me rest." But with many the faintness is interpreted as a demand for more food; so instead of giving the stomach rest, another burden is placed upon it. As a consequence the digestive organs are often worn out when they should be capable of doing good work. [*The Ministry of Healing*, p. 307]

[Note: in the passage above, Ellen G. White attributed vital force to nature. Mrs. White's practice of citing God and nature as the source of vital energy is an example of Christian/New Age syncretism.]

Where wrong habits of diet have been indulged, there should be no delay in reform. When dyspepsia has resulted from abuse of the stomach, efforts should be made carefully to preserve the remaining strength of the vital forces by removing every overtaxing burden. [*The Ministry of Healing*, pg. 308]

In the following passage, Ellen G. White links Christian growth with vital force:

Let a living faith run like threads of gold through the performance of even the smallest duties. Then all the daily work will promote Christian growth. There will be a continual looking unto Jesus. Love for Him will give vital force to everything that is undertaken. [From *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 356-360]

Those who think that perhaps Mrs. White used these terms unknowingly and innocently taught New Age doctrine, please understand that New Age teachings were not widely known in the United States in the 1800s. Ellen G. White learned these doctrines from someone...and that someone was not God.

Ellen G. White's "Christ" bestowed vital force:

He was the originator of all the ancient gems of truth. Through the work of the enemy, these truths had been displaced. . . . Christ rescued them from the rubbish of error, gave them a new, vital force, and commanded them to shine as jewels, and stand fast forever. [Manuscript 25, 1890.]

[Note: The context of this quote has to do with Mrs. White's defense of her practice of claiming authorship of material she did not write but she did use the occasion to link Christ with vital force. I ask which "Christ" might that be? It is the New Age Christ who afflicts his followers with subtle energy.]

In the next passage Ellen G. White was correct to warn against the dangers of drugs, but that does not negate the fact that she was functioning as an early spokeswoman for the New Age Movement by her continual promotion of the idea that vital force keeps the body in good health. We see Christian/New Age syncretism at work again via Ellen G. White's attribution of vital energy to nature in some passages and to God in others:

People need to be taught that drugs do not cure disease. It is true that they sometimes afford present relief, and the patient appears to recover as the result of their use; this is because nature has sufficient vital force to expel the poison and to correct the conditions that caused the disease. [*The Ministry of Healing*, pg. 126]

Here Mrs. White attributed vital force to God:

The Lord will put new, vital force into His work as human agencies obey the command to go forth and proclaim the truth. . . . The truth will be criticized, scorned, and derided; but the closer it is examined and tested, the brighter it will shine. . . . [Selected Messages, book 1, p. 201]

God endowed man with so great vital force that he has withstood the accumulation of disease brought upon the race in consequence of perverted habits, and has continued for six thousand years. . . . [From *My Life Today*, page 126]

According to Mrs. White, vital force is highly desirable and parents should take care not to deny this force to future generations:

If the mother is deprived of the care and comforts she should have, if she is allowed to exhaust her strength through overwork or through anxiety and gloom, her children will be robbed of the vital force and of the mental elasticity and cheerful buoyancy they should inherit. [The Ministry of Healing, pg. 375]

Children who are robbed of that vitality which they should have inherited from their parents should have the utmost care. [*Vital Vigor and Energy*, 204]

Rather than tell her followers not to overwork lest they become too tired and run down, Ellen G. White presented the New Age concept that overexertion depletes vital force to the hurt of one's health:

Those who make great exertions to accomplish just so much work in a given time, and continue to labor when their judgment tells them they should rest, are never gainers. They are living on borrowed capital. They are expending the vital force which they will need at a future time. [From *My Life Today* - Page 142]

Mrs. White promoted the New Age teaching that drugs destroy vital force:

Break Down Vital Forces.—Drugs always have a tendency to break down and destroy vital forces.— [*Medical Ministry*, p. 223 (General Manuscript entitled "Sanitarium," 1887).]

According to Mrs. White, frequent child-bearing depletes women of vital energies. This of course conflicts with God's command to multiply and be fruitful and 1 Timothy 2:15: "...she shall be saved in childbearing..."

Everywhere you may look you will see pale, sickly, care-worn, broken-down, dispirited, discouraged women. They are generally overworked, and their vital energies exhausted by frequent child-bearing. [*Vital Vigor and Energy*, 203]

While it is a fact that frequent child-bearing can be physically exhausting, giving birth has nothing to do with losing a nonmaterial "force" that sustains life.

Mrs. White taught that snacking causes the unnatural stimulation and wearing of the vital forces. The context suggests that an imbalance of the vital forces leads to sin:

Children are generally untaught in regard to the importance of when, how, and what they should eat. They are permitted to indulge their tastes freely, to eat at all hours, to help themselves to fruit when it tempts their eyes, and this, with the pie, cake, bread and butter, and sweetmeats eaten almost constantly, makes them gourmands and dyspeptics. The digestive organs, like a mill which

is continually kept running, become enfeebled, vital force is called from the brain to aid the stomach in its overwork, and thus the mental powers are weakened. The unnatural stimulation and wear of the vital forces make them nervous, impatient of restraint, self-willed, and irritable. . . . It is difficult to arouse them to a sense of the shame and grievous nature of sin. [*Selected Messages*, book 1, p. 201.]

The God of the Bible is NOT the god of Vital Force.

Ellen G. White, regardless of what she may have stated in her other writings, chose to repeatedly use the occult phrase, "vital force" to promote the pagan belief that "an alleged nonmaterial force sustains life." The Bible clearly states that it is by the Lord Jesus Christ that all things consist:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: Colossians 1:16

And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. Colossians 1:17

It is in Jesus Christ that we live, move and have our being: For in him we live, and move and have our being; Acts 17:28

The Holy Bible refutes the New Age lie of vital force. It is by Jesus Christ himself, not a nonmaterial force that all things consist. It is in Jesus Christ (not vital force) that Christians live and move and have their being. It is God, not Vital Force That Sustains Mankind.

This passage was cited earlier in the article; but in conclusion, please note that Ellen G. White taught her followers that vital force has enabled man to live on earth for six thousand years without becoming extinct:

God endowed man with so great vital force that he has withstood the accumulation of disease upon the race in consequence of perverted habits, and has continued for six thousand years. . . . If Adam, at his creation, had not been endowed with twenty times as much vital force as men now have, the race, with their present habits of living in violation of natural law, would have become extinct. [From *My Life Today*, page 126]

It is God himself, not a nonmaterial "vital force" who has mercifully sustained mankind's existence upon the earth for all these years. Ellen G. White promoted the "vital force" doctrine of devils long before Eastern religious thought became prevalent in the United States and other parts of the western world.

Please note that these researchers question where Ellen White acquired her New Age vocabulary, since the New Age was in its infancy. Where else would her New Age inspiration have come from but her spirit guide-- the "angel" who appeared to her in the form of a young man and was her constant companion for many years. It is also worthy of note that Ellen White's view of salvation by progressive sanctification was not much different than that of New Age thinking. Both belief systems are based on the principle that Man can save himself through his own efforts. The players are simply different. With the false Christian version of progressive sanctification you have God, angels, and humans. With the New Age Reincarnation model, the players are spirit guides, an impersonal god who controls the reincarnation process and imparts a vital force to living things, and humans. While it is true that later in her career she mouthed acceptance of salvation by Righteousness by Faith, it seems like she still viewed Faith as something mustered up by human effort and rewarded by God with salvation. The Christian view of salvation by contrast, differs from all other religions in the world. The faith that we have comes from God and our salvation is totally based, not on what we do for Jesus, but what He did for us.

Just like the owners of the fortune-telling slave girl used her to make money for themselves, so the early leaders of the Advent Movement used Ellen White's visions to assure income for themselves and the fledgling Church. In reviewing what these early leaders knew about her, it is difficult to come to any other conclusion. It appears that her visions were frequently accompanied by supernatural manifestations. These manifestations were taken as evidence that her visions were from God. The accounts of her amazing vision experiences spread far and wide among the Advent believers, and the belief that God was speaking directly to them through Ellen White scared the money right out of their pockets into the Church's coffers.

There are three theories about the source of Ellen White's visions. **The first theory**, that her visions came from God, is impossible. Her prophetic track record is a disaster by biblical standards but easily meets the standard for a spirit medium. There are seven requirements for a true prophet. She meets only one out of seven of them.

The second theory, that her visions came from the Dark Side, is supported by a wealth of evidence that supernatural events, or at least the appearance of supernatural phenomena, attended her visions— especially her earlier ones.

The third theory, that her visions were the result of her childhood head injury, is supported by extensive clinical evidence and professional medical opinion.

The second and third theories are not very flattering. Even if her visions resulted from her head injury, this explanation creates more questions than it answers. Regardless of the source of her visions, she should have quickly recognized that the information she was either receiving or imagining was usually wrong, and she should have stopped telling people she was receiving the information from God. Instead, she chose to lie about things to maintain the appearance that the visions were from God.

Even during the pioneer days of Adventism there was an ever-growing body of evidence that the “angel” who controlled her in vision was a lying spirit. In looking back at our historical time-line, we see that as early as 1861 **J. N. Andrews**, who wrote a history of the Sabbath, knew that Christians “abandoned” Sabbath-keeping hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Roman Catholic Church. When Ellen White was “shown” that the Catholic Church “changed the day,” Andrews and other leaders had to have known that her “angel” guide lied to her about very important matters. It seems like Andrews and the other pioneers of the Advent Movement were overwhelmed by the manifestation of the supernatural to the point where they were blinded to the clearest evidence staring them in the face from their knowledge of the facts of history.

By the end of the Civil War, Adventist leaders knew the angel had lied to her about England coming over to fight with the South against the North. By 1866, Snook and Brinkerhoff of the Iowa Conference of Seventh-day Adventists had figured out that Ellen White was a fraud and had published a book documenting their evidence to the point of over-kill. Their book included a lengthy list of contradictions in her writings and statements that disagreed with the known facts of science. One example they mentioned was her claim that the bones of human beings who were several times larger than those of people living today had been found in the ground. Her statement was true in regard to animals, but not in regard to human fossils. Keep in mind that the Seventh-day Adventist Church had organized just three years earlier in 1863. Adventist leaders, again, seemed so overwhelmed with the supernatural powers that accompanied Ellen White's visions that they chose to hang onto her visions in the face of the mountain of evidence that she was a fraud as clearly outlined by the research of Snook and Brinkerhoff. You can read their book doing an Internet search.

Why didn't the Church repudiate her as a false prophet at that time? By then what Adventists refer to as “The Work” had grown rapidly to include a network of churches, institutions, and a bureaucracy to care for it and pay the salaries of its workers. Since Ellen White's visions gave power to each of the key beliefs of the Church via a “heavenly” endorsement by an “angel” from God, repudiation of Ellen White's prophetic ministry would have meant an end to the success of Adventism. This kind of event would have ended the salaries of Church employees, including those of the leaders at the top. The families of these “workers” might have gone hungry. Adventist leaders might have had to find some kind of honest work.

No one knew the power of the visions to generate money more-so for the “business” of the Church than her husband, James White, who was a very astute businessman. At the same time, no one else knew better than he did that her visions were fraudulent, with— perhaps— the exception of D. M. Canright, who worked closely with the Whites and other top SDA leaders

for nearly 30 years before he apostatized. A story related by Canright in his book, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White— Her Claims Refuted*, suggests that these early leaders had little faith in the genuineness of her visions:

Elder J. N. Andrews told me that he once sat by while Mrs. White read a mild testimony of reproof to her husband. He said, “Ellen, hand me that.” She obeyed, and he took it and threw it into the fire!

Andrews, as you may recall, authored two important early Adventist books on the Sabbath, and you may have noted that Canright made reference to two of Andrews’ books in his own writings.

Recall that back in 1983, Ron Graybill, who was then associate director of the White Estate, was fired when copies of his doctoral dissertation were stolen and distributed to key Adventist leaders all over the world without his knowledge or consent. His dissertation, completed at a non-Adventist university, included documentation which provided abundant evidence that Ellen White was a fraud. Perhaps for the first time in the history of Adventism, numerous of its leaders had the proof of her fraudship hit them smack in the face by one of their “own.” After spending over a dozen years with unlimited access to every word that Ellen White wrote, he reached the following conclusions:

1. She made fraudulent claims.
1. Her personal character was seriously flawed.
2. She appeared to have produced her so-called “visions” when necessary to defeat her opposition.

It would seem that Ron Graybill knew more about the stupid stuff Ellen White had written than anyone else alive at the time. A logical mind would conclude that no testimony against her could be more powerful than his. Reason would demand that Adventist leadership respond to this astonishing revelation of Ellen White's deceptions by demanding that the Church immediately repudiate her and organize campaigns to burn her books in front of every Seventh-day Adventist Church in the world. Unfortunately, as Bill Hohmann points out in another chapter, religion should make sense, but often it doesn't.

At the moment these SDA leaders received irrefutable proof that she was a fraud, they became accountable to God to stand on the side of truth. However, the Church did not change direction in the slightest.

The supernatural manifestations that accompanied those visions included remarkable feats of super-human strength, the cessation of breathing, and a gaze that could not be broken by even extraordinary distraction techniques. While some of her critics dismiss all of this phenomenon as the result of a mental condition caused by the blow to the head she sustained as a young girl, most witnesses seemed convinced that the manifestations were supernatural. Researchers, including both her supporters and critics, have studied both her own accounts of her vision experiences and the testimony of her observers, both supporters and opposers, and have come away with the conviction that the best explanation for these happenings was that they were not likely to be of human origin.

It is a matter of public record that that Ellen White claimed to have an attending “angel” throughout her ministry. Looking back at the train wreck of her prophetic record from the perspective of today (2014), an unfortunate conclusion is unavoidable. Her angel lied to her on a regular basis. Here is a partial list of the lies she was “shown:”

- Several dates for the Second Coming of Christ between 1844 and 1851.
- That at least one person in an 1859 meeting would be alive when Jesus came.
- England would join the South to fight against the North.
- The Civil War was being fought to preserve slavery.
- Slavery would return to the United States at a later time.
- Moses Hull would die an unexpected death as retribution from God.
- Spiritualism would pervade the main-line churches before long.
- God fooled His people about the Sanctuary question to test them.
- The prophetic charts of William Miller were accurate and exactly how God wanted them to be.

- The development of the black race [implied] was the result of the genetic mixing of people and animals.
- Mountains were formed by high winds piling up debris after the flood. (in *Selected Messages*)
- The bones of human beings many times larger than human beings living today are found buried in the earth as a result of the flood. (In *Selected Messages*.)
- Sun worship influenced Christians to abandon the Sabbath.
- The Roman Catholic Church influenced Christians to abandon the Sabbath.
- Only the ceremonial parts of the law were nailed to the cross.
- The Fox Sisters did not use “human trickery” in regard to the “rappings.”
- That Jupiter had an incorrect number of moons.
- That the main-line Protestant Churches would fully adopt spiritualism and that to speak against the ‘rappings’ would be considered by them to be a sin.
- That Dr. J. H. Kellogg built buildings in Chicago with funds he diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium.
- That Dr. J. H. Kellogg was a Pantheist.
- That Martin Luther lived a noble life that Christians should emulate.

Logic is considered to be a science. By the rules of logic, there is no other possible conclusion other than this angel guide lied repeatedly to her. The Bible is very clear about the following facts:

Angels DO NOT impart false visions to true prophets of God.

Evil spirits DO give false information to spirit mediums.

As we mentioned, Ellen White’s critics have always speculated that Ellen White’s visions could have been caused by a serious head injury she sustained while a young girl. Along this line, **D. M. Canright** cites the opinion of several physicians who were contemporary to Ellen White and took this position, but our research concludes that the White Estate has effectively demonstrated that the medical credentials and characters of some of the “doctors” who stated that they believed her visions were the result of the head injury were not well-qualified. We hasten to add the fact that even if they did not have the best medical credentials, they probably enough common sense to see that something was wrong with her.

SDA physicians who have researched the accounts and opinions of her contemporary evaluators are divided in their opinions. One expert researcher, SDA Loma Linda Neurologist, **Dr. Donald I. Peterson, MD**, does not believe her head injury explained the phenomena of her visions. He published an article entitled “Visions and Seizures— Was Ellen White the Victim of Epilepsy?” (Copyright 1988, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Boise, Idaho) He makes a very good case for the probability that Ellen’s particular type of head injury is not the kind that would likely produce visual disturbances. He provides what seem like reliable eye-witness accounts of her public visions that suggest the phenomena observed was supernatural. Dr. Peterson’s paper was written to refute the conclusions of two articles to the contrary, one written by Pediatrician **Delbert H. Hodder, MD** in a 1981 issue of *Evangelica*, and one written by (then) retired dermatologist, **Dr. Molleurus Couperus**, in a 1985 issue *Adventist Currents*. Both papers attempted to demonstrate that Ellen White’s visions were primarily due to her temporal lobe epilepsy. However, both these writers seem to have difficulty with the fact that a significant number of eyewitnesses testify that she did not seem to breathe during her visions (See **Donald I. Peterson, “Visions Or Seizures— Was Ellen White the Victim of Epilepsy?”**) at:

<http://www.whiteestate.org/issues/visions.html> .

He cites the observations of a prominent early SDA leader, **J. N. Loughborough**, who testified he saw Ellen White in vision “about fifty times” and that while in vision “she does not breathe, yet her pulse beats regularly.”

Dr. Peterson cites Elder Loughborough’s quote of a statement made by **Daniel T. Bourdeau**, who was skeptical of Ellen White’s visions before he had the privilege of evaluating her during an actual vision himself:

[On] June 28, 1857, I saw Sister Ellen G. White in vision for the first time. I was an unbeliever in

the visions; but one circumstance among others that I might mention convinced us that her visions were of God. To satisfy my mind as to whether she breathed or not, I first put my hand on her chest sufficiently long to know that there was no more heaving of the lungs than there would have been had she been a corpse. I then took my hand and placed it over her mouth, pinching her nostrils between my thumb and forefinger, so that it was impossible for her to exhale or inhale air, even if she had desired to do so. I held her thus with my hand about ten minutes, long enough for her to suffocate under ordinary circumstances; she was not in the least affected by the ordeal.

According to Butler and others, the length of time Ellen White was in vision "varied from fifteen minutes to one hundred and eighty" and possibly more. This, to say the least, is a remarkable length of time to suspend breathing.

Today's critics and defenders have been dependent on the historical record for a very long time. Depositions left by eye-witnesses stating that Ellen White did not breathe while in vision are so consistent, clear, and unequivocal that even Hodder is constrained to admit that "it is possible that something 'supernatural' was happening." He seeks to explain away this apparent supernatural phenomenon by theorizing that her breathing was merely "imperceptible." Similarly, Couperus also theorizes that her breathing appeared to be "almost imperceptible." Neither critic cites sources to support his conclusions.

Another eye-witness account of Ellen White in vision was **George I. Butler**, a General Conference president during some of the years that she was having public visions. He made these observations:

"All we ask is that people shall be reasonable. We are prepared to support by hundreds of living truthful witnesses all that we shall claim, so far as facts are concerned, of the manifestation itself, for this thing has not been done in a corner. For nearly thirty years past these visions have been given with greater or less frequency, and have been witnessed by many, oftentimes by unbelievers as well as those believing them. They generally, but not always, occur in the midst of earnest sessions of religious interest while the Spirit of God is specially present, if those can tell who are in attendance. The time Mrs. White is in this condition has varied from fifteen minutes to one hundred and eighty. During this time the heart and pulse continue to beat, the eyes are always wide open, and seem to be gazing at some far-distant object, and are never fixed on any person or thing in the room. They are always directed upward. They exhibit a pleasant expression. There is no ghastly look or any resemblance of fainting. The brightest light may be suddenly brought near her eyes, or feints made as if to thrust something into the eye, and there is never the slightest wink or change of expression on that account; and it is sometimes hours and even days after she comes out of this condition before she recovers her natural sight. She says it seems to her that she comes back into a dark world, yet her eyesight is in no wise injured by her visions.

"While she is in vision, her breathing entirely ceases. No breath ever escapes her nostrils or lips when in this condition. This has been proved by many witnesses, among them physicians of skill, and themselves unbelievers in the visions, on some occasions being appointed by a public congregation for the purpose. It has been proved many times by tightly holding the nostrils and mouth with the hand, and by putting a looking glass before them so close that any escape of the moisture of the breath would be detected. In this condition she often speaks words and short sentences, yet not the slightest breath escapes. When she goes into this condition, there is no appearance of swooning or faintness, her face remains its natural color, and the blood circulates as usual. Often she loses her strength temporarily and reclines or sits; but at other times she stands up. She moves her arms gracefully, and often her face is lighted up with radiance as though the glory of heaven rested upon her. She is utterly unconscious of everything going on around her while she is in vision, having no knowledge whatever of what is said and done in her presence. A person may pinch her flesh, and do things which would cause great and sudden pain in her ordinary condition, and she will not notice it by the slightest tremor.

"There are none of the disgusting grimaces or contortions which usually attend spiritualist mediums, but calm, dignified, and impressive, her very appearance strikes the beholder with reverence and solemnity. There is nothing fanatical in her appearance. When she comes out of this condition she speaks and writes from time to time what she has seen while in vision; and the supernatural character of these visions is seen even more clearly in what she thus reveals than in her appearance and condition while in vision, for many things have thus been related which it was impossible for her to know in any other way.

"Peculiar circumstances in the lives of individuals, whom she never before had seen in the flesh, and secrets hidden from the nearest acquaintances, have been made known by her when she had no personal knowledge of the parties other than by vision. Often has she been in an audience where she was wholly unacquainted with the individuals composing it, when she would get up and point out person after person whom she never had seen before, in the flesh, and tell them what they had done, and reprove their sins. I might mention many other items of like nature, but space forbids. These things can be proved by any amount of testimony, and we confidently affirm that they are of such a character that they could not be accomplished by deception." — *Review and Herald*. June 9, 1874. (J. N. Loughborough, *Heavenly Visions*, pp. 76a-76d.)

See: <http://www.ellenwhite.info/visions-no-breath-3.htm>

Still another interesting eyewitness account of one of Ellen White's visions gives powerful credence to the likelihood that her visions were the result of satanic deception. Dirk Anderson comments on some information he discovered while digging through some really old material he obtained recently. In a letter from a Brother Hicks, dated September 3, 1884, and published in the periodical, *Messenger of Truth*, Vol. 1, No.3, p. 3 (October 1854), Anderson quotes the following excerpt:

"As concerning Ellen G. White's visions, I have heretofore known but little about them. I once saw her have one, and I once saw a table tip over and then tip back again of its own accord so far as I could discern. Neither the phenomenon of the vision, nor of the table tipping did I understand."

Anderson says the significance of this detail did not occur to him at first:

I marked this quote and didn't pay too much attention to it, but 2 days later I was reading the *USA Today* newspaper, and since it being near Halloween, they had an article on "ghosts". While I usually ignore these, this one was about Dan Aykroyd (the actor) and his family's involvement with séances, so I started reading it. In that article Dan's father witnessed a séance and one of the phenomena he reported seeing was "tipping tables". I then checked the Internet and found that "tipping tables" is a common theme associated with séances. In fact, the online *Thesaurus* lists "table tipping" as a synonym for a séance. (E-mail Dirk Anderson to Kerry Wynne, Oct. 17, 2009).

There are other evidences that she was possibly experiencing spiritualistic phenomena. As we have mentioned before, Ellen White often talked about a supernatural "guide" who accompanied her in her visions. She often referred to him as her "accompanying angel." Spiritualistic mediums often claim to have a spirit guide. Here is one of her interesting statements from an 1875 article in the *Signs of the Times*, Nov. 11; and also *Counsels on Health*, p. 465. [Cited in Kaspersen, *Ellen G. White— the Myth and the Truth*]:

The following night I dreamed that a young man of noble appearance came into the room where I was, immediately after I had been speaking. This same person had appeared before me in important dreams to instruct me from time to time during the past twenty-six years.

Also, she often reported sensing the fragrance of flowers during her visions. This is most interesting, since psychic mediums often write of exactly the same thing when referring to their supernatural experiences. One such instance, an 1890 event recorded in *Life Sketches*, the 1915 edition, p. 30, is this one, also cited in Kaspersen:

Climbing the stairs, she knelt by the bed, and before the first word of petition had been offered she felt that the room was filled with the fragrance of roses. Looking up to see whence the fragrance came, she saw the room flooded with a soft, silvery light.

To complicate matters still further, Kaspersen notes that epileptics, during a seizure, often report experiencing the scent of flowers. Ellen White had a serious head injury that some medical experts believed caused a special kind of seizure disorder in her.

Recall once again that in the aftermath of the Chicago Buildings Vision Fiasco, a SDA businessman with the Kellogg name and Dr. William S. Sadler started the largest and most respected spiritualistic movement of all—URANTIA. We will have much more to say about this fact elsewhere. All of the Battle Creek physicians associated with Dr. John Harvey Kellogg would have been acquainted with the evidence that much of the vision activity of Ellen White seemed to be undeniably supernatural. It is worth thinking about that since some spirits are thought of as “good” and some spirits are thought of as “bad,” they are not expected to be reliable sources of information. For this and other reasons, these doctors, who had known Ellen White for much of their lives, concluded that her visions were genuine psychic phenomena, despite the fact that she was wrong at times. This concept explains how they could become thoroughly disillusioned with Ellen White's claim that God Himself communicated with her, yet followed the “call” of Spiritualism thereafter.

The White Estate, by seeking to prove that Ellen White's visions were supernatural, takes the issue of the source of her power from the frying pan into the fire. Logic demands the following sequence of reasoning. We do not and cannot know for certain if her visions were the result of a medical problem— a brain injury. However, we can know, and do know, with absolute certainty that Ellen White was completely wrong about a whole host of prognostications she made under the influence of her attending “angel.” If we cannot excuse her failed predictions on the basis of behavior that results from a brain injury, and if the evidence is almost overwhelming that her visions were supernatural, we must conclude that her “angel” guide was a “fallen” angel. 100% accuracy has always been required of God's prophets. Adventists apply this principle against other false prophets of her day, like Joseph Smith, but refuse to apply the same standard to their own prophetess! Over 100 years later we see even more clearly that most of her long-range predictions were total failures, but her prophetic blunders were so great even during the early decades of her ministry that there was no excuse for Adventist leaders to regard her as anything but delusional, a fraud, or an instrument of Satan. Again, using the simple science of logic, we are faced with the “unthinkable”:

- 1. Ellen White experienced the supernatural in vision according to credible witnesses.**
- 1. Her predictions failed.**
- 2. Her supernatural guide lied to her.**
- 3. God's angels do not lie to God's prophets.**
- 4. Her “angel” guide was an evil spirit.**

The predictions of Ellen White's that were fulfilled were apparently the result of either a good guess on Ellen's part or a good guess of the part of the evil spirit which controlled her. Her visions could not possibly have come from God.

In the years that followed the eye-opening events of the 1970's and 1980's that followed the discovery of the 1919 Bible Conference transcripts, researchers began to scrutinize her writings. Douglas Hackleman, for example, found that Ellen White altered the dates in her diary so that it would look like she received information from God in advance of events she predicted. How much lower could a person go than what is revealed by his research about the Salamanaca “Vision:”

On November 3, 1890, Ellen White allegedly received a vision during her stay at Salamanca, New York. Because this vision apparently was fulfilled in a striking manner, it is often referred to as “proof” of her prophetic gift. However, a closer investigation of the circumstances around the vision and the alleged “fulfillment”, throws serious doubts on Ellen White's honesty.

In short, she allegedly received a vision on November 3, 1890, which she was unable to recall. Four months later (March 8, 1891), she claimed that she was awakened by an angel in the midst of the night (the “young man”?) who instructed her to write down the vision she had received four months previous, but which she could not recall.

On the previous evening, March 7, 1890, the General Conference had been holding an important meeting behind closed doors. The matter in question was the magazine *The American Sentinel*, a forerunner of today's *Liberty Magazine*. Some people had been claiming that *The American*

Sentinel should downplay its name and the Sabbath in order to gain influence among politicians and other leading people in the United States.

Early in the morning, at 5:30 AM the following day (March 8), a few hours after Ellen White allegedly had been awakened by the angel and instructed to write down the vision she had received four months earlier, the General Conference was going to hold a preacher's meeting. Shortly after O. A. Olsen, the President of the GC, had opened the meeting, Ellen White entered the room, accompanied by her youngest son Willie. She then read the manuscript she had written down according to the instructions the angel had given her during the night. She told the congregation that she had been receiving a vision four months earlier in Salamanca, about what was going to happen during the meeting the night before, and that a hard and unchristian attitude was being manifested during this meeting.

When Ellen White was finished reading her manuscript, Albion F. Ballenger was the first man to arise to his feet and confess that they had been following a wrong course during the meeting. Other people gave similar confessions. This was being considered a direct intervention by God to prevent a mistake in regard to The American Sentinel, and a mighty proof for Ellen White's prophetic gift. After all, she had seen in a vision four months earlier what in fact did happen during the meeting the night before, but was instructed to write down the vision a few hours before the morning meeting, and read it before the preachers.

An analysis of this vision and the circumstances around it could be read in *Adventist Currents*, September 1986, in an article by Douglas Hackleman. The conclusion is inevitable: Ellen White both lied and behaved as deceiver with the "Salamanca Vision".

Ellen White's diary from this time shows up with mis-dated entries, and matters of a later date which clearly had been put into previous entries to create the impression that the later matter was of an earlier origin. The matter in the diary which had been mis-dated 21 November 1891, gives no reason whatsoever to the claim that this was a "revelation" from God, and that it depicted a meeting to be held four months later. She had mis-dated four paragraphs in her diary to create the impression that she knew about things before she actually learned about them. She was in the habit of putting things of a later date into earlier matter in her diary. Douglas Hackleman says,

"The appearance of evil is then strong. The evidently false dating of these is a serious business that should become the basis for a more extensive study of White Estate manuscripts to ascertain the extent of this practice." (Douglas Hackleman, *Adventist Currents*, Sept. 1986.)

In her diary, under November 4, 1890, the day after the "vision," she wrote that she was very frustrated because she was not able to recall the vision, or to write down what she had been shown. But in a letter to W. P. Burke (October 1891), she writes about this experience, and that she "immediately began to write it down" in her diary. However, no one is able to find this today - at least not with clear reference to Salamanca.

Ellen White makes it very plain that no one had told her anything before she wrote down the vision from 1890 during the night on March 8, 1891. Recalling this experience, she says,

"The circumstances were such that on this occasion the excuse could not possibly be used, 'SOMEONE HAS TOLD HER.' No one had an opportunity to see me or speak with me between the evening meeting [March 7] and the morning meeting that I attended [March 8]." (EGW Diary, May 20, 1905. Quoted in *Adventist Currents*, Sept. 1986. Emphasis supplied.

Because Ellen White during the morning-meeting could describe what had taken place during the evening-meeting the night before, the question arises: From where, or from whom did she get her information? There are just two possibilities: Either the information came from the vision four months earlier, which she was instructed to write down a few hours before the morning-meeting,

or somebody had told her. She makes it plain, however, that no one had any opportunity to inform her, because "No one had an opportunity to see me or speak with me between the evening meeting and the morning meeting that I attended".

"The angel" awoke her sometime between 01:00 and 04:00 AM. Edna K. Steele, who slept in the room adjacent to Ellen White's room, recalled that Ellen told her secretary, Sara Mc Enterfeer, about five in the morning, that she had no intentions to be present at the morning-meeting, and that she (Sara) just could sleep on [Ed. Note: could continue to keep sleeping if she wished?]. Obviously Ellen did not wish her secretary to be present at that particular time for some reason.

Ellen White's statement that no one had had any opportunity to talk with her between the evening-meeting and the morning-meeting, does not square up with the statement in the book, *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White* (1915) about the same incident:

"Sunday morning, about 5:20, Brethren A. T. Robinson, W. C. White, and Ellery Robinson were passing Mrs. White's residence on their way to the early meeting. They saw a light in her room, and her son ran up to inquire about her health. He found her busily engaged in writing. She then told him that an angel of God had wakened her about three o'clock, and had bidden her go to the ministers' meeting and relate some things shown her at Salamanca. She said that she arose quickly, and had been writing for about two hours." (*Life Sketches*, 1915 Edition, p. 315.)

It becomes therefore plain that Ellen White contradicts herself in this respect. Her son William Clarence ("Willie") was with his mother early in the morning and accompanied her to the meeting.

The documentation shows that Willie was with his mother before the morning-meeting, and had ample opportunity to talk with her and give her information on what had been going on at the evening-meeting the night before, which he had attended. This is in contradiction with Ellen White's letter from 1905, where she strongly rejects any claims that somebody could have informed her because, as she said, no one had any opportunity to talk with her between the two meetings.

The circumstances regarding this "Salamanca Vision" are so full of contradictory statements, inaccuracies, undated and mis-dated entries in Ellen White's diary, and also later matter inserted in earlier matter in the diary, that her own version of the entire story has to be taken with a big pinch of salt. The Ellen White defenders are catching at straws when they use the "Salamanca Vision" as proof that she "saw" things in advance which later were exactly "fulfilled".

When Douglas Hackleman wrote to Arthur White in 1982 requesting a copy of Ellen White's handwritten diary for the period November 3, 1890 to March 8, 1891 (the period for the "Salamanca Vision" and the later meetings in the General Conference), he never received a reply from Arthur White. However, he discovered that his request had created some activity in the White Estate. Later in the year Mr. Hackleman went to Washington, D.C., and visited the White Estate in order to get an opportunity to see this diary. He had, however, called the Estate in advance, to inquire. *During this call, the Estate informed him that the diary possibly was not there-- that somebody was doing research in connection with the diary, and may have borrowed it.* [The previous sentence rendered in italics has been extensively edited by your authors to make it make sense. The Internet posting of this passage was corrupted. We believe our editing preserves the intended meaning of the author.]

Mr. Hackleman pointed out that that would not be in harmony with the Estate's policy. The original manuscripts would never be removed from the vault-- just copies. However, Mr. Hackleman took his chance and went to the White Estate. When he arrived, they informed him that he would not get permission to see the diary. He expressed his astonishment and told them that all who asked if there was anything in the vaults they would not be allowed to see, had been informed that church

members could just come in and see everything they wanted, including the so-called "Z-file", containing sensitive material.

Obviously, the prince of the vaults did not have clean hands in regards to this particular diary, and possibly other things in the vaults. However, the person who in reality did not have clean hands, was Ellen White herself, the author of the diary.

The information on the Salamanca Vision has been taken from *Adventist Currents*, September 1986.

CHAPTER TEN

THE VISIONS CREATED HOW MUCH MONEY?

The Church manipulated Ellen White and her visions to produce income for the Church. When the leaders needed support for a financial scheme, they looked to her to supply a vision to back up their desired plan. That she used her visions to make money for herself is beyond doubt. When her authority was questioned, she resorted to a vision “from God” to protect herself. The use of her visions for financial gain placed her among the top 1% of money-makers in the world. When she was preparing a book on the relationship between health and the mind and discovered that Dr. J. H. Kellogg was about to publish a similar book that might compete with her book for sales, she denounced his book as full of pantheistic ideas when she said similar things that could be taken exactly the same way.

In regard to Ellen White's use of her visions to create wealth, there is no substitute for reading Dirk Anderson's well-researched article, “Ellen G. White: Prophet or Profit?” at: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com

Anderson makes the following points and provides documentation for his claims:

She earned over 2.2 million dollars in royalties from her books, placing her in the top 1% of the wealthiest people in the world. (Figures in the Year 2005 equivalency)

She earned between \$175,000 and \$265,000 annually in the 1880's and 1890's when translated into the value of the U.S. Dollar in the Year 2005.

Her posh mansion at Elmshaven would be worth up to 10 million dollars in terms of 2005 dollars.

In 1876 she and James White spent, in terms of 2005 dollars, over \$8,400 for a photographic negative while she counseled Adventists about the sin of having photographs of family members in their homes.

She fought with denominational leaders over their view that she was asking too high a percentage for her book royalties.

She used her “visions” to induce Advent believers to purchase her books— a huge conflict of interest— by claiming that God was commanding Adventists to buy her book for themselves and to purchase additional copies to give to other people.

The facts of Ellen White's wealth and under-handed financial tactics were better known in her day than they are today, thanks to the subsequent damage control techniques of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. For another eye-popping view of the darker side of Ellen White and money, study *Life of Mrs. E. G. White - Her Claims Refuted*, by D. M. Canright, 1919, Chapter 11.

See: http://members.tripod.com/~Help_for_SDA/LifeofEGWHerClaimsRefutedCanright.html

The entire book is available on-line, and a printed copy of this book can be purchased through Amazon.com

The facts of her use of her prophetic claims to earn money for herself had not been forgotten as late as 1933. Note this passage from Vowless, the SDA-EGW myth-basher from New Zealand:

SUPPOSED “PRECIOUS RAYS OF LIGHT” PROVES USEFUL FOR MONEY-MAKING

The prophets of the Bible were generally hard-working people, and had little. Mrs. White says, “We entered upon our work penniless.” (*Testimonies* V.1-75). [“We,” being Mrs. White and her husband.] This point is often

brought up by SDA's, but that is as far as they ever say. Why do they not say further? Perhaps it is because of the following:— Soon after they began and became leaders, they commercialized their work and managed to supply themselves well, and when Mr. White died (1881), it is said that he left between 15,000 dollars and 20,000 dollars; for the present, I do not need to show how this was made, but let us quote a couple more of her writings: “If there is one work more important than another, it is that of getting our publications before the public, thus leading them to search the Scriptures.” (*Testimonies* V.4-390). “You should lend “Spirit of Prophecy” to your neighbors, and prevail upon them, to buy copies for themselves. Missionaries for God, you should be earnest, active vigorous workers.” (*Testimonies*, V.4.-391). “Many are going directly contrary to the light which God has given to his people, because they do not read the books which contain light and knowledge in cautions, reproof.....so precious, coming from the throne of God, is hid under a bushel. God will make His people responsible for this neglect.” (*Testimonies* V.4.-391).

So, of course, her books were pushed and sold in large numbers, and as a result, she received large financial, returns through receiving royalties on everything she has written. Her royalties received from one publishing house alone, in Washington, DC in the year 1911, amounted to 8,000 dollars, which was more than the net profits for the publishing house itself for that year. From one book alone she received over 40,000 dollars, and from all her books over 100,000 dollars up till her death in 1915, and they are fixed that since her death her son is to receive the royalty and still is. Think of it, God giving revelations to anyone to sell to the people! I wonder how much royalty Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Paul, and John and the others received, that is, comparing them with Mrs. White as the Conference does.

The White Elephant of Seventh-Day-Adventism? by R. Vowless (New Plymouth, New Zealand, P. F. Burrows Ltd., Eliot Street, New Plymouth. Can be accessed at: http://www.truthorfables.com/white_elephant.htm

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Ellen Makes Billions for the Church With Her Un-Biblical Tithing Doctrine

Be sure to set aside a tenth of all that your fields produce each year. Eat the tithe of your grain, new wine and oil, and the firstborn of your herds and flocks in the presence of the LORD your God at the place he will choose as a dwelling for his Name, so that you may learn to revere the LORD your God always. But if that place is too distant and you have been blessed by the LORD your God and cannot carry your tithe (because the place where the LORD will choose to put his Name is so far away), then exchange your tithe for silver, and take the silver with you and go to the place the LORD your God will choose. Use the silver to buy whatever you like: cattle, sheep, wine or other fermented drink, or anything you wish. Then you and your household shall eat there in the presence of the LORD your God and rejoice. And do not neglect the Levites living in your towns, for they have no allotment or inheritance of their own. —Deut. 14:22 through Deut. 14:29 (NIV)

The Seventh-day Adventist Church is the biggest “little” Church in the world. Adventists are known for giving more money per capita than the members of any other denomination. Its business operations span the globe with churches, publishing houses, food factories, hospitals, colleges, and universities. It operates a world-wide social services agency, the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), which, itself, takes in more money each year than the Church receives from all other sources combined. The Church's combined business operations require a bureaucracy of many thousands of church employees and leaders.

There are other Sabbatarian denominations, but none of them have turned their belief system into a lasting income creating machine like the Seventh-day Adventists. The Worldwide Church of God did so on a smaller scale and for a much shorter period of time, and for largely the same reasons, but better world communications made it more difficult for its false prophet to get away with his deceptions. We reason, then, that it is the Adventist belief that Ellen White is a true prophet of God that is responsible for the financial success of Adventism, and we view this as a crime because SDA leaders know, and have known for a very long time, that her prophetic claims are false. The story of the coming together of the Adventist money-making machine is an interesting study of deception itself.

In the first years of Adventism, the business model chosen to finance the Church was conceived by James White and called “**Systematic Benevolence**.” James’ system was adopted by the Advent believers after Ellen White was “shown” “in vision” that it was the system God wanted for His Church. Interestingly, the Whites rejected the twisted and non-biblical “Levitical” tithing system that the Church would adopt later because it was thought to be insufficient to fund the grand scale of “the work:”

“We do not urge the Israelitish tithing system as embracing the whole duty of the believers in the third [angel's] message....That system was necessary in God's plan of the Levitical priesthood; but in closing message presents a far greater call for something of the kind.” R&H, April 9, 1861, p. 164. [Cited in Sanders, TITHING NOT A LAW FOR CHRISTIANS at www.truthorables.com]

Editor's note: “but in closing message presents a far greater call...” James White is referring to an article about giving that appeared in an Adventist Movement publication for which we do not have a reference and which may have been lost to scholars by now.

The Systematic Benevolence system, however, proved to be a failure in generating enough income to fund the visionary plans of the Whites for the Church. Apparently the angel who showed Ellen White that the Systematic Benevolence plan was the one he wanted for the Church was lying about the plan's potential for success. Ironically, it was D.M. Canright who introduced

the so-called “Levitical” tithing system that has made the Seventh-day Adventist Church the biggest little money-making Church of all time:

Dudley M. Canright: in a series of articles in 1876, **emphasized Malachi 3:8-11** as “the Bible plan of supporting the Ministry.” **He urged Adventists to adopt this plan** to glorify God... *R&H, February 17, 1876, p. 50, 51. See also Spectrum 1986, Adventist Tithing— the Untold Story, p. 139.* [Cited in Robert K. Sanders, “Tithing Not a Law for Christians”]

A little common sense should tell us that the True God could not say that both systems were the best one, but, sure enough, Ellen White’s angelic “guide” gave her a second vision “showing” her that the “Levitical” tithing system developed by D. M. Canright was the right plan for the Adventists. Neither system was Levitical, much less “biblical.” Perhaps the “god” who “blessed” D. M. Canright’s “Levitical” tithing system saw its potential to create financial corruption and misery for poor Advent believers who would be moved by the deception of this lie to give up food for their children in order to pay their tithe. Canright’s system, “blessed” by Ellen White’s “god”, was so perverted from the biblical model of tithing that it could not have even been used in Israel during the Theocracy, much less than in the Christian dispensation! It appears these early Adventist leaders were so busy looking for biblical and historical evidence to prove that the Seventh-day Adventist Church was the one and only true church that they didn’t have time to study what the Bible actually taught about tithing and a host of other more important things. Their neglect created a monster, as we will soon see. For now, let us consider what the Old Testament teaches about tithing and how Adventists unlawfully used, and continue to use, the threat of a non-existent Bible teaching in a hypocritical effort to separate Adventist believers from their hard-earned money. You will be amazed, later, to see how these Adventist leaders were using the tithe money back-handedly by the 1970’s to create personal gain for themselves!

THE LEVITICAL TITHING SYSTEM IN SCRIPTURE

by William H. Hohmann

A biblical tithe is defined as being the tenth of the increase of crops and livestock. These things are dependent upon the land, and under the economy of Israel, the land is what produced wealth. If Israel received rain in season, and the weather was favorable, the land produced abundantly, and all prospered. This reflected the blessings of God bestowed upon the people through the land.

If drought struck Israel, and the resultant shortage of food was extant, both people and livestock suffered, and the people did not prosper. There were other factors that could affect the production of food, such as foreign invasions where such forces devoured the produce and livestock of the land as they proceeded, and the ravages of insects and other pests such as mice, locusts and rats that could devastate the land. These things were perceived as God withholding His blessings due to the collective sins of the people.

The Israelites were commanded to tithe of the increase of their produce and livestock. This tithe was used, or distributed, in basically three ways:

The tithe was given to the Levites.

The tithe was given to the widow, orphan, poor, and destitute foreigner (stranger).

The tithe was used by the owner of the tithe at the festivals held in Jerusalem.

The post exilic Rabbis were confused by this division of the tithe, and concluded there were, instead, three separate tithes. To these rabbinical teachers of the law, everything had to be spelled out exactly, and the ambiguity of the tithe law as codified did not fit their sensibilities.

These are the same Rabbis that are identified in Scripture as the ones who added their own twists to the law, making many points of law overly burdensome. Is it any wonder therefore that they would conclude there were three tithes, taking up to 30% of the increase of those who grew crops and raised livestock?

When the Scriptures surrounding tithing are examined, these three ways the tithe were allocated and used include the support of the Levites! Were the Levites triple-dipping their fellow Israelites? [Ed. Note: Remember that the tithe the Israelites paid was only on agricultural products-- not their incomes from employment or trades. Also, keep in mind that we are talking about the rabbinical twisting of the tithing laws rather than the tithing laws as set of in the Torah. – K. Wynne]

There was only one tithe. If there were two tithes, or three tithes, then, instead of 10% of one's increase, it was actually 20% or 30%! Imagine your government informing you, as a parallel, that they were going to tax your income at the rate of, say, 15%, but then informed you that you were required to pay three income taxes! You may well complain, and they would respond with, "hey, your tax is only 15%, quit griping!

In this light, look at how a person's tithes were to be handled in the third year:

At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates: And the Levite, (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee,) and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come, and shall eat and be satisfied; that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest. — Deut. 14:28-29

When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled; — Deuteronomy 26:12

In the third year, the tithe was to be brought to the gates of whatever city one was near to, and provided to the poor, and also to the Levites who shared in the tithe the other two years.

In many respects, the law was ambiguous when it came to how the person with a tithe was to divide it up. Perhaps this was intentional. A land owner who controlled the basis of nearly all wealth had to decide how generous or how stingy he was going to be in relation to the Levites and poor of the land. A land owner with much in the way of crops and/or livestock, along with his family, could only consume so much of the tithe of their land at the festivals held in Jerusalem. Those, then, who had much could give much from that tithe of the land.

Those who had little may well have only been able to give a little.

In this regard, consider the command not to harvest the corners of one's fields:

And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the LORD your God. — Leviticus 23:22

How far in from the corners did this entail? If the land owner wanted to be generous, he could leave a large corner, for example. But also note the purpose of leaving the corners and gleaning was so that the poor of the land could go there and collect food for themselves to eat. So tithing was not the only means whereby the poor attained sustenance. Could this then have been a test designed by God to search out a land owner's heart? The law said to give a portion of his tithe to the poor. How much was left up to the owner of the tithe. How much of the corners of his fields he left for them was also up to him. Merely complying with the law did not reveal the heart of a person. Their behavior outside the confines of the law could.

These, then, were some of the things that were performed by those who owned land wherein they raised livestock and produce from the ground and their responsibilities in relation to the rest of the people.

In regard to all these instructions, God made this statement, more than once:

Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth

you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you. — Deuteronomy 4:1-2

What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it. — Deuteronomy 12:32

This last citation comes from a chapter in Deuteronomy where God addresses the Israelites in regards to tithes. So now the logical question that is raised by all this— Why do so many churches, especially Seventh-day Adventists, violate the very law they claim was not to be altered even down to jots and tittles, and to which God specifically commanded in relation to the tithing law that it was to be observed as commanded; that no one was to “add thereto, nor diminish from it?”

Tithes were never commanded of the people based on their income. Only those who had crops and/or livestock tithed.

Jesus had an interesting observation in relation to this sort of behavior:

This people draweth nigh unto us with their mouth, and honoureth us with their lips; but their heart is far from us. But in vain they do worship us, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. — Matthew 15:8-9

Is demanding tithes of people based on their wages biblical? No! But they have their excuses; their rationales for altering the same law they claim is unalterable down to jots and tittles as well as the tithing law that was commanded by God not to be added to or anything taken away from. Even a bank robber has his rationale and excuses.

The most common rationale put forth for altering the unalterable is to claim the change in circumstances today:

“There is no Levitical priesthood to give tithes to. We live at a time where we no longer have an agrarian society.”

What sort of society did we have in 1888 when the SDA produced their version of the tithing law that they commanded of the members, upon pain of eternal damnation should they not tithe? An agrarian society! They were not interested in livestock and produce. Adventist leaders were, and still are, interested in money. Furthermore they are not interested in you sharing your tithes among the widow and orphan and the poor. They want it all. Oh, they may throw a bone to an occasional widow and orphan alright, but it was never the responsibility of the Levites to turn around and give the poor of the tithe they were given; it was up to the individual whose tithe it was to begin with.

What does a wolf want? How would a wolf go about getting it? Would a wolf, disguised as a minister of God, resort to dire warnings of what will happen to you should you fail to tithe of your wages to them? Would they resort to claims of faithlessness on your part?

Adventists have rationalized, perhaps in the name of adapting the so-called “principles” of the Old Testament tithing laws to fit the culture of more modern, less agrarian-focused times, that they have the right to alter the teachings of Scripture to create a financial tool that brings in enough money to fund their aspirations for the “Work.” This tampering of Scripture is hypocritical because Adventists, citing Daniel 7:25, accuse the papacy of being guilty of changing “times and laws” in regard to the so-called change of the Sabbath.

The apostle Paul made his case to the churches in I Corinthians that those who preached the Gospel had a right to live of the Gospel. They were entitled to support. But was this support through the Old Covenant law of tithing? No, for Paul does not use tithing as a justification, but rather the command not to muzzle the ox that treads out the grain as an analogy. Ministers were to be provided for through free will offerings, and not by compulsion. It can be a hard concept for many to understand, but once something is a requirement, then it is no longer done through faith and love. It is done out of fear of retribution.

Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour. And a certain man lame from his mother's womb was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple

which is called Beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple; Who seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple asked an alms. And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something of them. Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk. — Acts 3:1-6

What would have been the circumstances here if the early church were indeed paying tithes of their wages to the ministry? Would Peter have been without gold or silver?

To claim the tithing law changed to accommodate the changing times is hypocrisy. If you level the false accusation against other Christians and their faith by demanding they explain how it is they could “change” the day of “worship” from the Sabbath to Sunday, while changing that same law yourself when it comes to tithing, it is the greatest expression of hypocrisy. If anything, you are guiltier than those who worship on Sundays, for nowhere in the Scriptures does it say the people were to gather on weekly Sabbaths for the sake of communal worship! The Christian law of Liberty allows believers to worship whenever and wherever they so desire.

Adventists have demonstrated themselves to be guilty of the very crimes they have charged against others. Even Jesus Christ commanded His followers not to make such condemnative judgments as Adventists do even now. The end result is to find yourself condemned by God for the things you condemned in others.

CHAPTER TWELVE

Church Corruption During The 1970's

Prior to 1970 there were no large-scale financial scandals in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Prior to 1970 only a select few leaders at the top seemed to have known that Ellen White was a fraud. Everything changed in the 1970's. In the 1970's when one unsavory revelation after another surfaced. More leaders became aware of the problem. In order to keep their jobs they had to teach others what they themselves knew was untrue. Searing their consciences to the Ellen White problem seems to have opened the door to other kinds of dishonesty. Since the 1970's Adventism has been plagued with one serious scandal after another to this very day. There is a major unresolved scandal at the time of this writing of which most Seventh-day Adventists know nothing. **Douglas Hackleman** of *Members for Church Accountability* says in his salient book on the phenomenon of Adventist Church corruption, *Who Watches, Who Cares?—Misadventures in Stewardship*:

Since the late 1970's, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has been buffeted by a concatenation of corporate church financial scandals that have resulted in the unnecessary loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. Ours are lesser losses, in absolute terms, than those of the United Nations food-for-oil fraud, or than the betrayals of stockholders by Enron, WorldCom or Arthur Anderson. But the church losses may be considered more serious because they continue in waves, one after another, and because we believe each instance not only betrays the institution and the members that comprise it but the Higher Source whose selected stewards we claim to be.

(1979-1980) THE DAVENPORT SCANDAL COMPLETE WITH “HUSH MONEY” PAYMENTS BY THE CHURCH!

With the Davenport Scandal, we see Adventist leaders *en masse* participating in fraudulent business practices. By fate or Providence we find one fearless man, Walter Rea, placed in a unique position to be forced, by his conscience, to expose not only the lying claims of Ellen White, but a financial scandal that ran broad and deep. Even a writer of soap opera scripts would have a difficult time coming up with something more captivating than the Walter Rea's expose of the Davenport Scandal.

While doing some research on Ellen White, Dr. Walter Rea noticed strong similarities between extensive sections of her books with the writings of the authors of books that she kept in her personal library. In short, he discovered massive plagiarism of the writings of those authors. This problem was particularly of concern because she had claimed that God had showed her these things in vision. He approached SDA leaders with his findings, but his discoveries were not welcome. After being double-crossed by the Church he was defrocked and fired. Subsequently he published the *New York Times* best-seller, *The White Lie*, in 1982.

At the same time Dr. Rea was a member of several Church finance committees. His work on these committees gave him the ability to monitor the ever-increasing misuse of Church tithe funds in the shaky and illegal investment schemes of Dr. Donald Davenport, a Seventh-day Adventist physician and real estate developer. Dr. Davenport promised Adventist denominational entities and church leaders, the latter who were treated as private investors, a much higher than average return on their official church and individual investments. In fact, he usually paid individual investors, many of whom were high-ranking Church officials, a higher rate of interest than he paid the church entities who invested with him.

Soon something happened that would later add greatly to the Church's damage control challenges. Dr. Davenport and his wife divorced. His wife was a member of the Adventist church Dr. Rea was pastoring at the time, and she came to him with their divorce decree in hand, asking for advice. Immediately Dr. Rea noted that Dr. Davenport's disclosure of their financial assets and liabilities was far shy of what he knew about the extent of the Church's investments with him. He knew this as a result of the inside knowledge he had of the Church's ties with Davenport. To make a long story short, the Church fired Dr. Rea and took away his retirement benefits for his exposé of Ellen White. Dr. Rea was able to get those retirement benefits

restored by agreeing not to publish his book about the Davenport Scandal, *Pirates of Privilege*, which Rea would otherwise have published in 1984.

As of the time of the writing of this chapter for *Lying For God* (Fall 2009), Dr. Rea was 87 years old and was enjoying every penny of the “hush money” the Church has been paying him not to expose the extent of their financial iniquities over the last few decades. Wonder of wonders! Adventist leaders are guilty of bribery, and showing themselves willing to do almost anything to cover up the TRUTH about their lies and wrong-doings! The statute of limitations of the California court case that prohibited Dr. Rea from publishing this book has expired, and *Pirates of Privilege* is available now at a few places on the Internet and from Dr. Desmond Ford’s Australian website, *Good News for Adventists*. Recently Amazing Lies Publications reformatted this book for electronic publication. It is posted by us on SCRIBD.com with Dr. Rea’s permission.

(1985) HARRIS PINE MILLS

For years the Church owned Harris Pine Mills, a large furniture manufacturing operation that had been donated to the Church by Harris himself in 1951. By 1984 its annual income had reached nearly \$60 million and it employed 2,282 Adventist students. There was a financial set-back in 1985, and Douglas Hackleman gives us the details:

In 1985 financial and management difficulties panicked the chairman of the board, Neal C. Wilson, who was also president of the GC Corporation. As chairman of the board, Neal Wilson forced Harris into Chapter 7 bankruptcy, even though its assets outweighed its debits by roughly \$15 million. After changing the liquidation filing to a more flexible Chapter 11 reorganization status, bankruptcy trustee John Mitchell told the February 6, 1987, *East Oregonian*, “It’s the best situation I’ve ever seen for restructuring. Harris Pine basically is back in operation. . . . We should be able to restructure and be profitable by the end of June.”

Wilson has never explained why, when the bankruptcy trustee made clear that the business was recoverable, he was unwilling to be reunited with the business that, weeks earlier, he had described to Adventist Review readers as “this marvelous asset.”

Eventually most of Harris’ timber holdings became the property of the Louisiana-Pacific Corporation. Harris’ primary lumberyard and sawmill in Pendleton, Oregon, is now the site of a Wal-Mart store. The loss to the denomination is incalculable.

See http://www.advmca.org/html/rmc_conf_review.html

Members for Church Accountability

PO Box 1072, Morrison, CO 80465

advma@aol.com

1990 – DAVID DENNIS NARROWLY ESCAPES

GC OUSTER FOR GOOD ACCOUNTING

David Dennis, General Conference auditor, with a reputation for tight accounting practices and the courage to confront GC leaders with account discrepancies, was nearly railroaded out of office by a host of GC leaders who were smarting at his attempts to restrain their questionable business practices. **Elder Russell R. Standish** and 15 other retired General Conference leaders successfully protested and blocked, by only one vote, a scandalous attempt to oust him. These individuals were verbally abused at a union conference meeting by then union president Elder Robert H. Carter and two other union

conference presidents. (Standish, *The Twenty-eight Fundamentals: apostasy proclaimed in silence*, p. 121. excerpts posted at Google Books.)

1992 - LAKE REGION CONFERENCE SCANDAL #1

The Lake Region Conference's first scandal is reported in the independent SDA-related journal, *The Remnant Herald*, No.2, December 1992, p. 10 as quoted in the Russell R. Standish book, *The Twenty-eight Fundamentals: apostasy proclaimed in silence*:

The Indianapolis Star of August 3, 1992, reported the Lake Region Conference which used unauthorized church funds to build a shopping mall in Chicago and also mortgaged the Shiloh Church in Chicago without the knowledge or consent of the members, in order to generate capital, has been sued by two banks because of loan defaults. Already the Cole Taylor Bank of Chicago has won its case for \$2,260,000 and the Lloyd's Bank of London is suing for 43,521,475 plus \$34,931 in interest. The case is pending. Since the Lake Region Conference "has 22 cents in assets for every dollar of liability," the court in the first case has ruled that the Seventh-day Adventist church organization must pay the shortfall in the Conference's ability to repay the debt. It is likely that the situation is worse. On November 11, Colin and I spoke about this matter to one General Conference official and he informed us that other banks were also suing and that the total cost to our church could be twelve million dollars. Thus dishonest activities by a Conference President [Elder L. R. Paler] have led to loss of large sums for the work of God's church. The offending Conference President is still a denominational employee with current ministerial credentials.

1994 - FAMILY ENRICHMENT RESOURCES

In 1994 the Church devised a scheme to consolidate and improve its profits from selling religious books and videos. The project was financed largely with tithe funds. This disastrous program lost 1.6 million dollars within a two year period. The consolidated organization was called Family Enrichment Resources. The story is well-worth reading and was reported by Richard Sheldon of *Members for Church Accountability*. The bungling use of church funds, including excess tithe monies, is particularly striking in this case.

Again, see: www.advmca.org/html/rmc_conf_review.html

1998 – G. C. PRESIDENT FOLKENBERG OUSTED

In the early 1990's the Church elected an individual with a track record of questionable financial activities to the exalted position of President of the General Conference. Not long after taking office, Robert S. Folkenberg maneuvered his younger brother, Robert, into a contractual position with ADRA, the *Adventist Development and Relief Agency*, and later, to the position of Associate Treasurer of the General Conference in charge of dispensing Global Mission funds to Eastern Europe. This brazen nepotism on the part of President Folkenberg should have raised red flags everywhere because his brother, Robert Folkenberg, had embroiled the Columbia Union Conference in the Davenport Scandal (See historical time-line for late 70's and early 80's.), causing that conference to lose huge sums of money back in the 1970's. With the connection of Robert with ADRA, the agency became even further plagued with financial irregularities. In 1998 President Robert S. Folkenberg was forced out of office because of his questionable business dealings with a Sacramento businessman by the name of James Monroe. Not surprisingly, Brother Donald resigned at the same time!

Monroe, who was convicted of eight counts of fraud in 1987 and incarcerated from 1989 until January 1, 1992, claimed he had given Folkenberg \$8,000,000 in trust and that his money was missing,. Monroe threatened to sue President Folkenberg and, by extension, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, if he did not get his money back. It appears that he did get all or most

of his money back, but that the money came from the Church in the form of a Church insurance policy, rather from President Folkenberg himself. The story of how the Church came to lose an undetermined amount of money to settle with Monroe is almost stranger than fiction.

According to Standish, it appears that Folkenberg had somehow used a General Conference insurance policy to settle the \$8,000,000 loss, but Folkenberg and his attorney, a Mr. Prochnower, did not go through Adventist Risk Management Services through the normal channels to obtain the policy or to achieve the settlement with James Monroe. Standish concludes the story on page 142:

When a GC representative called the insurance company to inquire about the money paid to Folkenberg, the claims representative refused to speak to him. The representative said that the GC would have to speak to Folkenberg's attorney because Prochnower had told the insurance company that the settlement was confidential and ordered the company's employees not to speak about it to General Conference representatives.

The GC representative replied, "What do you mean, you can't speak to me? We pay the premiums on these policies!"

To which the claims representative replied that the GC would have to speak to Folkenberg's attorney.

The GC representative called Prochnower who refused to speak about the settlement, claiming attorney-client privilege.

"We've opposed a settlement since we first became aware of this case," the GC representative stated to Prochnower, but he refused to discuss the matter.

"We may never know exactly what happened or how much money was spent," stated the GC source who was admittedly "very angry" about the situation. (Article entitled "Folkenberg Uses Insurance Money Secretly" – parenthesis in the original).

As far as we have discovered, The General Conference does not yet know the amount which the Insurance Company had paid to settle the law suit claims of Mr. Moore against Elder Folkenberg.

1998 - ADRA SCANDAL COMES TO LIGHT

In 1994 David Dennis' lawsuit against the Church for his wrongful dismissal as General Conference auditor alleged that the **Adventist Development and Relief Agency** was guilty of serious financial and ethical misconduct. The court records show that Dennis charged that Adventist leaders had tolerated the misuse of millions of dollars in charitable donations and overseas government relief by ADRA. Our source is a report from the ultra-conservative Adventist "reform" organization, Pilgrim's Rest, HCR 77, Box 38A, Beersheba Springs, TN 37305 USA. (This organization's point-of-view is that the cause of the Church's abysmal corruption is its failure to follow the writings of Ellen G. White and does not share the views of your authors.) The reporter summarizes and comments on August 14th, 1998 *Los Angeles Times* article about ADRA which carries this title and sub-title, **"A HISTORY OF COMPLAINTS DOGS ADVENTIST AID AGENCY: Questionable spending, poor oversight alleged. Group, which gets U.S. funds, says controls are tighter now."**

Here are some selected things uncovered by the *Los Angeles Times* reporter, summarized by Pilgrim's Rest, and further condensed by us to focus on the most important facts:

Tennis courts at a Seventh-day Adventist-owned and operated compound were built with funds provided by a Rwandan government agency. These "government" funds represented money from a kick-back by corrupt government agents in the area who had been funneled a large shipment of food and supplies by ADRA which was intended for the poor people of the country, but which

ended up being retained by these local better-off Rwandans for their own personal use. A second tennis court was built near-by with “government” funds because the first court had been built at an angle that forced the SDA churchmen who played on it to have to look into the sun. This crime was settled with the Government of Rwanda by a promise from ADRA that it would not engage in corrupt activity in the future. The auditor who dealt with this situation, Wayne Vail, expressed disgust that with all the poverty in the country, funds intended to minister to the poor had been diverted for such a shameful purpose.

In Haiti during the summer of 1997, auditor Vail investigated a complaint from government officials who were questioning the misuse of ADRA funds. One example was that ADRA employees repeatedly visited Miami at government expense to purchase supplies that were available on the Island.

During a two year period, ADRA received \$85,000,000 in federal cash from the U.S. government and tens of millions of dollars from other nations and private donors. Out of 400 such organizations that received government funding, ADRA had the third highest overhead.

Records from The Agency for International Development, the U.S. Government agency that funnels money to ADRA and other world relief organizations, show “a vexing pattern of warnings, upbraidings, and occasional funding suspensions of ADRA during the last decade.”

In just one year’s auditing period, 1995, AID auditors found \$2,800,000 in improper ADRA billings and suspected that ADRA “had charged the government twice for the same items, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in possible double-billings.”

In 1997, AID auditors reported that ADRA’s overhead rate was the second highest of the 10 biggest recipients of government money. Overhead expenses reflect salaries, travel and other administrative expenses subsidized by the government. It’s 11.1% over-head rate was just behind that of Pathfinder International, a family planning, abortion group, and well above the average 7.4% of this group of the 10 largest recipients of government money.

Over a two year period, \$85,000,000 was received by ADRA, and at an 11.1% rate of over-head, that would mean a non-profit “profit” of \$9,435,000.

Confirming the allegations of David Dennis in his suit against the General Conference for his illegal dismissal from his position of auditor, the *Los Angeles Times* said, “Federal records show that in some cases, documentation to substantiate the expenditure of millions of U.S. dollars was found to be ‘inadequate or nonexistent.’”

In the last four years (previous to the date of the article), government auditors “have questioned nearly \$5,000,000 in ADRA billings for public relations, fund-raising and rent.”

The writer of this Pilgrim’s Rest article adds that the General Conference is not permitted to audit any monies handled by ADRA, yet “in a given year, more money passes through the hands of ADRA than through all the rest of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.”

For the complete story, use this link: <http://www.sdadefend.com/MINDEX-K-L/LA-times.pdf>

2001 – SDA CHURCH SETTLES OUT-OF-COURT WITH DAVID DENNIS

October 30, 2001, **David Dennis** withdrew his lawsuit against the General Conference for his unjust dismissal as General Conference auditor. By this time the Church had spent an estimated five to seven million dollars to settle with Dennis out-of-

court. These legal fees came from tithe funds because tithe money is what funds the operations of the General Conference in the first place. By the time the Church reached this out-of-court settlement with Dennis, his charges of wrong-doing had been proven to be right on target—especially his warnings about Folkenberg’s financial activities and the squandering of government and private donor funds by ADRA.

About the time all of this trouble between Dennis and the General Conference erupted, a woman came forward alleging that she and Dennis had had sex when she was a house-keeper for his family while the Dennises were serving the Church in Singapore during the 1970’s. His accuser had an extensive history of major psychological problems. Dennis denied these charges, confronted his General Conference accusers with the absurdities of their charges, and pointed out numerous cases where the General Conference had tolerated adultery at the highest levels and had even paid the legal bills of these adulterers in order to help them retain their employment with the General Conference.

It is ironic that the Church goes out of its way to protect adulterous leaders and ministers. In our next entry you will see that the Church has even hired an outside consulting firm to help “retain” its adulterous pastors in the service of the Church. An Adventist leader can lose his job and retirement benefits for questioning unsupportable Bible doctrines and the false claims of the Church’s blasphemous prophetess, or for trying to stop the financial crimes of other leaders, but he can commit adultery and find the Church right there to reach down with a helping hand! By using such a flimsy, questionable, and unsupportable excuse to get rid of whistle blower David Dennis, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists has forfeited the trust and respect of every Seventh-day Adventist in the world forever, whether the Church’s teachings are true or not. It is difficult to imagine how the General Conference could descend any deeper into the abyss of iniquity. There seems no limit to what Adventist leaders will do to continue on their pathway of hypocrisy, evil-doing, and lying in the name of God.

By taking shelter under the special protections afforded to religious organizations under the First Amendment and by spending these huge amounts of money in legal fees to keep Dennis’ suit out of court, the Church maneuvered him into a position where he was forced to give up his legal battle against the General Conference and to settle out of court. (The First Amendment is interpreted to give religious organizations special protections against law suits which seem to be religiously motivated.) Additionally the Church declined to testify against itself, which appears to represent a disgusting appeal (for a church) to the provisions of the 5th Amendment.

David Dennis published a book in September 2009 which tells the story from beginning to end. You can order his book, ***Fatal Accounts— the Audacity of an Adventist Auditor’s Quest for Transparency***. You can order this book from the liberal, barely tolerated, SDA-related journal, *Adventist Today*.

2004 – CHURCH HIRES OUTSIDE FIRM TO DEALING WITH CLERGY IMMORALITY

By 2004, so many Adventist pastors were involved in adultery that the Church had to hire an outside consulting firm to salvage these ministers so they could continue in their denominational employment. According to the late ultra conservative SDA researcher, **Russell Standish**, one union president boasted to his brother, **Colin Standish**, he had “saved” at least 17 ministers from being dismissed from the Adventist ministry. Standish tells the story of how a certain Adventist pastor known throughout the Adventist world for his books and speaking engagements was retained in the ministry, despite nearly watertight evidence that he had committed adultery. The accused adulterer’s secretary, Judy Wright, was convinced of his guilt and wrote a letter to Elder Thomas Mostert, President of the Pacific Union Conference, and to Elder Steven Gifford, President of the Southeastern California Conference, regarding what her disgraced boss told her one day. She wrote:

[The Union President] stopped by my office and offered his help. He said he had counseled a number of other ministers through similar crises and that every one of them is still in the ministry. He [the accused pastor] said [the Union President] advised me to deny everything. In fact, it sounded like he thought I should deny everything, whether I was guilty or not. (Letter dated April 16, 1989. *The bracketed words were inserted by Standish to facilitate clarity*. See Standish, p. 137.)

2005 – LAKE REGION CONFERENCE SCANDAL #2

The Lake Region Conference is the focus of a Federal probe, accused of financial irregularities and immigration violations (*South Bend Tribune*, 25th July, 2005, cited in Russell R. Standish, *The twenty-eight Fundamentals: apostasy proclaimed in silence*, p. 117.):

The Lake Region Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is under federal investigation in connection with misuse of funds and illegal immigration activities, which could threaten the organization's non-profit status.

The revelations shocked many of the estimated 730 delegates who attended a special meeting Sunday.

The following people were put on paid administrative leave in the wake of auditing and illegal immigration practices in the Lake Region Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, based in Chicago:

Hugo Gambetta, vice president for multicultural ministries. He was stripped of his ministerial credentials and license on Friday. He has been on paid administrative leave since July 11.

Treasurer Leroy B. Hampton resigned last week after his July 11 suspension.

Four pastors, all ministers in Chicago churches, are on paid leave: Ciro Aviles, Osmin Hernandez, William Rojas, and Alfredo Solis.

“There's been a lot of instances of lying and a case of personal enrichment,” Walter Wright, president of the Lake Union Conference, told delegates (*South Bend Tribune*, 25 July, 2005).”

JULY 1996 – EMBEZZLEMENT OF FUNDS BY AN AUSTRALIAN CONFERENCE TREASURER

Rob van Buuren of the South Australian Conference confesses to “borrowing” huge sums of money. The *Adelaide Advertiser* reported this in its story:

A former senior official with an Adelaide fundamentalist church is being investigated over allegedly defrauding the church of almost \$500,000.

Money is believed to have been siphoned from the Seventh-Day Adventist Church [sic] over a six year period.

The funds had been given to the official by Adelaide members in the form of trust funds and deceased estates.

He allegedly used the money to support a failing family cleaning business.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church [sic] president, Pastor Neil Watts, said yesterday the official had “succumbed to the temptation to borrow some money.” “The whole thing is very said,” he said.

Pastor Watts said the official “confessed” his actions to the church and planned to repay some funds, although it is not expected he will be able to reimburse the full amount. (*The Adelaide Advertiser*, 28th August, 1996, p. 1).

Standish reports that later the same newspaper ran a follow-up story on this event with a headline that read, 'SEVEN YEARS OF SIN—CHURCH TREASURER JAILED FOR STEALING \$906,000.' The writer of this story tersely observed, "Even Robert Adriaan Van Buuren must have sensed the irony as he ordered the personalized number plate ROB for his gleaming new Holden Statesman in 1991."

BEYOND 2005

Call it business as usual for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. ADRA continues to operate out of control. The General Conference president who took over after the ouster of Folkenberg, Jan Paulsen, refused to investigate, discipline, and prosecute those who were guilty of criminal activity at the GC and ADRA. If Ellen White was correct, whether she was inspired or not, those who do not rise up to stop sin in the camp are just as guilty as those who perpetrate the sin. Paulsen said he "prayed" about it and decided that prosecution of the guilty would not accomplish any real good for the Church.

Meanwhile, ADRA continues to solicit SDA believers with their mailing campaigns that show pictures of impoverished children in foreign lands which play on the sympathies of the reader, successfully inducing many sincere Church members to part with their hard-earned cash. Wynne points out that his elderly mother still receives requests for money from ADRA. ADRA's money is "blood money," since Adventists and other supporters would not give if they knew the truth about the organizations scandalous operations.

The Church, confronted with absolute proof that Ellen White was a fraud, repeatedly throughout the history of Adventism, continues to tote her as the inspired mouthpiece of God. Additionally confronted with the impossibilities of the Sabbath and Investigative Judgment doctrines, it forges ahead telling the same old lies it has told now for almost 140 years. This hypocrisy has obviously stultified the consciences of Adventist leaders and clergy to the point where they behave as if there is no Heaven to win or Hell to shun, much less believe in the Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Investigative Judgment.

By now the Adventist Church has become a mammoth business operation that is, to many, a culture of business, rather than a vehicle to preserve and foster the Christian Faith. Many Pastors and Church leaders do not believe what they are teaching others, and this hypocrisy opens the door to sin. When it comes to money, the Church has everything to lose and nothing to gain by coming to grips with the fact that, to the point of over-kill, Adventism has been proven to be absolutely FALSE. As we have seen, there appears to be a direct correlation between what Adventist leaders learned in the 1970's about the impossibilities of Adventism with the development of the unstoppable corruption that has plagued the Church ever since.

Adventist teachers, pastors, college professors, and leaders at all levels are nearly powerless to stand up and call the three pillars of Adventism by their right name—LIES— because they will lose their jobs. Unless reform happens all at once, from the top down, and with as many people as possible on the same page, Adventism may implode.

The conservatives like the Standish Brothers, the late Russell, and Colin, and Vance Ferrell of Pilgrim's Rest are right, up to a point, that Adventism has become corrupt by its failure to follow the counsels of Ellen White. While there are probably several reasons why Adventist leaders do not wish to follow the EGW "Blueprint" for the Church, one contributing factor is certainly that they know that the source of the testimonies they ignore was either her vivid imagination or otherwise of questionable origin.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Does Religion Have To Make Any Sense?

By William H. Hohmann

Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. —John 17:17

DISCERNING TRUTHS AND DECEPTIONS

When I was being recruited into a Sabbatarian “church” (I use the word loosely.) I had no real understanding of how to discern between truth and deceptions. I concluded simply that if something was to be found in Scripture, and it was a command from God, then that was that. It was a simplistic view of Scripture, shared by many. I also was under the impression that I was way too smart to be suckered into a false belief system. Only much later did I come to see that this mindset would trip me up later. If you believe you are too smart to be fooled, you set yourself up to be fooled. It is foolish to think you are above being deceived. Satan deceived a third of the angels who knew God.

This group I was recruited into went the extra step to insure the chances of me ever abandoning them and the “truths” they revealed to me would be slim. All sorts of dire warnings were attached to these beliefs. The devil would do everything he could to deter me from their truths. It was God who really revealed these truths to me, and I must guard them with my life, seeing as it was my life that was indeed at stake.

I was warned that even some members from within the group may well succumb to the wiles of the devil, and that they in turn would try to sway me from “God's truths.” Those who would leave “the Church” were deceived and disgruntled ex-members with an ax to grind, and hatred now in their hearts for God and His ways. That anyone might have left due to legitimate doctrinal issues was viewed as an impossibility by these former associates. My position now, however, is that if the “truth” is really a false belief, a person has a moral obligation to abandon that belief and the organization that promotes it. People, such as myself, who are indoctrinated in the belief that they will be eternally lost if they leave a false religious system have little chance of ever learning the truths of Scripture from any person or any source by using the proper tools for Bible study. Yet, miracles still happen, and I was one of these miracles.

I ask my readers to consider this important question and answer it in their own minds. If the devil, that deceiver, was behind your beliefs, would he not do everything possible to prevent you from examining any and all other sources of information? I know... you “proved” everything a long time ago, and you see no need to go over it all again. Scripture calls that behavior having ears dull of hearing, and eyes dull of seeing. You are merely complying with the conditioning you underwent to prevent you from ever truly examining your beliefs in the light of Scripture as Scripture was intended to be used.

You may well be saying to yourself how you have been studying Scripture for years, even decades, yet if you are not working from the proper perspective, your beliefs may end up being nothing more than a house of cards.

Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. —2 Timothy 3:7

It is so much easier to remain smug in one's beliefs and to dismiss others and their witness that things are not as they seem to be. It is easier to dismiss the witness of those who left your fellowship with epithets of their character. It is easier to claim loyalty to the organization you believe provided you with truth than to admit you might be in error and disloyal to the Word of God.

There are rules that a person must use in order to discern truth from error. The first and greatest rule is so simple that it is easily overlooked, and so easily dismissed.

Scripture is the “God-breathed and Inspired” Word of God. As such, no person or church has the right to alter Scripture or its application. Scripture words this, stating that no one is to add to it, or take away from it. It stands as written, unaltered.

Sounds simple. Sounds easy. But once you truly begin to evaluate your beliefs in this light, you just might be surprised, and dismayed.

How important then is it to never alter Scripture or its application?

There are Scriptural examples regarding how seriously God takes what He says. Saul, the king of Israel, was rejected by God for interpreting for himself how to comply with what God had commanded him. Saul's rationalization for his disobedience was unacceptable. Why then would we believe God to be any less resolute regarding the rest of His Inspired Word?

“And Samuel said, When thou wast little in thine own sight, wast thou not made the head of the tribes of Israel, and the LORD anointed thee king over Israel? And the LORD sent thee on a journey, and said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. Wherefore then didst thou not obey the voice of the LORD, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the LORD? And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the LORD, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God in Gilgal. And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being king. And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice. Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel.” – 1 Samuel 15:17-26

If we do not abide by the written Word of God, are we not rejecting the Word of God? Are we not being stubborn by not believing what God has inspired to be written? Are we not being rebellious?

Jesus berated the religious leaders of His time who altered Scripture and its application, by showing they had no right to keep the commandments of God according to their traditions. Yes, God is serious about His Word. We have no right to edit it.

“Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” – Matthew 15:2-9

Sabbatarians are taught (and believe) that they are keeping the commandments of God in accordance with Scripture, as contrasted to mainstream Christianity who they believe do not keep God's commandments at all. The fact of the matter is that Sabbatarians attempt to keep commandments of God that God did not command or require of them, and that these commandments they do attempt to keep, they keep in accordance with the dictates of men, and not God. This shall be revealed later.

At the very end of the book of Revelation, God gives a warning to those who would think to add to the words of that book or take away from those words. Yes, God is very serious about His written Word.

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” – Revelation 22:18-19

Some Sabbatarians claim the mark of the beast, discussed in the book of Revelation, is related to worship on Sundays; that those who worship on Sundays receive the mark of the beast. Is this an example of adding to the book of Revelation?

We are without excuse should we find ourselves altering Scripture or its application. Why then do people resort to altering Scripture and/or its application? There are a number of reasons.

1. People don't believe what God says. It becomes an example of faithlessness.
2. The person who is altering Scripture and its application is a wolf who seeks power and control over others in order to “feed his own belly” at the expense of others.
3. People buy into the alterations of Scripture and its application as taught to them by others who in turn are deceived also.

The process works this way:

A person is confronted by a passage of Scripture that conflicts with what they believe as stated. They conclude that the error lies with Scripture; that the passage is perhaps a bad translation. This can be true, and through the proper rules of translation and hermeneutics a proper determination can be arrived at. Often though, the proper methods of evaluating Scripture are ignored in favor of methods that tend to result in errors and falsehoods.

Other conclusions regarding a questionable passage is to conclude it is somehow obscured in semantics, or the passage does not impart all the information relevant to the issue, and they see the need to “fill in the blanks” by comparing it with other Scripture so as to make it appear to comply with what a person does believe.

At this juncture, a person, in order to reconcile the conflict, resorts to the methods of “interpretation” that lead to deceptions and falsehoods. I call these the methods of deception, and they are many.

These include, but are not limited to the following:

Rationalizations, inferences, assumptions, faulty drawn conclusions, eisegesis (proof texting; taking Scripture out of context), redefining words and terms, and the use of logical fallacies.

The tools or methods of proper understanding and scholarship include the following:

Proper use of logic, proper use of one's critical thinking skills, proper hermeneutics, including proper exegesis (understanding a passage of Scripture in context), and the proper definition of words and terms.

There are a number of useful rules one uses when it comes to critical thinking.

Beliefs can be stated as claims, to which we examine the Scriptural evidence that supports or refutes the claim.

Is the claim of such a nature that it defies the ability to refute the claim?

This is a variation on what is commonly known as the falsifiability test. The claim cannot be worded in such a way that we cannot prove or verify the claim, and where there is no way to disprove the claim. A common example is a person who claims to have personal revelations from God. A deceiver would be unable to produce evidence to truly support his claim, and we would be unable to provide evidence to disprove his claim. Such claims are useless when it comes to determining truths from lies, and as such, are better left rejected. We must ask ourselves if God would endorse this sort of thing, where we have no way to verify one's claim to divine guidance. God's written word admonishes us to prove all things. We cannot prove whether

a person has direct revelations from God or not. We can be reasonably certain that a false prophet would claim such, and that a false prophet would eventually make false predictions. Another example is the common claim that if one tithes, they will be blessed. The opposite gets cited often also; if you do not tithe, you will be cursed. Can the minister or church prove their claim? Try asking them to guarantee the claim! You will see soon enough that they personally have no such faith that you will actually be so blessed.

Is there comprehensive evidence in Scripture to support the claim?

Of times, those who are trying to support an erroneous belief will resort to flooding the issue with assumptions and rationalizations, as well as other claims in an attempt to shore up a belief that otherwise would succumb to the proper methods of examination. In other words, they attempt to make a flood of assumptions look like comprehensive Scriptural support.

Does the claim hold true for all circumstances affected by it?

An example would be the claim that being under the Law does not mean one is free to break the law, rather it means not being under the penalty of the Law, that penalty being a death sentence. This belief attempts to claim people are still obligated to keep the law though no longer under the condemnation of the law. The law becomes toothless.

The claim lacks logic. Regardless, a law without teeth is a useless law. But the law is not so toothless when you examine other beliefs held by those who claim this belief; how the law is used in relation to salvation.

Also, the claim does not hold true for all circumstances affected by it. If being “under” the law means one is under the *condemnation* of the law, then what of Jesus who was born under the law? Was He therefore under the condemnation of that law? Some have actually argued He was! Yet such was not the case.

But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. — Galatians 4:4-5

“We establish the law” – Rom 3:31

“The law is holy, just, and good” – Rom 7:12

“Sin is the transgression of the law” – I John 3:4

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets...” Mt 5:17

All this and more in order to overcome the most basic rule of understanding Scripture: that we have no right to alter Scripture and its application, seeing as it IS the Word of God.

What could help in this regard is to use an example from another group's beliefs where you with your own belief system are not associated except in the methodology.

Some groups hold to the belief that blood transfusions are a sin and violate Scripture. As evidence to support this belief, the following Scriptures are cited:

It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood. —Leviticus 3:17

Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings. Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be cut off from his people. —Leviticus 7:26-27

And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. —Leviticus 17:10

A blood transfusion is seen as consuming blood. They see no difference between taking blood in through the mouth or through an I.V. They argue you wouldn't take milk or water in through an I.V. Yet, it is a facetious argument, easily seen as such by those who do not buy into that particular belief. Just try to convince someone who holds to this belief they are wrong though, and that their argument "doesn't hold water."

What are the consequences of this belief that goes beyond the scope of Scripture? People who otherwise may well have had life-saving medical treatment end up dead instead. God, it would seem, prefers human sacrifices.

God and the Israelites were the parties to the old covenant Law. Regardless of how you "chop up" the old covenant Law (redefining words and concepts), even claiming the Ten Commandments to be a separate covenant, it can still be demonstrated the parties to that covenant Law were God and the Israelites and no others. There was a provision in the old covenant for those *not* born of Israel to enter into that covenant relationship with God through circumcision. Were Gentile Christians required to undergo circumcision? No. Were they required to keep the Law? Not according to Acts 15. The very Law people claim Christians should keep excludes Christians if they refuse circumcision.

I could easily go through all the proof texts employed by Sabbatarians, and show the flaws, but it isn't necessary. This has been done in other articles available at www.truthorfables.com anyway. Regardless, it becomes an exercise in futility, for no matter how well you expose the proof texts for what they are, and that they do not actually support the erroneous belief, they will produce yet another and another proof text or rationale to support their flawed beliefs. They seek only to validate their beliefs, even at the expense of Scripture; God's Word.

Either you believe what God has inspired to be written as written, or you do not. If you do not, then you demonstrate your faithlessness. You demonstrate your rebellion. All the proof texts in the world cannot save you.

Did God command non-Israelites to keep the Ten Commandments? No.

"Yea, but..."

Did God command non-Israelites to keep the Sabbath? No.

"Yea, but..."

When it came to the Sabbath and the Israelites, God was specific and detailed in His instructions regarding the Israelites keeping the Sabbath.

When the New Covenant was being instituted, not a peep came from Christ regarding Gentile (non-Israelite) Christians keeping the Sabbath. What do Sabbatarians think then? Was it just an oversight on His part? The rationalizations fly in flocks.

God is not going to violate His covenants, and we need to understand the nature of His covenants.

What was the nature of the old covenant?

It was a legal contract between God and the Israelites.

It was also seen as a marriage contract between God and the Israelites.

Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD. A voice was heard upon the high places, weeping and supplications of the children of Israel: for they have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the LORD their God. —Jeremiah 3:20-21

It was also treated as a testament, put in force through the shed blood of substitute animals.

For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled

both the book, and all the people, Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. —Hebrews 9:19-20

Can someone, not a party to a covenant, be held to the conditions of said covenant? No. Yet Sabbatarians insist on enjoining some of the conditions of the old covenant Law on Christians.

Would God deal with us illegally, holding us to the conditions of a covenant we are not a party to? No. Yet this is exactly what Sabbatarians attempt to do with the Ten Commandments.

If God wanted Christians to keep the Sabbath, He would have made such a command in the New Covenant. God would not have left this matter up to us to discern through assumptions and rationalizations.

What is the nature of the New Covenant?

It is a covenant between God and those God has given His Spirit to, as foretold in Scripture. Like the old covenant, it was to be a covenant between God and Israel also, but as the old covenant had a provision that allowed those not of Israel to enter into that covenant through circumcision, Gentiles were “granted repentance unto life” by being given God’s Holy Spirit also, as a result of their belief in the gospel. Their “circumcision” was performed by God, and it was a spiritual circumcision of the heart.

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. —Romans 2:28-29

The law of the New Covenant; the conditions, revolve around faith and love. It is about being led by the Holy Spirit, and not a written code of law. (Rom 3:27; II Cor. 3; Rom 7:6)

The New Covenant was prophesied to *not* be like the old covenant.

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that 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 that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt*; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: —Jeremiah 31:31-32

Whereas the old covenant was essentially a contractual agreement, where God made promises physical in nature that would be fulfilled based on the performance/compliance of the Israelites, and punishments should they fail to fulfill the conditions of that covenant, the New Covenant is treated more like a marriage covenant, and has superior promises that are spiritual in nature. This, by the way, is the theme of the book of Hebrews; the superiority of the New Covenant over the old.

God (Christ) trusts and loves this wife. The wife trusts and loves the husband. Christ did not need to put “pre-nups” in this marriage agreement for the purpose of exposing a treacherous and cheating, adulterous, faithless wife.

The church is the bride of Christ. Those under the Old Covenant were faithless and seen by God as being a treacherous wife, whom God divorced.

And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also. —Jeremiah 3:8

Those were the people of the old covenant, letter of the Law. Jesus' death on the cross finalized the break with Israel and the old covenant. Paul explains this in Romans 7. Christ was now freed from the old covenant with the old treacherous wife and free to marry the new bride; the church; a faithful wife.

The Gospel Relationship

The gospel is a message of salvation through faith in Christ.

Those who do not believe the Gospel as stated, resort to the aforementioned process in order to make the Gospel acceptable to them. They apply the same methodology to the gospel as they do anything else in Scripture they do not believe as stated. Sabbatarian legalists add the Law and Sabbath keeping to the gospel.

They deny this, of course, because they do not believe they are really altering the gospel. They claim they believe in salvation through faith in Christ. One need only ask them what happens to their salvation should they quit keeping the Sabbath. Rather than outright admit this, they again resort to the methods of deception in order to obfuscate the obvious. Rationalizations regarding sin are cited, using proof texts such as I John 3:4 to claims of being hateful towards God and "His Law."

They "tweak" the gospel in order to make it acceptable to themselves. Again, the gospel as stated, to them, is seen as having left out some details that are found elsewhere in Scripture. If "sin is the transgression of the law," and no sinner will attain to salvation, then it is a simple matter to conclude one cannot be sinning by breaking the old covenant law in order to be saved.

This conclusion, innocent as it may appear, falsifies the gospel, and succeeds in bringing Christians back under the old covenant Law, and everything that goes with it, including being once again under sin and condemnation. Paul warns Christians against this in places like Galatians 5:1.

Plain and simple declarations made under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit are cast aside:

**"For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace."
– Romans 6:14**

But if you *are* under the Law, sin has dominion. Ever listen carefully to the argument that you are not *under* the Law, yet still obligated to keep it, and that, should you transgress it, you come back under the Law, and you sin and could lose your salvation? Talk about redefining words and terms! Talk about cognitive dissonance!

"But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." – Galatians 5:18

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." – Galatians 3:23-25

The Faith has been revealed. The Law is history. The Christian in possession of the Holy Spirit is complete in Christ, and there is no need to be under the Law that was for the faithless and spiritually immature; for it is the immature, the children, who need a schoolmaster. God's Holy Spirit is sufficient.

What then of all the proof texts and rationalizations that have been used to try and prove Christians must keep the Law and Sabbath?

They can all be explained. They have all been explained. But, explaining them to someone who believes they must keep the Law and Sabbath is a waste of one's time, for they are, as stated before, the anchor Scriptures the unwary and deceived rely on so heavily.

It is those who are beginning to see the truth of the gospel, and the lies of legalism and Sabbatarianism that benefit from the explanations that show the fallacies of the proof texts used to support legalism and Sabbatarianism. This article and the others here are for them.

To those of the legalistic and Sabbatarian persuasion who may have read this far, who rely so heavily on their “proofs” of Scripture that you believe backs your belief, I once again point out that there is no Scripture where God/Christ commands Christians to keep the Law and the Sabbath. No one has the right to alter Scripture or its application. But that's what you must do in order to believe as you do.

Salvation is for the faithful; those who believe the gospel as stated in God's Word. Salvation is for those who believe God for what God has said, and not what people think God meant. Salvation is for the humble who would not dare alter Scripture.

Salvation is not for those who feel free to rationalize around Scripture, making Scripture over to their preconceived beliefs, making God over into their own image; an act of rebellion and faithlessness.

To those who believe they must keep the Law, how is that working out for you? Do you keep the law perfectly, as required? Those who are proponents of the law make another claim, that the Holy Spirit enables a person to keep the Law. So again, how's that working out for you? Now that you have the Holy Spirit, you keep the law perfectly, as required, right? You are now without sin, right?

Has it never occurred to you that your focus in relation to others who do not believe as you do one of trying to convince them to keep the Sabbath and Law, instead of a focus on preaching the gospel? Sabbatarians are constantly referring to preaching the truth about the *Sabbath*, and rarely, if ever, the *truth* of the gospel.

Haven't you noticed that when confronted by people who do not believe as you do, your response is to attack those who oppose your view, accusing them hating God and “His Law” all the while perceiving their opposition to your beliefs as being a case of them persecuting you?

The apostle Paul declares in II Corinthians chapter 3 that those who remain in the teachings and writings of Moses have a veil before their eyes. What did Moses teach and write? The Law! Who then has a veil before their eyes? Those who hold to the Law! Through the use of the methods of deception, a whole new “reality” is created by the Sabbatarian legalist. It is a fantasy world, built upon rationalizations, proof texts, and denial regarding the facts of Scripture where the deceptive tactics are given greater weight than the plain and simple declarations found in the Word of God. God's Word is spun away, circumvented through alterations of Scripture and its application.

Covenants have been covered. Christians are not a party to the old covenant Law that ended.

The gospel has been covered; salvation through faith only, without the “benefit” of the Law.

APPENDIX I

SABBATH NOT A LAW FOR CHRISTIANS

Researched And Written By Robert K. Sanders

Many Seventh-day Adventists have written to challenge why I renounced keeping the 7th day Sabbath that begins sundown Friday through sundown Saturday after 47 years. To answer their objections is the reason for this article, "Sabbath Not a Law for Christians."

When I was a Sabbath keeper, I was questioned by non-Sabbath keepers, "Why do you still hold on to the Sabbath and renounce the other old covenant teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church"? They asked, "Would not the same arguments that I use to show that tithing and refraining from the eating of unclean meats are no longer binding on Christians be the same arguments to show the Sabbath is no longer binding on Christians"? After careful study I have had to conclude they were correct.

THE COVENANTS

Seventh-day Adventists arbitrarily divide the old covenant into two divisions, moral and ceremonial. They claim that the Ten Commandments are moral and the rest of the law/covenant is ceremonial. They have offered no biblical evidence to support a two-part division of the old covenant. There are moral and ceremonial commands in the whole law as well as a ceremonial command in the Ten Commandments.

1. The Bible writers never declared the old covenant was a two-part covenant. The Jews understand that there is but one law/covenant and it is all equally holy and binding. When Israel vowed to keep the covenant, it was one covenant not a two-division covenant.

Ex. 24:3 (NIV) - When Moses went and told the people all the LORD'S words and laws, they responded with one voice, "Everything the LORD has said we will do."

A. There are 613 commands in the old covenant that Israelites were required to keep perfectly.

B. The Ten has one ceremonial command, the Sabbath, which is not a moral command.

Sabbath keeping was given to Israel as a weekly ritual "to rest" from labor. It was never commanded as a communal day of worship. Israel was commanded to remember their deliverance from Egypt and that God created the world. The Sabbath is not a moral command as no person has ever been charged with sin for breaking the Sabbath except Israel of the Old Covenant.

2. The Old Covenant is a binding agreement God made with Israel at Sinai.

(NIV) Moses then took the blood, sprinkled it on the people and said, "This is the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words."

SDA's teach that the Sabbath is binding on all nations and all people for all time when in fact it was given only to one nation Israel. Circumcision was the entry sign into the covenant. Gentiles could only legally keep the Sabbath and be accepted by God, if they joined the Israelite community through circumcision and kept all the requirements of the Covenant.

3. The sign of the Old Covenant between God and Israel was the Sabbath. God never made the Sabbath a sign for Christians in the New Testament. Do you find Christians mentioned in the text? Can you legally enjoin on Christians that which God has not enjoined on them?

Ex. 31:16 - 17 (NRSV) - Therefore the Israelites shall keep the Sabbath, observing the Sabbath throughout their generations, as a perpetual covenant. 17 It is a sign forever between me and the people of Israel that in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.”

4. Circumcision is just as much a perpetual covenant for Israel as the Sabbath. Circumcision was first made with Abraham as an “everlasting covenant.”

Gen. 17:9-10, 13-14 (NIV) - Then God said to Abraham, “As for you, you must keep my covenant, you and your descendants after you for the generations to come. 10 This is my covenant with you and your descendants after you, the covenant you are to keep: Every male among you shall be circumcised. 13 Whether born in your household or bought with your money, they must be circumcised. My covenant in your flesh is to be an everlasting covenant. 14 Any uncircumcised male, who has not been circumcised in the flesh, will be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

5. God then gave circumcision to Israel along with the Sabbath in the Law of Moses.

John 7:21 - 24 (NIV) - Jesus said to them, “I did one miracle, and you are all astonished. 22 Yet, because Moses gave you circumcision (though actually it did not come from Moses, but from the patriarchs), you circumcise a child on the Sabbath. 23 Now if a child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the Law of Moses may not be broken, why are you angry with me for healing the whole man on the Sabbath? 24 Stop judging by mere appearances, and make a right judgment.”

6. The Old Covenant ended at Calvary with the death of Jesus.

When a party to a covenant dies, said covenant ends. In this case it was Jesus who died, and He made that covenant with Israel. Thus the old covenant ended, even as a marriage covenant ends upon the death of either party. The surviving person is free to marry again, even as Jesus now takes the church as His new bride. If a mate dies, the surviving person is no longer married to a corpse. Rom. 7 shows this comparison of marriage and dying to the law through Christ. SDA's are married to the old covenant corpse. They read Sabbath-keeping in the Old Covenant (contract) God made with Israel and apply it to themselves. They do not accept the fact that they were never a party to that covenant. The only way for them to legally keep the Sabbath is through circumcision and they are then obligated to keep ALL the requirements of Old Covenant with its 613 commands, which they do not do. They refuse to kill Sabbath breakers and stay at home on Sabbaths as the law requires. Thus they are lawbreakers, and subject to the condemnation of that law.

WHAT ENDED AT THE CROSS?

Jesus Abolished Israel's law with Ten Commandments and regulations.

Eph. 2:15 (NIV) - by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations.

Notice, “the law” is singular that was abolished, not laws. There was just “one law” the Mosaic Law with many commands and regulations, and it was abolished by Jesus.

God canceled the written code and regulations nailing it to the cross. SDA's claim that the “written code” was not the Ten, but the law that Moses wrote.

Both God and Moses wrote the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments written on stone tablets by the finger of God were placed inside the Ark of the Covenant, and they were also written by Moses on parchment and placed outside the Ark in the Book of the Covenant. Otherwise you would not be reading it in your Bible. Col. 2 and Ex. 24 explain this.

Col. 2:13 - 14 (NIV) - When you were dead in your sins and in the uncircumcision of your sinful nature, God made you alive with Christ. He forgave us all our sins, 14 having canceled the written code, with its regulations, that was against us and that stood opposed to us; he took it away, nailing it to the cross.

Ex.24:3 - 4 (NIV) When Moses went and told the people all the LORD'S words and laws, they responded with one voice, "Everything the LORD has said we will do." 4 Moses then wrote down everything the LORD had said. He got up early the next morning and built an altar at the foot of the mountain and set up twelve stone pillars representing the twelve tribes of Israel.

vs. 7 - then he took the Book of the Covenant and read it to the people. They responded, "We will do everything the LORD has said; we will obey."

Jesus was taken down from the cross, but the law with the Sabbath remains nailed to the cross for eternity. SDA's try their best to pry the nails from the cross to make the Sabbath binding on Christians.

"The first Covenant" had "stone tablets of the covenant."

There is no way to avoid the fact the old covenant included the Ten Commandments.

Heb. 9:1 – Heb. 9:4 (NIV) - Now the first covenant had regulations for worship and also an earthly sanctuary. 2 A tabernacle was set up. In its first room were the lampstand, the table and the consecrated bread; this was called the Holy Place. 3 Behind the second curtain was a room called the Most Holy Place, 4 which had the golden altar of incense and the gold-covered Ark of the Covenant. This ark contained the gold jar of manna, Aaron's staff that had budded, and the stone tablets of the covenant.

The Old Covenant with the Ten Commandments is obsolete.

Heb. 8:7 – Heb. 8:13 (NIV) - For if there had been nothing wrong with that first covenant, no place would have been sought for another. 8 But God found fault with the people and said, "The time is coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. 9 It will not be like the covenant I made with their forefathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, because they did not remain faithful to my covenant, and I turned away from them, declares the Lord. 10 This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time, declares the Lord. I will put my laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God and they will be my people. 11 No longer will a man teach his neighbor, or a man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest. 12 For I will forgive their wickedness and will remember their sins no more." 13 By calling this covenant "new," he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.

The Ten Commandments were a ministration of death and condemnation.

2 Cor. 3:6 - 9 (NIV) - He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant—not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. 7 Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, fading though it was, 8 will not the ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious? 9 If the ministry that condemns men is glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness!

Only one who was a party to that law/Sabbath could die to that law/Sabbath. No one alive today was a party to the old covenant. For someone to insist on keeping the Sabbath and other old covenant points of law is to insist on being bound to a dead mate.

Christian Jews are “released from the Law” and now serve the Spirit and not in the way of “the written code”.

If you have not died to the law/Sabbath you are holding onto a corpse. Good luck with that!

Rom. 7:4-6 (NIV) - So, my brothers, you also died to the law through the body of Christ, that you might belong to another, to him who was raised from the dead, in order that we might bear fruit to God. ⁵ For when we were controlled by the sinful nature, the sinful passions aroused by the law were at work in our bodies, so that we bore fruit for death. ⁶ But now, by dying to what once bound us; we have been released from the law so that we serve in the new way of the Spirit, and not in the old way of the written code.

The law was a witness against Israel not Christians.

God gave the law to Israel to show them their sins and the law was a witness to it. They were a stiff-necked, rebellious, idolatrous, faithless nation.

Deut. 31:26 - 27 (NIV) - “Take this Book of the Law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God. There it will remain as a witness against you. For I know how rebellious and stiff-necked you are. If you have been rebellious against the LORD while I am still alive and with you, how much more will you rebel after I die!

The law was a school master (*paidagogos*) to bring Israel to Christ, not Christians who were never under that law. How can SDA's who claim to be justified by faith, want to be under Israel's schoolmaster (law)?

Gal. 3:23 - 25 (KJV) - But before faith came; we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. ²⁴ Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster [*paidagogos*] to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. ²⁵ But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

A *paidagogos* was one who accompanied a child, who was usually a slave of the parents of the child, and even administered punishment as required. Once the child came of age and was mature, the *paidagogos* was dismissed from this oversight of the child. Those who insist on living by that law demonstrate their immaturity; still needing a law to tell them everything they are to do or not do.

Christ is the end of the Law for Israel.

The law made no one righteous and no one could keep it perfectly.

Rom. 10:4 (NIV) - Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for everyone who believes.

Rom. 3:20 (NIV) - Therefore no one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law; rather, through the law we become conscious of sin.

The Law of Sin and Death is the Ten Commandments.

2 Cor. 3:6 - 7 (NIV) - He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant—not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. ⁷ Now if the ministry that brought death, which

was engraved in letters on stone, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, fading though it was.

The law was made for rebellious Israel, and not Christians with the spirit of God.

Do Christians need a law to tell them not to worship idols, not to murder and steal?

1 Tim. 1:9 - (NIV) We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, 10 for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine 11 that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

How can Christians be righteous before God without the law?

Christians will receive their righteousness from the gospel and will live by faith.

Rom. 1:17 (NIV) - For in the gospel a righteousness from God is revealed, a righteousness that is by faith from first to last, just as it is written: “The righteous will live by faith.”

Rom. 3:21-23 (KJV) - But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; 22 Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: 23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

Paul was not under the Law.

Be like Paul and win SDA's and other Sabbatarians that put themselves under the law.

Cor. 9:20 (NIV) - To the Jews I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the law I became like one under the law (though I myself am not under the law), so as to win those under the law.

Rom 6:14 (NIV) - For sin shall not be your master, because you are not under law, but under grace.

Gal 5:14 (NIV) - The entire law is summed up in a single command: “Love your neighbor as yourself.”

Gal 5:18 (NIV) - But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law.

The Apostles opposed the Judaizers that were trying to impose the law on Gentiles.

The issue was keeping the Law of Moses. Notice that the Sabbath was not included in the discussion. In the Jewish mind a gentile must first be circumcised before he could keep the Sabbath. This would have been an excellent time to tell the gentiles to keep the Ten as do SDA's.

Acts 15:5 (NIV) - Then some of the believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees stood up and said, “The Gentiles must be circumcised and required to obey the law of Moses.”

Acts 15:10 - 11 (NIV) - Now then, why do you try to test God by putting on the necks of the disciples a yoke that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? 11 No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are.

Acts 15:19 - 21 (NIV) - “It is my judgment, therefore, that we should not make it difficult for the Gentiles who are turning to God. 20 Instead we should write to them, telling them to abstain from food polluted

by idols, from sexual immorality, from the meat of strangled animals and from blood. 21 For Moses has been preached in every city from the earliest times and is read in the synagogues on every Sabbath.”

The Sinai Covenant is Slavery represented by earthly Jerusalem. Jewish and Gentile Christians are free in the New Jerusalem in heaven which is of faith.

What was given on Mt. Sinai? The 10 Commandments and the Sabbath.

Gal 4:21 - Gal 4:31 (NIV) - Tell me, you who want to be under the law, are you not aware of what the law says? 22 For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the slave woman and the other by the free woman. 23 His son by the slave woman was born in the ordinary way; but his son by the free woman was born as the result of a promise. 24 These things may be taken figuratively, for the women represent two covenants. One covenant is from Mount Sinai and bears children who are to be slaves: This is Hagar. 25 Now Hagar stands for Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present city of Jerusalem, because she is in slavery with her children. 26 But the Jerusalem that is above is free, and she is our mother. 27 For it is written: “Be glad, O barren woman, who bears no children; break forth and cry aloud, you who have no labor pains; because more are the children of the desolate woman than of her who has a husband.” 28 Now you, brothers, like Isaac, are children of promise. 29 At that time the son born in the ordinary way persecuted the son born by the power of the Spirit. It is the same now. 30 But what does the Scripture say? “Get rid of the slave woman and her son, for the slave woman’s son will never share in the inheritance with the free woman’s son.” 31 Therefore, brothers, we are not children of the slave woman, but of the free woman.

The New Covenant is God writing his laws on the Christian's heart.

Hebrews 8:10 (NIV) - This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time, declares the Lord. I will put my laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God and they will be my people.

What are the laws that God has written on our hearts?

SDA's would have you believe that God is writing the same old covenant law of sin and death on our hearts. The Apostles tell us what they are.

Law of Faith. To know we are justified before God without keeping the Old Covenant.

Rom. 3:27-28 (NRSV) - Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28 For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.

The Law of the Spirit has set us free from the law of sin and death.

Rom. 8:1 - 4 (NIV) - Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, 2 because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death. 3 For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, 4 in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.

Live by the Spirit. If you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

Gal. 5:16 – Gal. 5:21 (NIV) - So I say, live by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the desires of the sinful nature. 17 For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want. 18 But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law. 19 The acts of the sinful nature are obvious: sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery, 20 idolatry and witchcraft; hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage, selfish ambition, dissensions, factions 21 and envy; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God.

Law of Christ.

Gal. 6:2 (NIV) - Carry each other's burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ.

Law of liberty.

James 2:8 -9 (NIV) - If you really keep the royal law found in Scripture, "Love your neighbor as yourself," you are doing right. 9 But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as lawbreakers. 10 For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it. 11 For he who said, "Do not commit adultery," also said, "Do not murder. "If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker.

James mentions two distinct laws—that is, (1) the royal law and the law of liberty (which are identical) and (2) "the whole law" (which includes the entire Torah, all the Laws of Moses). James tells us that the royal law is "Love your neighbor as yourself." This law, found in Leviticus 19:18, is one of many laws that the Lord gave to Moses to instruct Israel regarding how to live moral lives and develop good interpersonal relationships with others. James also states that, as in the old covenant law, if you broke even one point of the whole law, you were guilty of the entirety of the old covenant. Likewise, if you fail to show proper love for even one person by showing partiality, you are guilty of breaking the law of Liberty. Therefore to break one point in the Ten or in the "whole law" consisting of 613 commands, YOU are a lawbreaker.

Jesus gave a new commandment to love one another.

Will a Christian that loves one another, murder, steal, commit adultery, and worship idols? There is no need for that obsolete law or the Ten Commandments. Love does no harm to one's neighbor therefore love fulfills the law. Keeping the law does not fulfill it. Another way to look at this is that, if a Christian has love for even his enemies, he would not commit these acts, seeing as these things are a result of an unconverted heart, not motivated by love. Do you trust the spirit to guide you? If not you have no faith just as Israel.

John 13:34 - John 13:35 (NIV) - "A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. 35 By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another."

The world will know you are Jesus' disciples if you love one another.

Paul tells Titus what to teach. Notice that nothing is said about keeping the Sabbath.

Titus 2:11 - Titus 2:15 (NIV) - For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men. 12 It teaches us to say "No" to ungodliness and worldly passions, and to live self-controlled, upright and godly lives in this present age, 13 while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, 14 who gave himself for us to redeem us from all wickedness and to purify for himself a people that are his very own, eager to do what is good. 15 These, then, are the things you should teach. Encourage and rebuke with all authority. Do not let anyone despise you.

DO SABBATARIANS FOLLOW JESUS' EXAMPLE?

Sabbatarians enjoy pointing to Jesus as our example to keep the Sabbath. Is this a valid argument? If we are to follow Jesus' examples of how he lived under the old covenant, we should consider this:

Do Sabbatarians Follow Jesus' Example? No!

1. Jesus wore tassels on a robe with a blue cord.
1. Jesus paid tax to the temple and supported temple worship
2. Jesus went to a Jewish synagogue on Sabbath and read from the Torah in Hebrew.
3. Jesus spoke out against the Jewish Leaders.
4. Jesus limited his study only to the Torah.
5. Jesus kept all 12 sabbaths including eating the Passover lamb.
6. Jesus did not baptize anyone.
7. Jesus did not own a home, did not marry, was not employed, had no income, stayed in other people's homes, and rode a donkey.

Paul Used the Sabbath For Evangelism.

Whenever the Apostles are mentioned in connection with the Sabbath, it was for evangelism and not Sabbath keeping. Paul often went to the Temple and synagogues to preach Christ to both Jews and Gentiles. It is never recorded that Paul or the Apostles preached Sabbath keeping to Jews or Gentiles. Notice Acts 17:2. Paul did not go to the synagogue to keep the Sabbath or to worship. Worship was done at the Temple, not the synagogues. The synagogues were used to teach the Torah. Paul taught from the Torah how Christ fulfilled the prophecies found in the Torah. Not once in the book of Acts is the Sabbath a point of discussion. Gentiles were coming into the church by the thousands and were not taught to keep the Sabbath Command or the penalties for breaking the Sabbath.

Acts 17:2 - Acts 17:4 (NIV) - As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned with them from the Scriptures, 3 explaining and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead. "This Jesus I am proclaiming to you is the Christ, he said. 4 Some of the Jews were persuaded and joined Paul and Silas, as did a large number of God-fearing Greeks and not a few prominent women.

Does Paul, quoting the Ten Commandments, prove that the Sabbath is binding on Christians?

Paul was always silent when it came to Sabbath keeping. He does quote the Ten Commandments, but not as a duty for the church. Paul is saying the duty for Christians is to love your neighbor as yourself and it is this that fulfills the requirements of the Torah/Law. The Jewish audience that Paul was addressing believed that if they kept the Ten Commandments they were fulfilling all the Torah/Law but they were not, if they did not love their neighbor.

Rom. 13:8 – Rom. 13:10 (NIV) - Let no debt remain outstanding, except the continuing debt to love one another, for he who loves his fellowman has fulfilled the law. 9 The commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not murder," "Do not steal," "Do not covet," and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: "Love your neighbor as yourself." 10 Love does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

ANSWERING SABBATH COVENANT ARGUMENTS

Here is a list of some often-used arguments to support Sabbath-keeping:

Argument: God rested on the Sabbath at Creation; he made the day holy, and sanctified the day. Therefore all mankind is bound to keep the day holy.

Gen. 2:2-3 (NIV) - By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing; so on the seventh day he rested from all his work. 3 And God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it he rested from all the work of creating that he had done.

The term "Sabbath" is not mentioned in the creation account. God rested from creating on THAT seventh day; He didn't continue creating by creating a repetitive day of rest. God rested / ceased from His creating on that particular seventh day from the creation that was completed the sixth day, and He sanctified THAT particular seventh day, and not the recurring seventh day.

God "rested" from that work because He was done with that work. A lawyer in court "rests" his case when He is done and has no more to offer to the court. Genesis also shows that that day shows having no end. God is still at rest from that work, and, according to the author of Hebrews 4, believers have the opportunity to enter into God's rest that He began then. The believer enters into God's rest "Today" seeing as that day has yet to end. This is the rest the Sabbath pointed to, and was a shadow of.

By using the argument that "this rest couldn't possibly be just for God" a rationalization is made to include Adam and Eve, and the rest of mankind into a physical, weekly seventh day rest. If this rest were not just for God, then mankind would be given the potential to enter into this same rest, right? And isn't that what the author of Hebrews is getting at? We can enter into God's rest, so why would we want to enter into that shadow rest that pointed to Christ, and is indeed this rest? See Col. 2:15-16. Sabbatarian logic gets side-tracked due to their preoccupation with the weekly, physical Sabbath that was but a shadow.

It is not logical to conclude, that we therefore enter into another rest that God did not enter into; the weekly Sabbath. God commanded Israel to rest on that reciprocal seventh day, and did not command Himself or claim He rested on weekly Sabbaths. The witness of Christ confirms this when He declared that the Father works on sabbaths as well as Christ.

Sabbatarians desperately need to establish the recurring seventh day Sabbath here in order to make the case for it applying to Christians who were not a party to the old covenant, and to make the case that the Sabbath is somehow special and "eternal."

The term "Sabbath" is not used in the Genesis account and there is no internal evidence God sanctified every seventh day. It was THAT first seventh day that God sanctified and rested; not every seventh day thereafter as recorded in John 5:16-17. God kept the manna that he gave Israel in the wilderness from spoiling on the Sabbath day. God preserves life and holds the worlds in place on the seventh day.

The Father and Jesus work on Sabbaths.

John 5:16 - 17 (NIV) - So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him. 17 Jesus said to them, "My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working."

Argument: Adam and Eve kept the Sabbath.

There is no internal evidence Adam and Eve were commanded to keep the weekly Sabbath, or anyone else prior to Israel being at Sinai when the Law of Moses was put forth and codified. It is more wishful thinking. Their line of reasoning here has been one of "once holy, always holy" and this includes Christians, so why isn't that ground at Sinai still holy? You can't have it both ways. Those that claim Adam and Eve kept the Sabbath are doing so by speculation.

The Bible does tell us that the Sinaitic Covenant which includes the Sabbath was not made with the fathers such as Adam, Noah, Isaac, Jacob and Abraham.

Deut. 5:2 -3 (NIV) - The LORD our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. 3 It was not with our

fathers that the LORD made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today.

Argument: Abraham kept all God's commandments. Therefore he kept the Sabbath.

Gen. 26:5 (NIV) - because Abraham obeyed me and kept my requirements, my commands, my decrees and my laws.”

This is another false claim that is speculation. The Sabbath was not included in God's covenant with Abraham. Circumcision evidently was more important to God than the Sabbath as God made circumcision the covenant sign and not the Sabbath with Abraham.

Gen. 17:10 - 11 (NIV) - This is my covenant with you and your descendants after you, the covenant you are to keep: Every male among you shall be circumcised. 11 You are to undergo circumcision, and it will be the sign of the covenant between me and you.

Argument: The Sabbath is a lasting covenant. Therefore it will never end.

Ex. 31:16 -17 (NIV) - The Israelites are to observe the Sabbath, celebrating it for the generations to come as a lasting covenant. 17 It will be a sign between me and the Israelites forever, for in six days the LORD made the heavens and the Earth, and on the seventh day he abstained from work and rested.”

So if the Sabbath stands now because it was an eternal, everlasting covenant, then so does circumcision.

Gen. 17:13 - 14 (NIV) - Whether born in your household or bought with your money, they must be circumcised. My covenant in your flesh is to be an everlasting covenant. 14 Any uncircumcised male, who has not been circumcised in the flesh, will be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

The new covenant was not to be like the old covenant!

Jer. 31:31 - 33 (NIV) - “The time is coming,” declares the LORD, “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. 32 It will not be like the covenant I made with their forefathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, because they broke my covenant, though I was a husband to them,” declares the LORD. 33 “This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time,” declares the LORD. “I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be my people.

God told Israel the time would come that he would stop their Sabbaths.

Hosea 2:11 (NIV) - I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days— all her appointed feasts.

SDA's want to make just the 7th day Sabbath holy and an “eternal covenant” to meet their agenda and discard the other ten rest sabbaths found in Deuteronomy 23. The Sabbath was a shadow of the finished work of Christ. Why Sabbatarians want to live in the shadows and deny the finished work of Christ is a mystery to me. Paul tells us that these weekly, monthly and yearly Sabbaths are temporary— shadows which meet their reality in Jesus.

Col. 2:16 - Col 2:17 (NIV) -Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ.

Argument: Isaiah proves the Sabbath is eternal, as it will be kept in the earth made new.

Isa. 66:22 - Isa. 66:24 (NIV) - "As the new heavens and the new earth that I make will endure before me," declares the LORD, "so will your name and descendants endure. 23 From one New Moon to another and from one Sabbath to another, all mankind will come and bow down before me," says the LORD. 24 "And they will go out and look upon the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; their worm will not die, nor will their fire be quenched, and they will be loathsome to all mankind."

If the messages of Isaiah apply to the Christian Church, then we are faced with a lot of problems. Read this carefully:

Isa. 65:17 tells about when God will create a new heaven and earth. vs. 20, people that do not live to be 100 will be accursed. (People will die in the new earth?) vs. 22, people will live as long as a tree. (Many trees do not live 20 years) vs. 23, women will bear children. (Jesus tells us, there will be no marriage in heaven.) As you can see this has nothing to do with the Christian belief of the New Heaven and the New Earth. If Israel had been faithful/obedient to God these blessings would have come to them. Isaiah's prophecy applies only to Israel and not to new covenant Christians. Will the saints really need a weekly Sabbath to rest from their labor, to remember they were delivered from Egypt and that it was God that created the world? I think not.

Every Sabbath in the new earth you can go out each Sabbath and view dead bodies and worms that do not die.

Isa. 66:22 - 24 (NIV) - "As the new heavens and the new earth that I make will endure before me," declares the LORD, "so will your name and descendants endure. 23 From one New Moon to another and from one Sabbath to another, all mankind will come and bow down before me," says the LORD. 24 "And they will go out and look upon the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; their worm will not die, nor will their fire be quenched, and they will be loathsome to all mankind."

There is no death or dead worms in the New Earth. As you can see Isaiah's prophecy has nothing to do with the new covenant description of the New Heaven and the New Earth.

Argument: The Sabbath will be kept in the New Jerusalem!

Rev. 21:23 – Rev. 21:25 (NIV) - The city does not need the sun or the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God gives it light, and the Lamb is its lamp. 24 The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their splendor into it. 25 On no day will its gates ever be shut, for there will be no night there.

How indeed can the Sabbath be kept in the New Jerusalem without any night to define the start and end of the day? Is God going to ring a bell? It is ridiculous to think the saints will need a day "of rest" once a week to commune with God or to rest from work. God does not rest on the seventh day, why would the saints?

Argument: Jesus did not abolish the Ten Commandment law; therefore the Sabbath is binding.

(This argument used by Robert Sanders with the permission of William H. Hohmann.)

Matt. 5:17 – Matt. 5:19 (NIV) - "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. 1 Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

The above declaration by Jesus Christ is interpreted by those who hold to Sabbath keeping as proof that the Ten Commandments, including the Sabbath command, is binding on Christians. At first glance, this appears to be true, until one subjects the above to proper Biblical scholarship and critical analysis.

If it were a matter of being points of law, then the phrase “law or the Prophets” would not make sense, seeing as there is no law codified in the Prophets to “fulfill”. It is erroneously concluded that it is the law that is “fulfilled” and not the prophecies located in the law and prophets.

The first problem that arises is over the interpretation of “fulfill” in verse 17. The Sabbatarian argument is that this “fulfill” is to be understood as “filling to the full” or “filling up” the law. Jesus came to bring it up to full strength, as it were. This view forces a conclusion that Sabbatarians overlook in this interpretation. The law was deficient or incomplete; the same law they claim to be “God’s law” and a perfect, eternal law.

And if it is being “magnified” in this regard, how can this be accomplished without altering it way beyond jots and tittles? What of those portions of “God’s law” that are sacrificial and ceremonial in nature that the Sabbatarian insists are not binding on Christians? What happened to their “jots and tittles”?

And finally, how can you fill up or fulfill the law in that portion of scripture referred to as “The Prophets” where there is no codification of law? The opening declaration again states: Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. How can one “destroy” the prophets, and how can one “fulfill” the prophets?

So here we have a situation where one cannot fulfill that section of the Bible called the Prophets regarding law, seeing there is no law codified in the Prophets that has the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed. But this potential exists in the law and the prophets in regards to prophecies, as there are prophecies in the law and the prophets.

The next question to be asked is, Did Jesus come to fulfill the prophecies found in the law and the prophets? Yes he did. At this point, we need to address the context of verse 18:

Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Seeing as the law and prophets are addressed in the preceding verse, we cannot quickly assume that now just the law, or the first 5 books (the Pentateuch) are being solely addressed, for quite often the term “the law” is used to indicate the entire old testament.

Those who hold to the “fill the law to the full” view are quick to point out that not all things were fulfilled prophetically by Jesus; the heavens and earth are still here, ergo the context is about filling up the law. If not A, then B is the logic, without examining any other possibilities. This is commonly called “black and white thinking” and is poor Biblical scholarship. We have already seen how this does not hold up in regards to verse 17, and when we try to apply this understanding to verse 18, even greater problems arise.

If this is about filling up the law, then we have a condition here that once the law is filled up, completed, or brought up to full strength, then it passes away with the passing of heaven and earth. Does it make sense to build up the law for the purpose of doing away with it, especially in light of a belief that insists this law is eternal?

Do we run into such illogical errors when we conclude it is a matter of things prophesied to occur culminating in a new heaven and earth? Not at all. When all things foretold in the law have come to realization, then all things have been done and there is an end to those things followed by the new heavens and earth.

What then of the apparent conflict where it is claimed Jesus did not “fulfill” all prophecies that culminate with the passing of heaven and earth? It is a result of trying to connect two things that are actually separate in the context of the two verses.

Verse 17: Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

This needs to be taken in the context of that moment. Did Jesus come at that time; at that moment to fulfill all things as related

to in verse 18, or did he come at that time to fulfill what was prophesied concerning his coming then and there?

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. — Luke 24:44

Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. — Luke 18:31 Is Jesus here referring back to when he spoke the words here in Matthew 5:17? It sure looks that way.

What is so conveniently overlooked by Sabbatarians is that verse 18 compliments verse 17 from this time perspective. First, Jesus came to fulfill those things written of him in the law, prophets, and psalms. Verse 18 begins a new thought that follows this same line of reasoning concerning fulfillment of scripture. 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.

Likewise, absolutely everything written in the law culminating in the passing of this heaven and earth will also be fulfilled. Nothing will be left undone. No prophecy will go unfulfilled. Everything will be done “by the book.”

Jesus came at that time to fulfill “all things” concerning him for that time and place. Likewise, all things prophesied to occur in this age will also come to pass. After all these things have been accomplished, this heaven and earth pass away and the new age begins, starting with the new heavens and the new earth, as also prophesied. Jesus speaks from the perspective of then and there to the perspective of the future *from* then and there.

If we were to enter that time and listen to what was being said then, and take into account what the people were thinking then about Jesus and the confusion surrounding him and what he taught, we might have concluded he had come to do something contrary to the prophesies in scripture, seeing as he was not doing those things they thought and believed the coming Messiah would do regarding Israel and the kingdom restored to her. It would be like Jesus saying to us:

Don't think I am going to act contrary to what was written and prophesied concerning me and my appearing; I am going to do exactly what was written of me. Likewise, all things will be done written in the law foretold to the end of the age and time. He then continues his dissertation to the people concerning the kingdom of God (heaven) and talks about those who will be great and those who will be least, depending on how well they heed his words that followed.

This Sermon on the Mount was not about law; it was about Jesus the Messiah preaching the gospel and his coming kingdom, often couched in parables as a veil to their understanding. Those who attempt to read into the narrative their pet beliefs will surely not understand the gospel being preached even now.

Now we come to verse 19: Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Notice the context says “these” commandments and not “the” commandments. Does the context leading up to verse 19 indicate that Jesus was talking about commandments? No. Does Jesus begin referencing commandments following this verse? Yes, unless one wishes to redefine what a commandment is, as though Jesus did not proceed to give commands to those followers of his that he was addressing.

The Sabbatarian likes to conclude that Jesus was talking about Old Covenant commandments by force-fitting them into the preceding verses, and ignores that Jesus proceeds to give commandments to his followers in the context of that statement in what follows. Jesus then goes about, quoting from the law commandments in the law, and proceeds to alter points of law way beyond jots and tittles! How is this possible if he was claiming just moments before that none of the law was to be altered even down to the strokes of the letters of the law until heaven and earth had passed? But this sort of cognitive dissonance is common when holding to misinterpretations and misrepresentations of scripture.

The pattern now is one of “the law says this, but I say unto you that” where in some cases the law is totally nullified in the process. For example, performing one’s oaths. But Jesus commands that his followers swear not at all; to not make an oath to begin with. It is also stated in the law that one was to hate their enemy and love their neighbor. Jesus declares we are to love even our enemies.

The most telling of all is Jesus’ teaching on divorce. The law (this same law called “eternal” and “perfect” and not to be altered even down to the strokes of a letter) allowed a man to divorce his wife for just about any reason. What Jesus’ take on divorce was as found in the law?

The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. — Matthew 19:3-9

The law allowed for an easy divorce. It was a concession in the law because the people were carnal; devoid of God’s Spirit. So the law allowed for something that was wrong from the beginning. So much for the claim that the law existed from creation and was kept by the Patriarchs of old!

(End of the argument by William H. Hohmann cited by Sanders.)

Has Jesus altered the law beyond jots and tittles? Only a blind one would say no.

Argument: The Lord's Day is the 7th day Sabbath, because Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath.

This is one of many examples of Sabbatarians twisting the meaning of words in the Bible. The term “Lord's Day” is used one time in the Bible and it does not say it is the Sabbath. It is another assumption.

Rev. 1:10 (NIV) - On the Lord’s Day I was in the Spirit, and I heard behind me a loud voice like a trumpet.

The Sabbath is always called in the Greek *Sabbaton* or in the Hebrew *Shabbath*. Strong's: G4521 σαββατον sabbaton sab'-bat-on Of Hebrew origin [H7676]; the Sabbath (that is, Shabbath), or day of weekly repose from secular avocations (also the observance or institution itself);

The Church fathers in the first centuries called Sunday, “the Lord's Day” because Christ rose from the grave on Sunday. They choose this day as a celebration for their deliverance from sin and salvation by Christ. This tradition does not make Sunday a holy day or a Sunday Sabbath.

Argument: Worshiping on Sunday is honoring the sun god and the Papal Sabbath.

Jesus rose from the grave early on the first day of the week, Sunday. Jesus met with his disciples on the first day of the week after the resurrection. Was Jesus honoring the sun god or the Papal Sabbath? The pagans of the Roman Empire never celebrated a weekly day to the sun god. It is despicable for Sabbatarians to insinuate those that go to church on Sunday are worshiping or honoring a pagan god or the Pope of Rome. When SDA's go to prayer meeting on Wednesday evening, for example, are they worshiping the pagan god, Woden, chief god in Norse mythology? As you can see this is a ridiculous allegation to make against Christians that worship the Creator.

Editor's note: Recall that the Roman calendar utilized an 8-day week and the day named in honor of the sun was somewhere in the middle of that week. Therefore, the Roman day named in honor of the sun would only occasionally fall on the day of the 7-day week Jewish calendar that is named in honor of the sun, which was, of course, the first day of that week. Also recall that Christians were meeting on Sundays hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Roman Catholic Church and that the Gentile Christians probably never kept the Sabbath in significant numbers. Additionally, keep in mind that Mithraism, the sun worship cult in the Roman Empire, did not become developed enough within Roman society until 200-300 A. to have been a likely source of influence on Christian worship practices.

Argument: The Ten Commandments are the eternal Gospel from the beginning of the World.

If so did Adam honor his mother?

Argument: Hebrews 4 proves Christians are to keep the Sabbath.

Heb. 4:9 – Heb. 4:11 (NIV) - There remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God; for anyone who enters God's rest also rests from his own work, just as God did from his. 11Let us, therefore, make every effort to enter that rest, so that no one will fall by following their example of disobedience.

Israel had the 7th day Sabbath ritual, but they did not have the Sabbath rest in God which is of faith. "God's rest" is rest for their souls not from chopping wood, working in a factory, etc. Now God wants Christians to have the rest in him that Israel failed to enter. If we are led by the Spirit, we will enter that rest. Christ is the Christians Sabbath rest of faith and trust which we enjoy daily.

Argument: Commandments in the NT means the Ten Commandments.

SDA's use these two texts to show that "God's commandments" are the Ten Commandments. There is nothing in the texts that tell us this.

Rev. 14:12 (NIV) - This calls for patient endurance on the part of the saints who obey God's commandments and remain faithful to Jesus.

1 John 2:3-4 (NIV) - We know that we have come to know him if we obey his commands. 4 The man who says, "I know him," but does not do what he commands is a liar, and the truth is not in him.

Christians indeed keep God's commandments that God addressed to Christians. But if we are going to assume that this means old covenant commandments, then why not commandments God gave to other individuals in the Bible? God commanded one prophet to bake his bread over cow manure. It is a commandment of God. Shall we keep this commandment also?

Baking Bread over cow manure:

Ezek. 4:14 - 15 (NIV) - Then I said, "Not so, Sovereign LORD! I have never defiled myself. From my youth until now I have never eaten anything found dead or torn by wild animals. No unclean meat has ever entered my mouth." 15 Very well," he said, "I will let you bake your bread over cow manure instead of human excrement."

Jesus commanded his disciples to preach to people. Do you do this?

Mark 6:8 - 10 (NIV) - These were his instructions: "Take nothing for the journey except a staff—no bread, no bag, no money in your belts. 9Wear sandals but not an extra tunic. 10 Whenever you enter a house, stay there until you leave that town.

Jesus commanded Peter to pay their taxes by getting a coin out of the fish's mouth. Do you do this?

Matt. 17:27 – (NIV) - “But so that we may not offend them, go to the lake and throw out your line. Take the first fish you catch; open its mouth and you will find a four-drachma coin. Take it and give it to them for my tax and yours.”

Argument: The Ten Commandments point out sins.

The Ten Commandments point out sins for those the Ten were given. God would never hold anyone accountable to a covenant He did not give to them or make with them.

Argument: Rich young man was told to have eternal life he must keep the commandments.

Matt. 19:16 - 19 (NIV) - Now a man came up to Jesus and asked, “Teacher, what good thing must I do to get eternal life?” 17 “Why do you ask me about what is good?” Jesus replied. “There is only One who is good. If you want to enter life, obey the commandments.” 18 “Which ones?” the man inquired. Jesus replied, ““Do not murder, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not give false testimony, 19 honor your father and mother,’ and ‘love your neighbor as yourself.”

What Sabbatarians commonly neglect is the rest of the context that proves the claim to be false.

Matt. 19:20 - 26 (NIV) - “All these I have kept,” the young man said. “What do I still lack?” 21 Jesus answered, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me.” 22 When the young man heard this, he went away sad, because he had great wealth. 23 Then Jesus said to his disciples, “I tell you the truth, it is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. 24 Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.” 25 When the disciples heard this, they were greatly astonished and asked, “Who then can be saved?” 26 Jesus looked at them and said, “With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.”

Argument: Aren't all Christians (even SDA's) in agreement with God today that, with the help of God's Spirit, we WILL keep His Law because we LOVE Him and we WANT to keep His Law of love?

This is an assumption. The Bible never tells us that God's spirit enables anyone to keep the old covenant law.

APPENDIX II

J. N. Andrews on the *Didache*

In his 1912 book, *Advent History of the Sabbath*, Andrews provides a very complete study of the section of Chapter 14 which has been translated in such a way that it demonstrates that Christians were meeting on the first day of the week as early as 50 AD. It is understandable that, failing to understand the real problems with Sabbatarianism, he would find it necessary to somehow demonstrate that the translation of this passage is wrong. The more evidence there is that Christians were keeping Sunday during the life-time of the apostles, the more difficult it is to make Ellen White's apostasy theory of the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians seem plausible— that is, unless you consider Peter to be the first pope.

The Greek wording of this passage is incomplete, making it impossible to be 100% certain how to translate it correctly into English. However, when all the facts presented by Andrews are taken together, it is easy to understand why scholars, for the most part, stand by the anti-Sabbatarian wording of the translation in English.

The following is a Greek/English Interlinear translation of the *Didache* Section 14 dealing with Sabbath observance. The majority of translators translate it as THE LORD'S DAY, although several meanings are possible. Please note that in my text, the Greek words are not represented in Greek characters:

1 According to 'the Lord's things' - of [the] Lord: gather break bread and give thanks, confessing out

*1 kata kuriakhn de kuriou sunacqentev klasate arton kai eucaristhsate, proexomologhsameno
the failings of you, so that pure the sacrifice of you be.*

ta paraptwmata umwn, opwv kaqara h qusia umwn h.

(The above quotation is from a Greek/Interlinear translation by Wieland Willker from the critical edition of Funk/ Bihlmeyer (1924) at this address: <http://home.earthlink.net/~dybel/Documents/Didachellnr.htm>

Here are the key points Andrews makes about the translation problem:

1. Other writers, contemporary to him, used the Greek word in question to mean, the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Day, or the Lord's Life.
1. Over the next 100 years, writers came to use this Greek word almost exclusively to mean the Lord's Day.
2. John used the adjective form of this Greek word in Revelation 1:10— "on the Lord's Day." Andrews seems to suggest the passage should be translated something like, "When you come together at the Lord's Supper, break bread and give thanks." The majority of scholars believe the passage should be translated something like, "When you come together on the Lord's Day, break bread and give thanks."

In the mind of Andrews, the issue is the supposed unscriptural transfer of the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, making Sunday a man-made, rather than a God-given, ordinance. He is right about Sunday being a man-made ordinance in a sense of the word, but this fact is not relevant to the Sabbath-Sunday question at all. He knows nothing of the deliberate anti-Sabbatarian wording of Moses' wording of the account of the Creation events of the 7th day, the weekly Sabbath being a part of TORAH law only, and the absolute requirement that a Jew or Gentile must be circumcised before keeping the Sabbath. This knowledge deficit allows him to draw the illogical conclusion that since gospel writers and Justin Martyr— contemporary writers to the author(s) of the *Didache*— did not use the *Didache's* Greek word when designating the first day of the week,

the writer/writers of the *Didache* were not likely to have used it to mean The Lord's Day. Andrews articulates his point-of-view as follows:

But we have another chain of proof. All the Gospels give to Sunday its regular Bible name— first day of the week. If the *Didache* is said to be the first evidence that henceforth this Bible term was changed into *Kypuucq*, then Justin Martyr, writing soon afterward, ought to have used it. But lo and behold he uses interchangeably the Bible term, “first day of the week,” and the heathen designation, “day of the sun (p. 276).”

Justin Martyr was writing to a Jewish critic of Christians, Trypho, and would probably not risk offending his Jewish sensibilities by designating the first day of the week with this decidedly Christian term. The Gospel writers were telling the story of Jesus as it took place in His contemporary setting— before Sunday became known as the “Lord's Day.” Note that John the Revelator, writing late in the First Century, used the adjective form of the Greek word. Furthermore, it would seem to be uncharacteristic of Greek literary usage to construct a sentence that would read something like, “At the Lord's Supper, break bread and give thanks.” Andrews sums up his arguments as follows:

We are now brought down to the close of the second century, and what is the result?—According to its first use, the term applied to the Lord's Supper. John uses the same adjective in speaking of the Lord's Day. The conclusion from its use in the New Testament is, the word means the Lord's or belonging to the Lord, whatever may be referred to. Ignatius uses the very *same* preposition, the *same* case, the *same* gender, as is found in the *Didache*, to be rendered, “according to the Lord's life.” This fully sustains the first conclusion reached from the New Testament—it may be the *Lord's Supper*, the *Lord's Day*, or the *Lord's life*.

It would not make any sense to translate the passage something like, “According to the Lord's life, break bread and give thanks.”

When all the facts are considered and the Sabbatarian bias is removed from one's thinking, it is clear why scholars had little choice but to choose to translate this passage in the best possible way, and that best possible way does not support Ellen White's apostasy/conspiracy theory of why Christians “ceased” to keep the Sabbath and adopted Sunday observance during the first years of the development of the Christian Faith.

APPENDIX III

Tertullian: Was He Sabbatarian or Anti-Sabbatarian?

Since Tertullian lived and wrote shortly after Sunday observance had become universal, 160-225 AD, what he has to say about the Sabbath-Sunday question is extremely important to understanding the way the early church viewed the matter. Tertullian in his work, *Against the Jews*, clearly teaches that the Sabbath of the Decalogue did not exist at Creation and that circumcision is required as a prerequisite to Sabbath-keeping. He explains that there was natural law before the Mosaic Law; that the Mosaic Law became obsolete at the cross; and that the Christian dispensation is based on the principle that we must love God supremely and others as ourselves as taught by Jesus. In another work, *Against Marconium*, he mentions the word "Sabbath" in the context of the Sabbath Festival, which Christians observed as a celebration, and discusses whether Christians should fast on that day or should not fast on that day. There is a certain passage from *Against Marconium* that some Sabbatarians quote out of context to make him look like he later adopted Sabbatarian views.

Here we quote Tertullian from Chapter Two of *Against the Jews*. He is explaining that none of the patriarchs kept the Sabbath because the natural laws established at Creation did not provide for it:

“In short, before the Law of Moses, written in stone-tables, I contend that there was a law unwritten, which was habitually understood naturally, and by the fathers was habitually kept. For whence was Noah found righteous, if in his case the righteousness of a natural law had not preceded? Whence was Abraham accounted a friend of God, if not on the ground of equity and righteousness, (in the observance) of a natural law? Whence was Melchizedek named priest of the most high God, if, before the priesthood of the Levitical law, there were not Levites who were wont to offer sacrifices to God? For thus, after the above-mentioned patriarchs, was the Law given to Moses, at that (well-known) time after their exodus from Egypt, after the interval and spaces of four hundred years. In fact, it was after Abraham's four hundred and thirty years that the Law was given. Whence we understand that God's law was anterior even to Moses, and was not first (given) in Horeb, nor in Sinai and in the desert, but was more ancient; (existing) first in paradise, subsequently reformed for the patriarchs, and so again for the Jews, at definite periods: so that we are not to give heed to Moses' Law as to the primitive law, but as to a subsequent, which at a definite period God has set forth to the Gentiles too and, after repeatedly promising so to do through the prophets, has reformed for the better; and has premonished that it should come to pass that, just as the law was given through Moses John 1:17 at a definite time, so it should be believed to have been temporarily observed and kept.”

“And let us not annul this power which God has, which reforms the law's precepts answerably to the circumstances of the times, with a view to man's salvation. In time, let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day because of the threat of death, teach [apparently, “prove”] us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the Sabbath, or practiced circumcision, and were thus rendered friends of God. For if circumcision purges a man since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did He not circumcise him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? At all events, in settling him in paradise, He appointed one uncircumcised as colonist of paradise. Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised, and inobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering Him sacrifices, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was by Him commended; while He accepted what he was offering in simplicity of heart, and reprobated the sacrifice of his brother Cain, who was not rightly dividing what he was offering. Noah also, uncircumcised— yes, and inobservant of the Sabbath— God freed from the deluge. For Enoch, too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, He translated from this world; who did not first taste death, in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might by this time show us that we

also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God. Melchizedek also, the priest of the most high God, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was chosen to the priesthood of God. Lot, withal, the brother of Abraham, proves that it was for the merits of righteousness, without observance of the law, that he was freed from the conflagration of the Sodomites.”

The following quote is from Chapter III, entitled “Of Circumcision and the Supercession of the Old Law”, also seems to connect Sabbath-keeping with the ordinance of circumcision.”

But Abraham, (you say,) was circumcised. Yes, but he pleased God before his circumcision; **nor yet did he observe the Sabbath. For he had accepted circumcision; but such as was to be for a sign of that time, not for a prerogative title to salvation.** In fact, subsequent patriarchs were uncircumcised, like Melchizedek, who, uncircumcised, offered to Abraham himself, already circumcised, on his return from battle, bread and wine.

And from **Chapter IV**, “Of the Observance of the Sabbath,” Tertullian makes the connection between circumcision and Sabbath-keeping direct:

It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary.

Thus, it is initially astonishing when his later work (believed to be later work), *Against Marconium*, argues with this heretic that Jesus did not rescind the Sabbath when He apparently broke it.

Marconium questioned Christ's claim to divinity because, as he claimed, God would not break one of His own rules. In the following passage from *Against Marconium*, Tertullian demonstrated that while Jesus lived under the Old Covenant which He Himself has established, He was consistent in keeping His own Sabbath, even though He had every right to abolish one of His own rules if He so chose to do so. The passage is lengthy, but a study of it demonstrates the context of what he said and pulls it into harmony with everything else we know that Tertullian said about Sabbath-keeping:

Now, that we may decide these several points first, lest we should be renewing them at every turn to meet each argument of our adversary which rests on some novel institution of Christ, let this stand as a settled point, that discussion concerning the novel character of each institution ensued on this account, because as nothing was as yet advanced by Christ touching any new deity, so discussion thereon was inadmissible; nor could it be retorted, that from the very novelty of each several institution another deity was clearly enough demonstrated by Christ, inasmuch as it was plain that novelty was not in itself a characteristic to be wondered at in Christ, because it had been foretold by the Creator. And it would have been, of course, but right that a new god should first be expounded, and his discipline be introduced afterwards; because it would be the god that would impart authority to the discipline, and not the discipline to the god; except that (to be sure) it has happened that Marcion acquired his very perverse opinions not from a master, but his master from his opinion! All other points respecting the Sabbath I thus rule. If Christ interfered with the Sabbath, He simply acted after the Creator's example; inasmuch as in the siege of the city of Jericho the carrying around the walls of the ark of the covenant for eight days running, and therefore on a Sabbath day, actually annulled the Sabbath, by the Creator's command— according to the opinion of those who think this of Christ in this passage of St. Luke, in their ignorance that neither Christ nor the Creator violated the Sabbath, as we shall by and by show. And yet the Sabbath was actually then broken by Joshua, so that the present charge might be alleged also against Christ. But even if, as being not the Christ of the Jews, He displayed a hatred against the Jews' most solemn day, He was only professedly following the Creator, as being His Christ, in this very hatred of the Sabbath; for He exclaims by the mouth of Isaiah: Your new moons and your Sabbaths my soul hates. Isaiah 1:14. Now, in whatever sense these words were spoken, we know that an abrupt defense must, in a subject of this sort, be used in answer to an abrupt challenge. I shall now transfer the discussion to the very matter in which the teaching of Christ seemed to annul the Sabbath. The disciples had been hungry; on that the Sabbath day they had plucked some ears and rubbed them in their hands;

by thus preparing their food, they had violated the holy day. Christ excuses them, and became their accomplice in breaking the Sabbath. The Pharisees bring the charge against Him. Marcion sophistically interprets the stages of the controversy (if I may call in the aid of the truth of my Lord to ridicule his arts), both in the scriptural record and in Christ's purpose. For from the Creator's Scripture, and from the purpose of Christ, there is derived a colourable precedent — as from the example of David, when he went into the temple on the Sabbath, and provided food by boldly breaking up the show-bread. **Even he remembered that this privilege (I mean the dispensation from fasting) was allowed to the Sabbath from the very beginning, when the Sabbath day itself was instituted. For although the Creator had forbidden that the manna should be gathered for two days, He yet permitted it on the one occasion only of the day before the Sabbath, in order that the yesterday's provision of food might free from fasting the feast of the following Sabbath day.** Good reason, therefore, had the Lord for pursuing the same principle in the annulling of the Sabbath (since that is the word which men will use); good reason, too, for expressing the Creator's will, when He bestowed the privilege of not fasting on the Sabbath day. In short, He would have then and there put an end to the Sabbath, nay, to the Creator Himself, if He had commanded His disciples to fast on the Sabbath day, contrary to the intention of the Scripture and of the Creator's will. But because He did not directly defend His disciples, but excuses them; because He interposes human want, as if deprecating censure; because He maintains the honour of the Sabbath as a day which is to be free from gloom rather than from work; because he puts David and his companions on a level with His own disciples in their fault and their extenuation; because He is pleased to endorse the Creator's indulgence: because He is Himself good according to His example— is He therefore alien from the Creator? Then the Pharisees watch whether He would heal on the Sabbath day, Luke 6:7 that they might accuse Him— surely as a violator of the Sabbath, not as the propounder of a new god; for perhaps I might be content with insisting on all occasions on this one point, that another Christ is nowhere proclaimed. The Pharisees, however, were in utter error concerning the law of the Sabbath, not observing that its terms were conditional, when it enjoined rest from labour, making certain distinctions of labour. For when it says of the Sabbath day, In it you shall not do any work of yours, Exodus 20:16 by the word yours it restricts the prohibition to human work— which every one performs in his own employment or business— and not to divine work. Now the work of healing or preserving is not proper to man, but to God. So again, in the law it says, You shall not do any manner of work in it, Exodus 12:16 except what is to be done for any soul, that is to say, in the matter of delivering the soul; because what is God's work may be done by human agency for the salvation of the soul. By God, however, would that be done which the man Christ was to do, for He was likewise God. Wishing, therefore, to initiate them into this meaning of the law by the restoration of the withered hand, He requires, Is it lawful on the Sabbath-days to do good, or not? To save life, or to destroy it? Luke 6:9. In order that He might, while allowing that amount of work which He was about to perform for a soul, remind them what works the law of the Sabbath forbade— even human works; and what it enjoined— even divine works, which might be done for the benefit of any soul, He was called Lord of the Sabbath, Luke 6:5, because He maintained the Sabbath as His own institution. Now, even if He had annulled the Sabbath, He would have had the right to do so, as being its Lord, (and) still more as He who instituted it. But He did not utterly destroy it, although its Lord, in order that it might henceforth be plain that the Sabbath was not broken by the Creator, even at the time when the ark was carried around Jericho. For that was really God's work, which He commanded Himself, and which He had ordered for the sake of the lives of His servants when exposed to the perils of war. Now, although He has in a certain place expressed an aversion of Sabbaths, by calling them your Sabbaths, Isaiah 1:13-14, reckoning them as men's Sabbaths, not His own, because they were celebrated without the fear of God by a people full of iniquities, and loving God with the lip, not the heart, Isaiah 29:13, He has yet put His own Sabbaths (those, that is, which were kept according to His prescription) in a different position; for by the same prophet, in a later passage, He declared them to be true, and delightful, and inviolable. **Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: He kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of His**

disciples, for He indulged them with the relief of food when they were hungry, and in the present instance cured the withered hand; in each case intimating by facts, I came not to destroy, the law, but to fulfill it, Matthew 5:17, although Marcion has gagged His mouth by this word. For even in the case before us He fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition; moreover, He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath and while imparting to the Sabbath day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by His own beneficent action. For He furnished to this day divine safeguards, — a course which His adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honouring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it. Since, in like manner, the prophet Elisha on this day restored to life the dead son of the Shunammite woman, you see, O Pharisee, and you too, O Marcion, how that it was proper employment for the Creator's Sabbaths of old to do good, to save life, not to destroy it; how that Christ introduced nothing new, which was not after the example, the gentleness, the mercy, and the prediction also of the Creator. For in this very example He fulfills the prophetic announcement of a specific healing: The weak hands are strengthened, as were also the feeble knees, Isaiah 35:3, in the sick of the palsy.

In Book V, Chapter One of *Against Marconium* we find Tertullian directly discussing the abolishment of the Sabbath, quoting an Old Testament passage— perhaps paraphrasing it— in which God prophesied that He would destroy the sabbaths and the Sabbath at some time in the future. In his discussion of the abolishment of the law, Tertullian sounds very much like modern day anti-Sabbatarians. Here is just one passage:

Now, from whom comes this grace, but from Him who proclaimed the promise thereof? Who is (our) Father, but He who is also our Maker? Therefore, after such affluence (of grace), they should not have returned to weak and beggarly elements. Galatians 4:9 **By the Romans, however, the rudiments of learning are wont to be called elements.** He did not therefore seek, by any depreciation of the mundane elements, to turn them away from their god, although, when he said just before, Howbeit, then, you serve them which by nature are no gods, Galatians 4:8 he censured the error of that physical or natural superstition which holds the elements to be god; but at the God of those elements he aimed not in this censure. **He tells us himself clearly enough what he means by elements, even the rudiments of the law: You observe days, and months, and times, and years Galatians 4:10 — the sabbaths, I suppose, and the preparations, and the fasts, and the high days. For the cessation of even these, no less than of circumcision, was appointed by the Creator's decrees, who had said by Isaiah, Your new moons, and your sabbaths, and your high days I cannot bear; your fasting, and feasts, and ceremonies my soul hates; Isaiah 1:13-14 also by Amos, I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies; Amos 5:21 and again by Hosea, I will cause to cease all her mirth, and her feast-days, and her sabbaths, and her new moons, and all her solemn assemblies. Hosea 2:11 The institutions which He set up Himself, you ask, did He then destroy? Yes, rather than any other. Or if another destroyed them, he only helped on the purpose of the Creator, by removing what even He had condemned. But this is not the place to discuss the question why the Creator abolished His own laws. It is enough for us to have proved that He intended such an abolition, that so it may be affirmed that the apostle determined nothing to the prejudice of the Creator, since the abolition itself proceeds from the Creator.**

In summary, Tertullian is completely consistent in his view of the Sabbath between both his works, *Against the Jews* and *Against Marconium*. In the quote used by Sabbatarian apologists to suggest that he was inconsistent or had possibly changed his mind about the Sabbath over time, he merely demonstrated that while living under the jurisdiction of his own Mosaic Covenant, Jesus kept the spirit of His very own Sabbath law. In the chapters following this statement in question from *Against Marconium*, he reiterates his position that the Sabbath has been abolished and quotes an Old Testament passage in which God says that He will put an end to the Sabbath at some time in the future.

APPENDIX IV

D. M. CANRIGHT ON THE SUPREMACY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH

Chapter 7 from *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer To Seventh-day Adventism On This Subject.*

Chapter VII

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE ORIGINATED WITH THE EASTERN, OR GREEK CHURCH, NOT WITH ROME IN THE WEST.

This is a very important fact bearing on the Sunday question. Adventists are constantly pointing to "Rome," to the "Pope of Rome," to the "Roman Church," to the "Roman Papacy," to the "Roman Councils," and to the "Roman pagans" as the originators of Sunday observance. They publish "Rome's Challenge," "Rome's Catechism," etc. Their cause stands or falls with these claims. It is easy to show that all these assertions are groundless. The change of the day was made in the Eastern Greek Church in the time of the apostles, and was carried thence to Rome, not from Rome to the East. The proof of this is abundant.

Generally people know little about the Greek Church, hardly know that it exists. Yet it is the oldest Church and numbers now one hundred and fifty millions. Generally people suppose that Rome is the "Mother Church," which is not true. As we all know from the book of Acts, the Christian Church began in the East, in Asia, not in Rome.

It started in Jerusalem in the East; thence spread over Judea, Samaria, Asia Minor, Greece, Egypt, Damascus, and far-off Babylon on the Euphrates. Rome and the West came later.

Notice briefly; Jesus and all the apostles lived in the East, where the Greek language was spoken. Every book of the New Testament except Matthew was written in Greek. Revelation, written as late as AD. 96, is in Greek. Largely the preaching of the apostles was in Greek. The Gospel began at Jerusalem in the East (Acts 2:1-11). Notice who heard that first sermon on Pentecost: "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene and strangers from Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God."

Here were persons from far-off Parthia, Media, and Mesopotamia, away east on the Euphrates, about two thousand miles east of Rome; then come Egypt and Libya; then Arabia; then Asia Minor; then Macedonia; then Crete - all these were in the East. Only one city in the West was named as being represented at Pentecost - Rome. These first converts carried the Gospel into all these far Eastern countries. The apostles soon followed and raised up Churches there. See where Paul went - Damascus, Arabia, Antioch, Ephesus, Troas, Corinth, Philippi, Galatia - all Grecian cities. Revelation is written to the seven Churches which are in Asia, none in Rome (Rev. 1:4). Peter's first letter seems to have been from Babylon (1 Pet. 5:13).

Paul was the first minister to visit Rome. This was not till AD. 65. (See Acts 28.) Even then Paul found only a few brethren at Rome, and these were Jews (Acts 28.), but no bishop or Pope.

For three or four hundred years after Christ the Bishop of Rome had no authority even over a large share of the Churches at home in the West. Over the great Eastern Greek Churches he had none whatever. On the other hand,

for about three hundred years the Church at Rome was a Greek mission, supported and ruled over by the Greek Church, as we will soon see.

Long before Paul visited Rome great Churches of thousands had, for half a century, been established in the East, even in far-off nations outside the Roman Empire.

Notice another fact. All the first witnesses for the Lord's Day were not Romans, but Greeks living in the East. (See Chapter VI.) These were Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Dionysius, Clement, Anatolius, Origen, Eusebius, etc. Not a single one of the first witnesses for the Lord's Day was a native of Rome. This speaks volumes as to the birthplace of Sunday observance. It was born in the East, not in Rome in the West.

What the Christian world owes to the Eastern, or Greek Church, is thus stated in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," Article "Greek Church": "This Church is the oldest in Christendom, and for several centuries she was the chief bearer [missionary] of our religion. She still occupies the sacred territory of primitive Christianity, and claims most of the apostolic sees, as Jerusalem, Antioch, and the Churches founded by Paul and John in Asia Minor and Greece. All the apostles, with the exception of Peter and Paul, labored and died in the East. She produced the first Christian literature, Apologies of the Christian Faith, Refutation of Heretics, Commentaries of the Bible, Sermons, Homilies, and Ascetic Treatises. The great majority of the early Fathers, like the apostles themselves, used the Greek language. Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basle, Gregory of Nazienzen, Gregory of Nyssia, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, the first Christian emperors since Constantine the Great, together with a host of martyrs and confessors, belong to the Greek communion. She elaborated the ecumenical dogmas of the Trinity and Christology, and ruled the first seven ecumenical councils which were all held in Constantinople or its immediate neighborhood (Nicaea, Chalcedon, and Ephesus). Her palmy period during the first five centuries will ever claim the grateful respect of the whole Christian world."

Notice that the Eastern, or Greek Church, ruled the first seven general councils which were all held in the East, none of them in the West, or papal territory. The date of these seven councils was AD. 325, 381, 431, 451, 557, 680, and 787. All these were dominated by the Eastern Greek Church, not one by Rome. These take us down this side [of] the latest date Adventists fix for the change of the Sabbath.

Hence, if the Roman Church, or Pope, or Papacy changed the Sabbath, it could only have changed it in the West, for it had no authority or influence over these hundreds of great Greek Churches in the East, many of them outside of Roman rule.

The following is from the Right Rev. Bishop Raphael, head of the Greek Church in America. Few Protestants are aware of the importance and number of that great primitive Church. Read it:

"The official name of our Church is 'The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church.' It was founded in the time of the apostles and by the twelve apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone, beginning on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2). Our Church has never been subject to the Roman Church or to the Latin Popes or to the Papacy. The Roman Church herself was a Greek mission for nearly three hundred years, and the Greek language was the tongue in which the Liturgy, or Mass, was said in the City of Rome.

"The first seven General Councils, beginning with Nicaea, AD. 325, on down to 787, which were the only General Councils acknowledged alike by Eastern and Western Christendom, were all held within the domain of the four ancient Eastern Patriarchates. They were dominated by the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church. Even the Popes of Rome, as in the case of Pope Leo in the matter of the exaltation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to an equality in temporal and spiritual powers, to Rome (vide Acts of the Fourth General Council-Chalcedon), were compelled to assent, like all others, to the Decrees of the General Councils, which latter were always higher than Popes or Patriarchs.

"Rome never dominated any of the first seven General Councils; on the contrary, they dictated to her and in some cases, e. g., Pope Honorius, excommunicated and condemned Popes as heretics.

"The name 'Catholic' was common to all Orthodox Churches, Eastern or Western, Greek or Roman, for eight hundred years after Christ. Rome, in the West, exclusively assumed the name 'Catholic,' yet prefixing it by the appellation 'Roman,' by default on the part of the schismatics within her own patriarchate, in the sixteenth century; but the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church of the East has never from the first been known by any other name than 'Catholic,' nor has she set aside the title in any official document. It is her inalienable property as the Mother Church of Christendom (vide Nicene Creed, Article 9), which, without a single omission, has been from the first proclamation read in our churches. Rome and all Western Christian Churches have never denied to her the title of the 'Mother Church' nor 'Catholic.' Her Apostolicity and Catholicity have been and are acknowledged in all lands and in all ages.

"Our Church, which includes all the very first Churches founded by the apostles, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Alexandria, and even Rome, for the first three hundred years, has kept the 'first day of the week' as a day of rest and in holy remembrance of the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord from the dead. From the dawn of Christianity she bears witness that it has been the Sacred Day on which the faithful assembled for the partaking of the Lord's Supper, for the saying of public prayer, and the hearing of sermons.

"Our Holy Traditions, the Sub-Apostolic, Anti-Nicene and Sub-Nicene Fathers, as well as all of our historians, also bear testimony to this fact. Under the head of the Fourth Commandment in our Catechism, which is accepted by the whole Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church, this instruction is given. And both the Roman Church and all other Churches which regard the authority of antiquity, calling themselves Protestant, agree on this very fact, viz., that the Lord's Day (the first day of the week) has been observed from the morning of the Resurrection till this moment.

"The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church consists to-day of not only the four ancient Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, but of the great Churches of Russia, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, Montenegro, Albania, Cyprus, Mount Sinai, and the four independent Churches of Austria, etc., and here in America, under the Holy Synod of Russia, a prosperous Mission, consisting of different national Churches, which extends from the northern limits of Canada to the City of Mexico. All these Churches are equal in authority and united in Doctrine, Discipline and Worship. She is the same Church without break, in her succession of bishops, traditions and teaching, from the days of the twelve apostles, when they met in the Upper Room at Jerusalem before there was ever heard of or thought of a Pope in Rome, and when St. James, spoken of as the first Bishop of Jerusalem, presided over the council of the Apostles and Brethren, when they considered the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Faith.

"The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church has never perceptibly changed in Doctrine, Discipline or Worship since Apostolic Days, and numbers to-day about 150,000,000 members."

RAPHAEL HAWAWEENY,

Bishop of Brooklyn, and Head of the Syrian Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Mission in America
March 30, 1914

Their catechism is very plain on this point. The Longer Catechism of the Greek Church says:

"Is the Sabbath kept in the Eastern Church?"

"It is not kept strictly speaking.

"How does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment?"

"She still every six days keeps the seventh, only not the last day of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the day of the Resurrection, or Lord's Day.

"Since when do we keep the day of the Resurrection?"

"From the very time of Christ's Resurrection."

The catechisms of a Church are the very best authority as to what that Church believes. Here are the Churches raised up by the apostles themselves and have continued this ever since. They have always kept Sunday. Here is a clear and emphatic testimony from the highest authority in that great Eastern Church. All her historians, bishops, councils, catechisms, and traditions agree in witnessing to the observance of the Lord's Day from the very beginning of the Church. This is not a mere theory, but an actual historical fact witnessed to today by one hundred and fifty million members. And all outside history confirms this.

All the first writers to defend the faith against both pagans and heretics were members of this early Eastern Church. None were Romans. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity now held in common by the Greek, the Roman, and Protestant Churches were first formulated and settled by the Eastern Church, not by the Roman Church. Her great scholars and teachers, her Christian literature, her preachers, and world-wide influence, far exceeded that of Rome and the West for over six hundred years. Rev. A. H. Lewis, Seventh-Day Baptist, admits that the Greek Church was the Mother Church.

He says: " In the changes of the first four centuries after Christ, the Eastern Church, which was really the Mother Church, and the home of primitive Christianity, was kept unaffected by way of influence which started the strong current of empire westward by way of Rome. But the truth is that a very large factor of church history is the Eastern current, and especially so in regard to the earliest ideas and practices, that of the Apostolic Period." (Sabbath and Sunday, pp. 220, 221)

This is true, and is an important concession from a Sabbatarian confirming the above from Bishop Raphael. Justin Martyr states in explicit language that as early at least as AD. 140 that Mother Church was keeping Sunday. (See previous chapter.) How then could Rome, two hundred years later, introduce Sunday to this old Church? How could Sunday originate with the pagan Romans in the time of Constantine, AD. 321?

It was her apostles and consecrated missionaries who carried the Gospel to Rome and the West and Christianized them. It was not Rome and the West that taught the East. It was exactly the other way. Specially was this true of the observance of the Lord's Day. It was carried from the East to the West, from the Greeks to the Romans. It was not pagan Romans, as Adventists say, who introduced the keeping of the Lord's Day to the great Eastern Church, but it was the Eastern Church that carried that day West and taught the converted pagans to observe it.

The following is from "The Historians of the History of the World," Article "Papacy," Vol. VIII, p. 520: "But the history of Latin Christianity was not begun for some considerable (it cannot but be indefinable) part of the first three centuries. The Church of Rome, and most, if not all, the Churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their Scriptures Greek, and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual, their liturgy, was Greek. Through Greek the connection of the Churches of Rome and the West was constantly kept up with the East."

The "Britannica," Article "Papacy," says that the Church at Rome was not founded till AD. 41-54. Then it says of the fourth century: "The Roman Church, having ceased to know the Greek language, found itself practically excluded from the world of Greek Christianity." "During the fourth century it is to be noticed that, generally speaking, the Roman Church played a comparatively insignificant part in the West."

These historical facts show that Rome for centuries was taught and ruled by the Eastern Greek Church, not the East by Rome. The following is from the noted scholar, the late Dean Stanley, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford, in his "History of the Eastern Church." It is of the highest authority. He says: "By whatever name we call it 'Eastern,' 'Greek,' or 'Orthodox' - it carries us back, more than any other existing institution, to the earliest scenes and times of the Christian religion." (Lecture 7. p. 56)

"Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, are centers of local interest which none can see or study without emotion, and the Churches which have sprung up in those regions retain the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out everywhere else" (page 57). Again Stanley says: "We know, and it is enough to know, that the Gospel, the original Gospel, which came from the East, now rules in the West" (page 95). The Church in far-off Eastern Asia, Chaldea, the home of Abraham," was the earliest of all Christian missions-

the mission of Thaddeus to Agbarus" (page 58). A delegate from that Church came to the Council of Nice, AD. 325.

"The early Roman Church was but a colony of Greek Christians or Grecized Jews. The earliest Fathers in the Western Church, Clement, Ireneus, Hermas, Hippolytus, wrote in Greek. The early Popes were not Italians, but Greeks" (page 65).

Consider carefully these facts. It was the Eastern Greek Church which sent missionaries to Rome, founded that Church, furnished it her teachers and supported it as a mission for centuries. For over two hundred years the observance of the Lord's Day was fully and universally established among all the thousands of the old Eastern Churches before the Church at Rome in the West ceased to be taught and supported as a Greek mission. Read the previous chapter. This shows that Sunday-keeping went from the East to the West, not from Rome to the East. Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and others show that the Greek Churches were all observing the resurrection day in the first part of the second century when they were yet sending teachers and pastors to Rome. Would not these carry their home custom there and teach it to the Roman Church? Certainly, and that is the reason why the West and the East were always agreed about keeping the same day, the Lord's Day. Did that "mission" force on all the old, long established, powerful Eastern Churches a Western Roman pagan day of worship, and that without a word of protest from these Apostolic Churches? Candid men will not accept such an unreasonable assertion.

Again I quote from Dean Stanley. "She [the Eastern Church] is the mother, and Rome the daughter" (page 66)." All the first founders of theology were Easterners. Till the time of Augustine (355-430) no divine had arisen in the West; till the time of Gregory the Great (596-604) none had filled the papal chair. The doctrine of Athanasius [the Trinity] was received, not originated, by Rome" (pages 71, 72). This indicates how dependent Rome was for centuries on the East and how far behind the East Rome was in learning and influence.

Again: "There can be no doubt that the civilization of the Eastern Church was far higher than that of the Western" (page 76). "The whole force and learning of early Christianity was in the East. A general council in the West would have been an absurdity. With the exception of the few writers of North Africa, there were no Latin defenders of the faith" (page 100). For over four hundred years the East was the mother, the missionary, the teacher, the leader, the ruler, while the West was the child, the mission, the taught, the led, the one to receive, not give. With the rest of the Gospel the East brought the Lord's Day to Rome and taught it to the less educated Roman.

Here is a notable fact: While the Jewish Christians, and perhaps a few Gentiles living among them, continued for a while to keep the Jewish Sabbath, all Christians, Jews or Gentiles, without a single exception, kept the Lord's Day. Not one single Church in all the early history of the Church has ever been found which did not hold their assemblies on Sunday. Let Adventists name one if they can. They never have, and never can. Another notable fact is: While there was some dispute with a few about the Sabbath, there is not the slightest hint of any dispute among the widely scattered and differing sects of Christians about the Lord's Day. Only one reason can be given for this; namely, the custom of keeping the resurrection day must have begun at the very first with the apostles and was universally accepted by all from the beginning.

Starting out from Jerusalem after Pentecost, the apostles and teachers went everywhere carrying the practice of the Mother Church to all nations.

"The Lord's Day," Rev. 1:10, was thus accepted by all, Rome with the rest. Here is another great fact. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others wrote extensively against all heresies, but not one ever mentioned Sunday observance as a heresy, though it was often mentioned incidentally as a well-known existing Christian practice.

The "Advent History of the Sabbath," edition of 1912, makes this confession: "Although Ireneus writes five books against the heresies, it is rather strange that he himself nowhere alludes to Sunday" (page 334). If the Lord's Day had been a heresy lately introduced from the pagan Romans, he certainly would have named it. His silence is proof that Sunday was not a heretical, pagan institution, for he wrote against all that. Weigh this fact well.

SUMMARY

1. The Eastern Greek Church was first, the Roman Church second and later.

2. The Eastern Church was the mother, the Roman Church the daughter.
3. Christianity went from East to West, not from West to East.
4. The Greek Church was for three hundred years the Missionary Church, while Rome was only the Mission Church.
5. The Greek Church for centuries sent teachers to teach Rome, while Rome never sent teachers to teach the Greek Church.
6. For three hundred years all the great scholars, writers, preachers, leaders, and defenders of the Christian faith were Eastern Greeks, none Western Romans.
7. For six hundred years the learning and scholarship of the Christian Church was in the East, not in the West.
8. For three hundred years the Greek Church furnished the liturgy for the Roman Church.
9. The early Bishops of Rome were Greeks, not Romans.
10. For over five hundred years the Eastern Greek Church far outnumbered the Western, or Roman, Church.
11. For the first eight hundred years all the general councils were held in the East, in Greek territory, were ruled by the Greeks. None by Rome. Rome had to accept these decrees though these councils never recognized the supremacy of the Papacy, but condemned one of the Popes.
12. The Eastern Church has from first to last always opposed and denounced the Papacy of Rome.
13. No Papacy or papal rule has ever had any place in the Eastern Church.
14. The Eastern Greek Church has never accepted a single dogma, doctrine, or practice from the Roman Church-not one. Note this fact.
15. The Eastern Church at the Council of Nice, AD. 325, formulated the creed of Christendom which Rome accepted at her hands.
16. Rome never claims to have taught Sunday-keeping to the Eastern Church, though she always claims everything possible.
17. All the thousands of Eastern Churches, composed of millions of Christians, scattered through all nations as far East as India, had been for centuries settled and established in their religious customs before the date when Adventists say Rome introduced Sunday observance from the pagan Romans into the Roman Church.
18. In all church history there is not the remotest reference to any dispute between the Roman Church and the Greek Church about keeping Sunday.
19. The histories, the catechisms, the teaching of her bishops, and her traditions, all agree in teaching in the most positive terms that the Eastern Greek Church has always kept the Lord's Day from the days of the apostles.
20. The Eastern Church strongly asserts that she has kept the Lord's Day from the very beginning.
21. Her catechisms, her historians, and her traditions all confirm this.
22. There is no record of any period in all her history when she did not observe the Lord's Day. Adventist, find it if you can.
23. There is no record showing, or intimating, that she ever received Sunday from Rome or the West.

24. There is no record of any period this side of the apostles when she began keeping the Lord's Day.
25. Justin Martyr, a Greek Christian, a Church Father of the Eastern Church, two hundred years before the date of Constantine's Sunday law, gives a full detailed account of the observance of Sunday by his brother Christians of the Eastern Church.
26. Eusebius, the first church historian, an Eastern Greek bishop of Palestine, before Constantine's law was issued, says, "We have transferred to the Lord's Day all the duties of the Sabbath" (page 153 of this work).
27. The Greek Church, which gave us the Lord's Day, also gave us our New Testament Scriptures long before Rome had any Scriptures in her own tongue.
28. It was the Greek Church which, through her early scholars and councils, gave to all Christendom, Rome included, our canon of inspired New Testament books.
29. The Eastern Church has always jealously held to her own custom against all efforts of Rome to change them.
30. The Roman Catholic Church always teaches that the "Holy Catholic Church" changed the Sabbath in the days of the apostles. (See Chapter IV.) But there was no Roman Pope or Papacy in existence at that time. Even Adventists will admit this. So Rome bears witness that the day was changed in the East, not at Rome. Mark well this fact.
31. With all these notorious facts before us, it is absurd to say that Rome changed the Sabbath, originated the observance of the Lord's Day, and handed it over to the old Eastern Church and then to all Christendom. Such a theory is an utter perversion of all the plainest facts of the history and traditions of the Christian Church.

In the matter of the observance of the Lord's Day, we are not dealing with a mere theory as in the question of election, fore-ordination, falling from grace, condition of the dead, etc., but with an actual condition, with historical facts.

Today there are said to be two hundred and fifty million Roman Catholics, one hundred and fifty million Greek Catholics, one hundred and fifty million Protestants, all agreeing in reverencing the Lord's Day, all agreeing that it originated with the apostles. In proof of this all appeal to their present practice, to their entire church history in the past, to all their traditions of their Churches, and to their catechisms. If all this is to be ignored as of no weight, then all the experience and history of all the world is worthless.

FIVE MONUMENTAL WITNESSES OF ALL CHRISTENDOM

Today we have with us, the world over, five monumental witnesses to the life of Christ, all mentioned in the New Testament.

1. The Church. "I will build My Church" (Matt. 16:18).
2. The New Testament Scriptures. "What thou seest write in a book " (Rev. 1:11).
3. Baptism. "Go baptizing them" (Matt. 28:19).
4. The Lord's Supper. "Eat the Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. 11:19).
5. The Lord's Day. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day " (Rev. 1:10).

Today all Christendom has all five of these in some form; all have come down hand-in-hand together, and one is as old as the other, and each has always been held as sacred as the other, and all have been equally blessed of God.

The Lord's Day is older than some of the New Testament books, its early beginning is better and more clearly attested than most of the New Testament books, especially Hebrews and Revelation.

THE EASTER CONTROVERSY

This question furnishes strong proof that the Lord's Day originated with the beginning of the Church itself, and was universally observed by all Christians from the very first. Of this controversy Dean Stanley says: "It was the most ancient controversy in the Church." (History of the Eastern Church, p. 173) It began immediately after the death of the apostles. The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, Article "Easter," says: "In the early Church there was no uniformity in the day observed." Some Churches celebrated it on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, the day of the Passover, no matter what day of the week it came on. The Churches of Syria, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, and Asia Minor followed this date. Others celebrated it on the day of the Resurrection, no matter what day of the month it came on. The Eastern Churches of Egypt, Greece, Palestine, Pontus, and the Church of Rome followed this custom. This shows that the apostles felt that it was a matter of indifference and had left no definite instruction about it.

The above named Encyclopedia says: "In the second century this difference was the occasion of a protracted controversy which agitated all Christendom." In AD 154 Polycarp visited Rome and tried to reach an agreement but failed. In 197, Victor, Bishop of Rome, threatened to excommunicate those who held to Nisan 15th, but no one obeyed him. Even the Churches in the West paid no regard to his order, while the Eastern Churches condemned and defied him. This shows how little influence the Bishop of Rome had at that date. This controversy continued to divide and agitate the Church till it was settled by the Council of Nice AD. 325. The council says: "It has been determined by common consent," indicating that it was not a matter of vital importance either way.

Remember that this question was settled by the Eastern Church, not by Rome, for this council was entirely dominated by the East.

Now notice: This simple question as to whether Easter was to be celebrated on a certain day of the month, or on a certain day of the week, divided all Christendom in a hot debate for nearly three hundred years, yet it pertained to only one day in the whole year! Nor did it pertain to more than a few hours' service even in that one day. Now compare this with the question of the Lord's Day. This came every week during the entire year, fifty-two days, and it embraced the whole day, twenty-four hours every week, yet during all these three hundred years of the early Church there was not one word of division over the observance of the Lord's Day. The question never came up for discussion as to any difference between any parts of the Church, East or West, North or South, Greece or Rome. During the entire Easter controversy the Lord's Day was often mentioned, but only incidentally as an institution well known to all and equally regarded by all, East or West. This uniformity could not have been obtained unless all the apostles had agreed in it and had established it at the very beginning of the Church so that there was no question about it later. Opponents of the Lord's Day have never been able to satisfactorily answer this.

Further, while there were some still who kept the Jewish Sabbath for a while, all these invariably kept the Lord's Day. No exception to this can be found whether orthodox or heretic. All observe the Lord's Day. Even Sabbatarians are compelled to admit this.

Elder Andrews says: "Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's Day." (Testimony of the Fathers, p. 11)

Yes, while some did, for a while, keep the Sabbath, yet even they, in every instance, also kept the Lord's Day.

"I have read this chapter and find it correct. - BISHOP RAPHAEL."

Bishop Raphael was educated in three seminaries: Damascus, Constantinople, and Kiev, Russia. He has twice received the degree of "Doctor of Divinity." He is the head of the Greek Orthodox Church in America. Hence, he is well qualified to state correctly the position of the Eastern Church on this question.

APPENDIX V

The 10 Commandments In The New Testament

Researched by Robert K. Sanders

The term "Ten Commandments" is not used in the entire NT. In the gospels whenever "law" is mentioned it obviously would include the Ten.

A search in all the NT for "law" in the NIV and there are 198 listed, and in the NRSV there 159 matches. The KJV gives 156 matches.

However the Sabbath and adultery from the Ten is mentioned in connection with the "teachers of the law".

Luke 6:6 - 8 (NIV) On another Sabbath he went into the synagogue and was teaching, and a man was there whose right hand was shriveled. The Pharisees and the teachers of the law were looking for a reason to accuse Jesus, so they watched him closely to see if he would heal on the Sabbath. But Jesus knew what they were thinking and said to the man with the shriveled hand, "Get up and stand in front of everyone." So he got up and stood there.

Luke 14:3 - 4 (NIV) Jesus asked the Pharisees and experts in the law, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath or not?" But they remained silent. So taking hold of the man, he healed him and sent him away.

John 8:3 - 4 (NIV) The teachers of the law and the Pharisees brought in a woman caught in adultery. They made her stand before the group and said to Jesus, "Teacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery.

Paul is showing those that brag about keeping the law then he lists some from the Ten that they break.

Rom. 2:17 - 24 (NIV) Now you, if you call yourself a Jew; if you rely on the law and brag about your relationship to God; if you know his will and approve of what is superior because you are instructed by the law; if you are convinced that you are a guide for the blind, a light for those who are in the dark, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of infants, because you have in the law the embodiment of knowledge and truth— you, then, who teach others, do you not teach yourself? You who preach against stealing, do you steal? You who say that people should not commit adultery, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples? You who brag about the law, do you dishonor God by breaking the law? As it is written: "God's name is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you."

Connecting the law with one point in the Ten, coveting.

Rom 7:7-10 (NIV) What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? Certainly not! Indeed I would not have known what sin was except through the law. For I would not have known what coveting really was if the law had not said, "Do not covet." But sin, seizing the opportunity afforded by the commandment, produced in me every kind of covetous desire. For apart

from law, sin is dead. Once I was alive apart from law; but when the commandment came, sin sprang to life and I died. I found that the very commandment that was intended to bring life actually brought death.

Love fulfills the Law which includes the Ten.

Rom 13:8-10 (NIV) Let no debt remain outstanding, except the continuing debt to love one another, for he who loves his fellowman has fulfilled the law. The commandments, “Do not commit adultery,” “Do not murder,” “Do not steal,” “Do not covet,” and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Love does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

The Ten is connected to keeping "the whole law".

James 2:10 - 11 (NIV) For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it. For he who said, “Do not commit adultery,” also said, “Do not murder.” If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker.”

APPENDIX VI

CHRISTIANS WORKING ON SABBATHS: UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

by William H. Hohmann

Jesus made an interesting statement to the religious leaders of His time in regards to the Sabbath.

He asked them if it was a sin to do good on the Sabbath; a good work, versus doing evil. The answer should be obvious. However, if any of us were to ask the same question, we might find ourselves being accused of asking a loaded question.

When the Sabbath was instituted with Israel, in Leviticus chapter 23, it was defined as being a “holy convocation” in relation to being or remaining in one’s dwelling on that day. During the duration of that day, the Israelite was perceived as being in the presence of God, and commanded to refrain from doing “any” work on that day. That day was to be a day of complete rest from work. The Israelite was not to be doing any work while perceived to be in the presence of God on that day.

When Adam and Eve sinned against God, they were cast out of the Garden of Eden and out of the presence of God. God does not allow sinful beings to be in His presence. One who sins is cut off from God, and spiritually dead – separated from God (Colossians 2:13; Isaiah 59:2).

When Christ took on the sins of the world, and Christ was hanging on the cross, He called out, “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?” which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Mark 15:34b)

God wants it understood that sin cannot abide in the presence of God.

Jesus stated that it was not a sin to do good on the Sabbath. The people had been taught that it was perfectly alright to pull an animal out of a pit on the sabbath, or to take an animal out to feed or drink, even though these things were defined as work.

And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: And, behold, there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. —Matthew 12:9-14

And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath. And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day. The Lord then answered him, and said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham,

whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him. —Luke 13:10-17

And the scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy it? And looking round about upon them all, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored whole as the other. And they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus. —Luke 6:7-11

Jesus makes it plain that it is not a sin to do good on the Sabbath. These religious leaders were “filled with madness” over Christ's interpretation of the Sabbath and work. The hardness of their hearts blinded them to this truth; this spiritual truth.

And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. *And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts,* he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him. —Mark 3:1-6

Sabbath keepers insist the Sabbath, due to its association with the other 9 commandments of the “Ten”, is a “moral” law, even though it can be demonstrated how Jesus treated the Sabbath in association with “ceremonial” laws. But what needs to be examined carefully is that the Ten Commandments are not “moral” laws per se, but rather laws that deal with man's *immorality*. If, for example, you refrain from committing adultery today, this does not prove you to be a moral person. If you refrain from murder today, or tomorrow, or never commit a murder, this too does not prove you to be a moral person. Have you ever thought about committing adultery with another woman (assuming you are a married man)? Have you ever hated another person? Have you ever desired anything belonging to another? Your heart condemns you, regardless of whether you have broken the letter of the law here or not.

Man's works, devoid of God and His sphere of influence, are seen by God as evil.

And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, *that they are wrought in God.* —John 3:19-21

But the one doing truth comes to the light, in order that his works may become-visible — *that they have been worked in God.* —John 3:21, Transline Translation

In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. For this is the

message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous. —1 John 3:10-12

Then came the word of the LORD unto Jeremiah, saying, Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me? Therefore thus saith the LORD; Behold, I will give this city into the hand of the Chaldeans, and into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, and he shall take it: And the Chaldeans, that fight against this city, shall come and set fire on this city, and burn it with the houses, upon whose roofs they have offered incense unto Baal, and poured out drink offerings unto other gods, to provoke me to anger. *For the children of Israel and the children of Judah have only done evil before me from their youth: for the children of Israel have only provoked me to anger with the work of their hands, saith the LORD.* For this city hath been to me as a provocation of mine anger and of my fury from the day that they built it even unto this day; that I should remove it from before my face, Because of all the evil of the children of Israel and of the children of Judah, which they have done to provoke me to anger, they, their kings, their princes, their priests, and their prophets, and the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And they have turned unto me the back, and not the face: though I taught them, rising up early and teaching them, yet they have not hearkened to receive instruction. But they set their abominations in the house, which is called by my name, to defile it. And they built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin. —Jeremiah 32:26-35

The Sabbath keeper looks at the Sabbath and insists it is a “moral” law and that we are commanded to rest on that day; that it is immoral to work on that day, but somehow, not “immoral” to work on the other days of the week. When it comes to what is called a “moral” law, there can never be an excuse for transgressing it. It is never excusable to murder, commit adultery, or bear false witness. This cannot be claimed for the Sabbath commandment.

God looks at the Sabbath in the context of being commanded of Israel, where the Israelites were to rest on the Sabbath because it was a holy convocation, with them seen or perceived as being in the presence of God on that day, and that they could not therefore be performing their evil works before Him. They could do “good” acts on that day; works that were merciful or acts of kindness for the benefit of animals, for example, and Jesus points out that a human being is of greater value than an animal. The Israelites seemed to have had no problem being compassionate to their animals, and seeing to their needs on the Sabbath, but due to the hardness of their hearts, they could not be compassionate regarding their fellow man in their hearts. Hence, their “works” were evil, even as Cain's works and sacrifices were evil, seeing as he hated his brother.

Jesus made it clear to the people of His time that if one had an issue with his brother, he was to postpone any offerings at the Temple, reconcile with his brother first, then give his offering. Else, he was wasting his time, seeing as God was not going to accept him and his offering.

In the theology of the New Covenant, Paul points out that love “fulfills” the law; all of it, including the Sabbath:

Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy

neighbour as thyself. *Love worketh no ill to his neighbour.* therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. —Romans 13:8-10

Jesus healed a man who was lame for 38 years, and as usual, does this on a Sabbath, escalating the conflict between himself and the religious leaders of the time who were big on the law and sabbath. The narrative is found in John chapter 5. From verse 16 we read:

And for this reason, the Jews were persecuting Jesus – because He was doing these *things* on a Sabbath. But Jesus answered them, “My Father is working until now, and I am working.” Therefore, for this reason the Jews were seeking more to kill Him– because He was not only breaking the Sabbath but He was also calling God *His* own Father, making Himself equal *to* God! —John 5:16-18, Transline Translation

Sabbatarians are quick to claim that Jesus didn't really break the Sabbath, but that John was writing from the perspective of the Jews.

This claim is typical of Sabbatarians who are quick to defend the Sabbath, resorting to any conceivable explanation in order to preserve the Sabbath and prevent the appearance of Jesus sinning, for in the eyes of the Sabbatarian, “sin is the transgression of the law” citing I John 3:4 which is actually a mistranslation and a misinterpretation of the Greek¹. The KJV proffers this interpretive translation into English as such, following the translation of the earlier Geneva Bible. No modern English Bible makes this translation, as such a translation does not follow the meaning of the Greek.

What is important to understand is that the Greek word used here in John 5:18, translated “breaking” is the Greek word “elyon” or “eluen”, rendering the understanding of Jesus having “loosed” the Sabbath command; having nullified its authority. The Sabbath command was not relevant to works done from a righteous perspective, where one does good, and not evil works, selfish in nature, devoid of God's involvement in one's life. With this understanding of the Greek, it can hardly be claimed that John was writing what he did from the perspective of the Jews, for the Jews did indeed believe Jesus was breaking the law, and would never claim or admit that Jesus had the right to “dismiss” or nullify the Sabbath command! Yet even Sabbatarians are quick to point out that Jesus is the “Lord of the Sabbath!”

Jesus did not transgress the Sabbath law like a man would; He nullified it. He rendered it irrelevant. He set it aside. He showed that it truly was *not* a sin to do *good* on the Sabbath, when one's works are in unison with God's will and His influence in one's life.

Jesus even went out of His way to call what He did on Sabbaths, healing people, “work.” Note again the citation above, where Jesus says, in relation to the Sabbath, that He works, and that even the Father in Heaven works.

Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee? Jesus answered and said unto them, *I have done one work*, and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; *are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day?* Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment. —John 7:19-24

Jesus here again refers to His healing on the Sabbath, “work.” He also tells us several other important things. These religious leaders and people who were big on the law and Sabbath didn't really keep that law. This makes them hypocrites. Jesus also points out that circumcision was more important than Sabbath keeping, and that circumcision takes precedence over the Sabbath. Why then don't Sabbatarians insist on practicing circumcision? It's too easily demonstrated as not required of Christians, whereas it is easier to obfuscate the facts and evidence when it comes to the Sabbath.

Finally, Jesus states that one should not judge according to appearance, but to judge righteous judgment. Yet judging Christians and Christianity regarding the Sabbath is all about appearance, for not even the Sabbatarian truly keeps the Sabbath, any more than those hypocrites of Jesus' time kept the law, given to them, according to Christ, by Moses, and not God. Moses was the moderator of that covenant, whereas Jesus was the moderator of the New Covenant, and it was His blood spilled, and not that of substitute animals.

When we read the next verse after I John 3:4 it says: “*And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.*”

So since that's the case, we are no longer seen as committing lawlessness, wickedness, etc.

The works of the law are dead works and can never bring life.

Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. – Galatians 3:21

Christianity is not about “keeping” the old covenant law of the letter, where one was commanded to rest on the Sabbath. Resting was just part of the issue. One sinned by *working* on that day; works that were *not* good in the sight of God.

Christianity is about “fulfilling” the law through love, and the apostle declares, as cited above, that this includes all the commandments, including the Sabbath commandment. Why? How? Because our works are pleasing to God, for God is involved in our lives. Christian works are good works *every* day, even on the Sabbath, even as Christ did. A Christian, in possession of the Holy Spirit, is in the presence of God always, and a Christian's works are not seen by God as being evil works. Our works are our fruit. Our works are a reflection of who and what we are: Christians.

How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? — Heb 9:14

As Sabbatharians are fond of saying, “shouldn't we be following Christ and His example?”

Let us understand. The Sabbath served a purpose and function in relation to the children of Israel:

It was a day of rest from labor; something they did not have while captive in Egypt.

It was a memorial of God and the Creation Week, where God rested from His work of Creation.

It was a memorial of God liberating them from the bondage of Egypt where there was no rest.

It was a shadow of Christ (Col. 2:16-17) that looked forward to the spiritual rest found in Christ, also known as “God's rest” (sabbatismos) in Hebrews chapter 4.

It served as a means of separating Israel from the pagan nations around them, as did other laws unique to the old covenant.

It was a holy convocation in relation to remaining in one's dwelling on that day, one being in the presence of God on that day.

It was the sign between God and the Israelites in relation to that old covenant between them.

Now, in the Christian dispensation, a number of things have changed.

There is to be no separation between Jew and Gentile in the Gospel. The barriers in the law that previously separated the two previously disparate groups were removed – done away with. The old covenant came to an end, terminated by the death of Christ, who was the God of the old covenant Incarnate. Paul explains this in Romans chapter 7 using a marriage covenant as an example.

God's rest (sabbatismos) that could only be entered into through faith, of which the weekly Sabbath (sabbaton) was merely a shadow of, is entered into by Christian believers, both Jew and Gentile. There is a "rest" from labors that were previously futile and indeed sinful, seeing as the previous life was and is viewed by God as a sinful life, devoid of God and His Influence in one's life.

The Christian is now always in the presence of God, and the works of a Christian are not evil. The Christian has been "purged" of dead works as cited above. A Christian's works are pleasing to God, and in accordance with His Will. The fruits of a Christian are manifested in the works of a Christian.

What then is the implication of the Sabbatarian who insists we must rest from work on the Sabbath? It is a declaration by the Sabbatarian that a Christian's works are sin after all, if done on a Sabbath.

Is there a conflict here? Absolutely! It is a good example of trying to force the new wine into that old wineskin. It is a case of Sabbatarians declaring that good is evil, and evil is good.

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! – Isaiah 5:20

A Christian has abandoned the darkness of the world, and entered into the light of the Gospel. He or she is a new creation. Even still, the Sabbatarian seeks to force-fit the Christian back into the old covenant, and back into darkness.

The devil could not possibly be more pleased. A Christian's good works in the sight of God are declared sin by Sabbatarians if performed on the Sabbath. The works of a Christian, wrought in God, are stifled. What God has declared as good the Sabbatarian has declared to be sin and evil.

They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. – Titus 1:16

The Sabbatarian declares the good works of a Christian sin when done on a Sabbath. They deny God when it comes to Christian works when done on a Sabbath. It is they who are disobedient to the faith while claiming to be obedient to the law.

The Christian is brought back under the old covenant where there is condemnation for transgressing it, and all transgressed that law. The "fruit" of that law is death, and not life, as attested to by Paul:

For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. – Romans 7:5

And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. – Romans 7:10-11

¹ I Jn 3:4: "its use here so soon after the references to the antichrists may be significant. The writer probably intended it to be a strongly pejorative description of sin. It seems likely, in view of I John 3:7, that the antichrists had a softened view of sin which John wished to refute." (Excerpted from *The Bible Knowledge Commentary* on I Jn. 3:4)

APPENDIX VII

Ellen White's Quinine Teachings Kill Missionaries

ELLEN WHITE'S TESTIMONY AGAINST THE USE OF QUININE

"Mercury, calomel, and quinine have brought their amount of wretchedness, which the day of God alone will fully reveal." *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. 4A, p. 139.

WILLIE C. WHITE'S CONCESSION THAT HIS MOTHER KILLED MISSIONARIES

"One time while we were in Australia, a brother who had been acting as a missionary in the islands, told mother of the sickness and death of his first-born son. He was seriously afflicted with Malaria, and his father was advised to give him quinine, but in view of the counsel in the testimonies to avoid the use of quinine he refused to administer it, and his son died." (W. C. White letter, September 10, 1935)

DR. GREGORY HUNT'S RESEARCH

A row of graves in Africa mark the site of the first SDA missionaries. They were told by authorities to take quinine, but as Adventists they got their marching orders from a higher source. They knew that quinine was valueless: they trusted Mrs. White that she had been shown this by God, and as a result they died."

--Gregory Hunt, M.D., *Beware this Cult*, Chapter 4, "Ellen White and Medicine", 1981.

APPENDIX VIII

CANRIGHT: NO WEEKLY HEATHEN WORSHIP OR REST DAYS

CHAPTER 5 FROM *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics nor Pagans*

CHAPTER FIVE THE PAGAN ROMANS AND GREEKS HAD NO WEEKLY DAY OF REST, OR FESTIVAL, OR WORSHIP.

One of the chief arguments which Seventh-Day Adventists make against Sunday observance is this: They say that the pagan nations, especially the Romans, regarded Sunday as a holiday, or festival day: a day of worship of their heathen gods, particularly the sun, on every Sunday, hence Sun-day. When these pagans professed Christianity they gradually brought into the Church this pagan custom of a Sunday festival day. Then the apostate Roman Church adopted it from these heathens. So now we are keeping a pagan, papal day, hateful to God. Their literature against Sunday-keeping is largely based on this theory as fundamental. Their "History of the Sabbath " is saturated with this argument. It bristles in their tracts, pamphlets, books, and sermons everywhere and all the time. Their children and members believe it as firmly as they believe the Bible. Hence, they abominate Sunday observance and delight in showing contempt for it in every possible way. If they are wrong here the very bottom drops out of their anti-Sunday arguments.

Read a few of their assertions. Elder J. H. Waggoner says: "I only take it upon me to fully and clearly show that the Sunday has its origin as a day of regard and observance in paganism and the Papacy."

"I shall show that the authority, the name and the sacredness of Sunday are entirely of pagan origin." "Sunday is in every feature a heathen institution." (Replies to Canright, pp. 125, 126,133) Also "History of the Sabbath," 1912, page 315: "Sunday was indeed the wild solar holiday of all pagan times."

Scores of such statements are found in their works. By these assertions they frighten the common people into giving up Sunday, because they are not able to answer them. All such statements are absolutely untrue as the following evidence will abundantly prove.

I do not accuse the brethren of any intent to deceive in this matter. Till nearly the last years I was with them, I myself taught the same thing. This they now quote against me. I did not mean to be untruthful, but, without personal investigation for myself, simply followed our older authors. I know that the other ministers did the same, and their ministers and writers do the same now. Their quotations on this subject in their recent publications easily prove that. It is not intentional dishonesty, but a lack of a candid investigation of historical facts as they really are.

In my city there is a great Public Library, of 146,000 volumes, containing all up-to-date publications available. Each department has a clerk who will quickly bring any book or article on any subject wanted. Here I have found much contained in these pages. An editorial in a leading daily says:

"One of the outstanding features of modern life is the fact that specialized knowledge is always on tap for inquiring minds. The first fruits of research may be procured at any up-to-date and extensive library, such as the one which Grand Rapids is fortunate enough to possess."

Knowing that our great state and national institutions of learning maintain specialists in every line of knowledge, I decided to apply to them for information on this subject. These learned scholars would have no inducement to be one-sided or unfair. These specialists have every possible means of information at hand and devote a lifetime of study to their particular branch of knowledge. It is their business to furnish to inquirers the results of their research. Hence I drew up a list of questions fully covering every possible phase of this subject, as will be seen. I carefully avoided giving any intimation of my views, or of the use I wished to make of their replies, so as not in any way to influence their answers.

The world-renowned British Museum is the highest authority to which I could refer, so I will give this first. I quote my letter to them with their answer to each question one after the other.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Dec. 8, 1911

British Museum, Department of History

London, England.

Dear Sir:

For the information of many who are deeply interested in this subject, would you kindly answer briefly the enclosed questions? D. M. CANRIGHT.

Here is the answer:

Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities,
British Museum
London, England Dec. 21, 1911

Sir:

I am commanded by the Assistant Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities to reply as follows to your questions on the ancient week: Q. 1. Did the pagan Romans and Greeks ever have any regular weekly day of rest from secular work? Ans. No. Q. 2. Did they have any regular weekly festival day? Ans. No. Q. 3. Did they have any regular weekly day when they assembled for pagan worship? Ans. No. Q. 4. Did they have any special day of the week when individuals went to the temples to pray or make offerings? Ans. No; both for Greeks and Romans the month was the unit and not the week. The Greek calendar varied in different states but the month was generally divided into three periods of ten days. The Romans reckoned from three fixed points in the month, the Kalend or first, the Nones fifth or seventh, the Ides thirteenth or fifteenth. These subdivisions in themselves had no religious significance. Also in the Roman calendars were nundinal, or market days, at periods of eight days, or, as the Romans reckoned time. On these days farm work, etc., stopped and citizens flocked into the town markets. To some extent this may be a regular stoppage of secular work; but it had no religious significance, except that it was considered an evil omen when the nundinal coincided with other festival days, e. g., the: Nones. The nundinal period seems

derived from a blundering reminiscence of a quarter of a lunar period, and there seems no connection with the later seven days' week (see below). Q. 5. As Sunday was sacred to the Sun, Monday to the Moon, Saturday to Saturn, etc., were those supposed deities worshipped on their own particular days more than on any other days? Ans. No; the old worship of the gods was disappearing when the seven-day week came about. The significance of the deities' names was astrological, not religious, e.g., if a person were born on Monday, the moon would influence his horoscope, but the moon was never an object of common worship. Q. 6. When was our week of seven days first introduced into the Roman calendar? Ans. There are traces in the literature of the late republic (first cent. B.C.) that the Romans used the week of seven days for astrological purposes, in connection with the many Eastern superstitions of the period. It was probably the third century, A.D. before the seven day week came into common use. Q.7. From whom did the Romans learn the week of seven days? Ans. From the Jews, alternately the Assyrians and Babylonians; the names were probably fixed by the Hellenistic Greeks. Q. 8. Did the pagan Greeks ever adopt in common life, or in their calendar, the week of seven days? Ans. No. Q. 9. Did Apollo, the Sun god, either among the Romans or Greeks, have any special day on which he was worshipped with prayers or offerings more than on any other day? Ans. There were certain set festivals at various temples; these were annual, not weekly. Q. 10. Did the pagan reverence for Sunday have anything to do in influencing Christians to select that day as their rest day? Ans. No; it can hardly be said that there was any special reverence for Sunday in pagan times (see answer to No. 5).

I am, sir, Your obedient servant,

F. N. PRYCE.

You see this historian gives an unqualified NO to all the questions. Notice particularly that the names of the days of the week were all only astrological, not religious. There was no religious sacredness attached to a day because it was named after some planet as Sun-day - Sun's day - or Mon-day, Moon's day, etc. The sun was not worshipped on Sunday, nor the moon on Monday, nor Saturn on Saturday, etc. Also notice carefully that Apollo was not worshipped on Sunday or on any weekday. His festival days were annual, not weekly, as Adventists have taught. Then note that there was no special reverence for Sunday in pagan times. Here again Adventists are proved to be entirely wrong. This again destroys all their contention that Sunday sacredness originated with pagans. The proof is abundant that no such thing was ever known among the pagan Romans or Greeks. Hence, Sunday-keeping, or Sunday sacredness, could not have originated with them.

Our next witness is from the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. This great institution of learning is supported by the United States Government. Here the highest qualified specialists in every line of knowledge are employed. Here they have access to every possible means of up-to-date information in the Library of Congress, etc. It will be seen that I addressed nearly the same questions to this learned body and that the answers are the same as from the British Museum: Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. September 23, 1914:

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Sir:

I have referred your letter of September 14th to Dr. I. M. Casonawicz, Assistant Curator of Old World Archeology, who furnishes the following replies to your several inquiries: 1. Did the pagan Romans and Greeks ever have any regular weekly day of rest from secular work? Ans. No. 2. Did they ever have any weekly festival day? Ans. No. 3. Did they have any regular weekly day when they assembled for pagan worship? Ans. No. 4. When was our calendar of the week first

introduced among the Romans and Greeks? Ans. The division of the month into weeks was introduced into Rome from Egypt. The date is uncertain, but it was not earlier than the second century, A.D. 5. When was our calendar of the week first recognized in Roman law? Ans. The earliest Sunday legislation was enacted under Constantine I, 321 A.D. No legislation of earlier date on the division of the month is known. 6. As each day of the week was dedicated to some god, as Sunday to the Sun, Monday to the Moon, Saturday to Saturn, etc., was each of these supposed deities worshipped on one particular day more than any other day? Ans. No. 7. Did the pagan Romans have anyone special day in the week when individuals, if they chose, went to make prayers or offerings to their gods? Ans. No. 8. Did Apollo have any special day in the week or month more than any other day when he was worshipped with prayers or offerings? Ans. No. Very truly yours, R. RATHBORN, Assistant Sec. in charge of National Museum.

Here we have two of the most reliable witnesses in the world perfectly agreeing. If their testimony is worth anything, then Adventists must revise their theory that Sunday sacredness, or Sunday festivals, or Sunday rest days originated with pagans.

But here is another witness confirming the other two but giving the answer more in detail. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., is the oldest and best known university in America. I addressed the same questions there. George F. Moore, professor of Ancient Roman and Greek History, furnished me the following complete account of all the Roman and Greek festivals. It completely destroys all claim for any pagan sacredness of Sunday. Professor Moore wrote me as follows:

Divinity Ave.
Cambridge, Mass.
May 24, 1913
Dear Sir:

There are two seven-day weeks: the Jewish week, with a Sabbath on the seventh day; and the Astrological week, with days named after the sun, moon, and five planets, in our order determined by the theories of astrology, but without any day of rest. The combination of the two is Christian. The Astrological week first appears in Greek and Latin writings about the beginning of the Christian era. Its antecedents are unknown. It had no use in ordinary life. Abstinence from labor on the seventh day, or on one day in seven, is a distinctively Jewish institution. The edict of Constantine (321 A.D.) closing the courts on Sunday and prohibiting some kinds of labor on that day, is the first recognition of a seven-day week in Roman law. The ancient Romans had a market day every eight days, when the peasants came to town to market, but it was in no sense a day of rest. In the old Roman calendar there were many days when the courts were closed and other public and private business was not done. They had also many festivals on which the people left their ordinary occupation to take part in the celebrations, but these have no periodicity like that of the week.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE F. MOORE

In a second letter he says:

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT
Dear Sir:

In reply to your inquiries in your letter of November 23rd, I would say: 1. The planetary week in

which the days were named from their regents, Saturday, Sunday, etc., was an invention of the astrologers, probably in the second century, B.C., and has no relation to religion or influence upon it. Saturn, for example, was not worshiped on Saturday, nor Jupiter on Thursday. The festivals of the several gods were never weekly festivals, nor did they occur on days fixed by other divisions of the month, say the tenth day. 2. The religious calendars of the Greek cities were independent of one another and underwent many changes in the course of time. Our knowledge of these calendars is incomplete; only that of Athens is pretty fully known. The festivals fell in certain months, and on certain days of the month. Thus, at Athens, where the first month of the year, Hekabombaion, began at the new moon following the summer solstice (roughly corresponding, therefore, to our July), there was a festival of Apollo on the first (or on the seventh of the month). The great festival of Athena Polias, the propheticess of the city, was on the 28th. There were often festivals on the 12th (Kronia) and on the 16th (Synorkia). The second month had only one, rather insignificant, festival. In the third month, the 5th day was an All Souls' Day, a feast of the dead; a thanksgiving was observed on the 12th-15th; from the 16th to the 25th were the great Athena Elensinia, and so on. No particular days of the month were to be especially favored, either in general or for any individual god. 3. The Roman calendar is preserved only from a comparatively late time, when the worship of Greek and foreign deities was fully established. So far as the old Roman calendar can be reconstructed it appears that the Ides of every month were dedicated to Jupiter, who had, besides, festivals on the 23rd of April, 5th of July, 19th of August, 11th of October, 25th of December. The festivals of Mars occur chiefly in the month named after him, 1st, 14th, 17th, 19th, 23rd, also February 27th, October 15th and 19th. These examples may suffice to show that no principle determines the fixing of these days. It may be observed, however, that, as among many people, the solstices and equinoxes, which mark the seasons of the year, are recognized in the calendar. Also that all who have a calendar based on lunar months give some importance to the first appearance of the new moon, and often to the full moon also. The festivals were public holidays, each with its own rites, and customs, sacrifices, processions, etc. The priests in Greece and Rome, speaking generally, officiated on these occasions only. The priest was a citizen, elected or chosen by lot, for a longer or shorter time (sometimes for life): in most cases he was not expected to demit his ordinary occupation. A priesthood who were priests and nothing else, who spent their lives in the service of the temples, with daily offerings and liturgies came in only with foreign, chiefly Oriental, gods, like the Magna Mater. Private persons went to the temples when they had occasion to offer prayers or sacrifices or to make vows, etc. There were no stated days for such visits-though some days were in some temples luckier than others, and there was nothing like a stated day for the assembling of a worshiping congregation except the festivals of the local calendar. Yours very truly,

GEORGE F. MOORE

It will readily be seen that this is a valuable historical document covering in detail every phase of Roman and Greek festivals. A weekly Sunday festival was utterly unknown to either pagan nation.

No weekly worship or sacredness whatever attached to Sunday. Our Advent brethren, if candid, must abandon that theory.

To make surety doubly sure, I will introduce one more witness. It will be seen that all four fully agree in every item. This one is from Prof. W. H. Westerman, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.:

University of Wisconsin
Nov. 13, 1913
REV. D. M. CANRIGHT

Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Sir:

I shall answer your questions briefly, and in the order in which you sent them. 1. The pagan Greeks and Romans never had a weekly day of rest. 2. They never had a weekly holiday or festival day. 3. They never had a special day in the week on which they made offerings or prayers to heathen gods. (Neither the pagan Greeks nor the Romans recognized a seven-day division or week division in the month.) 4. They made no offerings or prayers on Sunday to their gods any more than on other days. 5. The seven-day period of dividing the month or the week was never adopted into the calendar of the pagan Greeks. It appears in the Roman calendar after the time of Theodosius, or after 391 A.D., but the week, or seven-day period, first appears in Roman law in a constitution of Constantine, promulgated in 321 A.D. This appears in the Code of Justinian. The seven-day division of the month, which is, of course from the stand point of the calendar, a pretty cumbersome method of division, comes from the ancient Hebrews, whose Sabbath, falling on every Saturday, early became a period of rest. The word, Sabbath, means, probably, the "divider." The early Christians, for example, Paul, did not think it necessary for the Christian communities to observe the Jewish Sabbath. Usually, however, they did observe it. In the first two centuries of our era they developed the custom of observing the Lord's Day with prayer and common meals, and out of this, and the Jewish day of rest, arose our practice of observing Sunday. I have been very glad to be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,
W. H. WESTERMAN

December 18, 1914
REV. D. M. CANRIGHT
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Sir: I will again answer your questions in the order in which you asked them of me. 1. In the constitution of Constantine of A.D. 321, which spoke of the "venerable day of the sun," Constantine regards Sunday as venerable undoubtedly from the Christian standpoint. It had been so regarded by the Christians since the second century, as the day of the Resurrection. It would, therefore, be venerable to Constantine, who had already legalized the Christian religion. If it was in any way venerable or a holiday to the pagans, so far as my information goes, the pagans must have adopted the practice from the Christians. 2. Apollo was not worshipped on any stated day of the week or month more than any other. 3. I do not believe that there is any proof that the early Christians were led to observe Sunday by the example of any pagan worship upon that day. Indeed, I think Tertullian's statements, quoted by you, from Chapter XVI of his "Apology," goes to show that the pagans did not worship the sun upon that day, rather than the opposite.

Very sincerely yours,

W. H. WESTERMAN

The united testimony of these high authorities is decisive. Neither the pagan Romans nor the Greeks had any weekly day of rest from work, or any weekly festival, or any weekly day for worship. They made no use of a

week of seven days for anything. Professor Moore says it had no use in common life. Notice further: The old astrological week of seven days had no rest day. The idea of a rest day once a week was unknown to the pagan Romans and Greeks till they learned it of the Jews and Christians centuries after Christ. The edict of Constantine, A.D. 321, was the very first time the week of seven days was recognized in Roman law. All history agrees in this and it is a decisive fact showing that, up to that date, the Romans had made no use of our week of seven days, hence, did not, and could not, have observed Sunday as a day of rest. There was no religious idea connected with the naming of the days from the planets, as Sunday from the sun, Monday from the moon, etc.

All four of these specialists in ancient history agree in answering these questions though neither one knew that they had been submitted to the others; yet all four exactly agree in every particular, though widely scattered, London, Washington, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin. Such a unanimous agreement would settle any question in a court of law.

I accidentally learned that J. W. Moncrieff, A.Y., D.D., Associate Professor of Church History, University of Chicago, had carefully studied Seventh-Day Adventism, especially on this subject. So I sent him this chapter for examination. He wrote me as follows:

University of Chicago

May 13, 1915

Rev. D. M. Canright:

I appreciate very much the privilege of reading the two chapters of your forthcoming book, and shall certainly want a copy of it when it is out. Seventy years ago, when Seventh-Day Adventism was born, when people possessed a very meager amount of information concerning the ancients, and when even the great Samuel Johnson's Dictionary contained the statement that "The division of time by weeks hath been universally observed in the world, not only amongst the civilized, but likewise among the most barbarous nations" (I quote from the edition of 1819), it was excusable in Seventh-Day Adventists to relate Sunday observance to pagan Roman Sunday observance. But in the last fifty years an enormous amount of research into antiquarian life has been accomplished by reliable, competent historians, and when, with one accord, they proclaim the previously held notion to be a myth, pure and simple, with no support in well-ascertained facts, it is high time someone is bringing these facts which are to be found in every recent standard encyclopedia in the articles on "Calendar" and "Week" to the minds of the uninformed who are confused by a doctrine wholly at variance with now ascertained historical fact. I have consulted sixteen encyclopedias and dictionaries, and they differ in no essential detail in their treatment of the subject.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. MONCRIEFF

It will be seen this historian fully agrees with the four preceding ones. Having given special attention to this particular subject, his testimony is of great value in confirming the other.

I consulted a graduate of Michigan State University who has for four years made a specialty of teaching Roman history in the high school. I asked her if the Romans had any weekly rest day, or day of worship. She said, "No," and gave me *Roman Festivals*, by Fowler, as her textbook. Two university professors referred me to this same book, so it is good authority. The Preface, page 7, says: "A week of eight days was introduced at an early period." Notice, it was eight days, not seven; and the eighth day was simply a market day, not a day of worship. A large number of festivals are fully described but there is in all the book no reference to any rest day, or day of worship, on Sunday. If there had been such a rest day, the author would certainly have named it.

The Romans, centuries after Christ, learned the week of seven days, partly from Egyptian astrology and partly from Christians and Jews. The "Standard Dictionary," Article "Week," says: "It was not, introduced into the Roman calendar till after the reign of Theodosius in the fourth century."

The "Universal Dictionary of the English Language," Article "Week," says: "During the early centuries of their history the Greeks and Romans had not the institution of the week."

Webster's Dictionary, Article "Week," says: "The week did not enter into the calendar of the Greeks, and was not introduced at Rome till after the reign of Theodosius."

Constantine had been dead over forty years before Theodosius began to reign. So at the time when Constantine issued his Sunday law, A.D. 321, his pagan subjects did not use the week of seven days, hence, could not have, kept the first day of our week till taught it by Christians and required by Constantine's law.

Prof. A. Rauschenbusch, of Rochester Theological Seminary, quotes Lotz thus: "It is a vain thing to attempt to prove that the Greeks and Romans had anything resembling the Sabbath. Such opinion is refuted even by this, that the Roman writers ridicule the Sabbath as something peculiar to the Jews. In proof he cites many passages from the Roman poets, and one from Tacitus. Seneca also condemned the Sabbath observance of the Jews as a waste of time by which a seventh part of life was lost." ("Saturday or Sunday," p. 83)

Herzog says: "No special religious celebration of any one day of the week can be pointed out in anyone of the pagan religions" (Article "Sabbath").

The renowned Max Muller in "Chips from a German Work Shop," Vol. V, page 116, says: "It is well known that the names of the seven days of the week are derived from the names of the planets, and it is equally well known that in Europe the system of weeks and week days is comparatively of very modern origin. It was not a Greek, nor a Roman, nor a Hindu, but a Jewish or Babylonian invention."

The early Christian Father, Tertullian, A.D. 200, bears a decisive testimony that the pagans had no weekly festival, did not keep the Lord's Day with Christians. Reproving Christians for attending heathen feasts, he says: "Oh, truer fealty of the heathen to their own religion which taketh to itself no rite of the Christians. We are not afraid lest we be openly declared to be heathen! If thou must needs have some indulgence for the flesh too, thou hast it and thou hast not only as many days as they, but even more. For the heathen festival is on but one day in every year, thine upon every eighth day. Gather out the several solemn feasts of the heathen and set them out in order; they will not be able to make up a Pentecost." (Ante-Nicene Lib.," Vol. XI, pp. 162-163)

I notice that he says the heathen did not have a festival on the Lord's Day, nor on Pentecost, and that the heathen festivals came only "once a year" not every week, like the Christian Day. He says that all their feast days, if gathered together, would not be as much as Pentecost. This is decisive, that the heathen did not have a weekly festival day, nor did they have a festival on the same day the Christians did; viz., on the Lord's Day.

Johnson's "New Universal Encyclopedia," Article "Week," says: "The Greeks divided the month into periods of ten days, and the Romans gathered the days into periods of eight days; with both, the first day of a period was market day, on which country people came to town and stirred up both business and public life. The period of seven days, the week proper, was introduced to the Romans and Greeks, partly by Christianity, partly by Egyptian astronomy."

This demolishes the theory that keeping the first day of our Christian week came to Christians from the pagan Romans. Exactly the opposite is true. The Jew and Christians taught it to the pagan Romans.

Schaff, in his "Church History," says: "The pagan Romans paid no more regard to the Christian Sunday than to the Jewish Sabbath."

The "Encyclopedia Americana," Article "Week," says: "The Romans and Greeks each divided the months into periods, and were not acquainted with the week till a late period. The Romans had, however, for civil uses, as the arrangement of market days, a cycle of eight days, the ninth being the recurring one, instead of the eighth as with us."

I have before me a book of 160 pages, entitled, "Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's Day," by M. H. MacLead, Pueblo, Colo. It is the most exhaustive and scholarly work I have yet found on the history of the Sunday question in the first four centuries. He carefully quotes a large number of high authorities showing that the pagan Romans and Greeks had no weekly day of rest or worship on any day of the week. On the subject of heathen rest days he says:

"I have given it an uncompromising consideration. It was not without a study of the matter that I ventured even to myself a final and unchangeable denial of any truth in the claim." What the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, or other ancient nations believed or did has nothing to do with our question. It is claimed by Adventists that Sunday, as a day of rest and worship, came into the Church from pagan Rome. Hence, that is the only question to settle. The simple fact that Sunday was named from the sun, dedicated to the sun, or was sacred to the sun, does not furnish the slightest evidence that people ceased work on that day.

Every day in the week was named from some supposed deity and was sacred to that god. "The World's Standard Dictionary" says: "Monday, the day sacred to the moon." Did pagans worship the moon that day? Did they cease work that day? Saturday was Saturn's day, sacred to Saturn. Did they rest that day? So of all the days of the week. If they rested every day named after some god, when would they work? Sunday was no more sacred than any other day and pagans revered none.

So plain is the evidence on this subject that some of the best read Adventists have admitted that pagans did not rest from work on Sunday. Thus Elder J. H. Waggoner says of Constantine's Sunday law, A.D. 321: "Though the venerable day of the sun had long-- very long-- been venerated by them and their heathen ancestors, the idea of rest from worldly labor in his worship was entirely new." (*Replies to Elder Canright*, p. 130) Mark this confession, for it gives up the main pillar of their argument in their effort to prove that Sunday-keeping was taken from the pagans. The pagans never kept Sunday. It was a new idea to them when they were required to cease work that day! Where did they get that new idea? From the emperor who had just recently professed Christianity. He got it from his Christian brethren who had always kept it! See the folly of arguing that the pagans taught Christians to keep Sunday, when the pagans themselves had never kept it.

Here is another confession:

Elder L. R. Conradi, Seventh-Day Adventist, author of "History of the Sabbath," edition of 1912, in a letter to me dated Hamburg, February 9, 1914, says: "A weekly rest day from work and solely dedicated to divine worship was unknown in heathenism and only known among the people of Israel."

In answer to my question, "Did the pagan Romans keep Sunday as a religious day?" he says: "We never claimed that. The idea of keeping a day means, in the present age, resting from work and giving the time solely to worship. But this the pagans never did. They only made prayers to the sun-god and then followed their regular work."

Here we have two witnesses from Seventh-Day Adventists themselves, confessing that the pagans had no weekly day of rest from common work. Of course, they could say nothing else, for all history says the same. So then this point is settled beyond denial.

"Admissions in favor of truth from the ranks of its enemies constitute the highest kind of evidence."

These confessions from the two Adventist elders give up the question, as any candid person must see.

Elder Conradi, above quoted, says of the pagans: "They only made prayers to the sun-god and then followed their regular work." Here he assumes that the pagans made Sunday a special day of worship when they made prayers to the sun-god. He asserts that for which there is not a particle of proof. No prayers were made to the heathen gods on Sunday more than on Saturday or any other day. He cannot produce a scrap of proof for his assertion. The quotations given above from the historians of the several universities squarely deny what he asserts without any proof. Did all these pagans leave their homes every Sunday and go to their temples and offer prayers? No. They had no meetings whatever that day, nor on any other day of the week. On some special occasion, as a birthday, or recovery from sickness, or to avert some feared evil, or on some yearly festival, persons would go and offer incense or gifts to the gods. That was all. There was no regular day in the week for any offerings of gifts or prayers. The Adventists have invented a pagan Sunday of rest and worship which never existed.

No pagan nation today keeps Sunday. The great Chinese nation, numbering four hundred millions, keeps no day. Elder W. A. Westworth, Seventh-Day Adventist, in the Battle Creek, Mich., Daily Journal, May 18, 1914, says: "I have put in 15,000 miles in inland China visiting our stations. The Chinese have no week, nor any day of the week, kept as a weekly rest." The same is true of the Japanese, 67,000,000, the Koreans, the millions of pagans in Africa, etc. Then the Mohammedans, numbering 200,000,000, rest on Friday, and all work on Saturday and Sunday. They copied the idea of a weekly rest day from the Jews and Christians in the seventh century after Christ. India has a population of 315,000,000. They have no weekly rest day. The entire population of the earth is sixteen hundred millions. Of these only six hundred millions believe in the Bible and Christianity, and hence nominally respect Sunday. So ten hundred millions, nearly two-thirds of the people on the globe, have no regard for Sunday or Saturday and never had. All on this globe who now, or at any other time, have ever rested on Sunday have learned it from Christians. So Christians could never have learned it from pagans, for none of them ever kept Sunday.

The observers of the seventh day continually assert that Sunday with pagans was always a popular festival day, a day for religious assemblies and pagan worship, then of festivity or, perhaps, work, by some. The above testimony from numerous reliable authors squarely contradicts these assertions.

Listen now to the Adventists. Of Sunday they say: "They are assembly days at early morn, then given up to busy pleasure and to labor." "Many of his [Constantine's] pagan subjects revered the same day as a day of prayer in honor of the sun." Again: "The very effect of joining the pagans in their devotions on Sunday was to let down the bars which God had put up." (History of the Sabbath," edition 1912, pp. 373, 384,385, 363)

Here is another: "The bishops would very readily adopt the most popular heathen festival day [Sunday] in order to gain the favor of the pagans." "The observance of Sunday was itself the custom which was brought into the Church by converts from heathenism." "Sunday, the wild solar holiday of all pagan times." (Fathers of the Catholic Church, by E. J. Waggoner, pp. 324, 326, 328)

Here is one from a Seventh-Day Baptist, Rev. A. H. Lewis, in "History of the Sabbath and Sunday," page 70: "Sunday, already a festival among the heathen." "The sun's day had been a leading weekly pagan festival for many centuries" (page 521).

Elder Andrews in "Testimony of the Fathers," pages 26, 34, 43, says: "The Roman people observed a festival on the first day of the week." "The day commonly honored as a festival by the Romans."

These are only samples of what is repeated over and over by opposers of the Lord's Day. These assertions are made, not only without proof, but directly contrary to all reliable testimony, as we have quoted above. There was absolutely nothing of the kind with Romans or Greeks.

Elder Waggoner says: "Sunday is in every feature a heathen institution." (*Replies to Canright*, p. 133) Let us see.

What are the features of Sunday as kept by Christians?

1. All secular work ceases.
2. People dress up and go to church.
3. A hymn is sung.
4. Prayer is offered.
5. Scriptures are read.
6. A sermon is preached.
7. A collection is taken.
8. The Lord's Supper is celebrated.
9. Benediction is pronounced.

These are the features of the Christian observance of Sunday. Waggoner says that in every feature it is pagan! How many of these features can be found in the pagan day? Absolutely not one. They did not even cease work that day as he himself says above. Is not his assertion recklessly untrue? Could the pagan Romans give to the Christians these features of Sunday observance when they themselves never had one of them? It is absurd. But Adventists believe and teach it as a fact while all reliable evidence shows that it is all absolutely untrue.

The strong, clear, united historical quotations given in this chapter prove, beyond denial, that the pagan Romans never had any religious regard for Sunday, never had the week of seven days in common life, or in their calendar, or in their civil or religious laws. The very first deference they ever paid to Sunday was in obedience to the law of Constantine the first Christian emperor.

Because one day was named Sunday, sun's day, and because the ancient Babylonians and others worshiped the sun, therefore Adventists always assume and assert that Sunday was specially devoted to the worship of the sun. Thus one writer says: "The worship of the sun is one of the oldest and most universal forms of idolatry, and Sunday was the special day honored by the sun worshiper." Another writer says: "The very name Sun-day is a standing witness that it was the day of sun worship." This is simply in the sound of names, nothing more, without any foundation, in fact.

This ready assumption is entirely groundless. Each day of the week was named from some planet: as Sunday from the sun, Monday from the moon, Saturday from Saturn, etc. The first hour of each day was supposed to be ruled over by the planet of that day. This was purely an astrological invention for civil purposes and had no religious significance whatever; no idea of worship was connected with the name of anyone of these days. Religious worship had nothing to do in naming the days. The idea was purely and only astrological. Thus Johnson's "New Universal Encyclopedia," Article "Week," says: "It was found as a civil institution in the very earliest times among the Hindus, Persians, Assyrians, and Egyptians. But the Jews were the only nation with which the week had a religious significance." So also the answers from the above quoted historians all agree that names of the days are purely astrological, not religious. Sun worship had no connection with Sunday whatever, no more than any other day.

CONCLUSION

Recall that back in 1983, Ron Graybill, who was then associate director of the White Estate, was fired when copies of his doctoral dissertation were stolen and distributed to key Adventist leaders all over the world without his knowledge or consent. His dissertation, completed at a non-Adventist university, included documentation which provided abundant evidence that Ellen White was a fraud. Perhaps for the first time in the history of Adventism, numerous of its leaders had the proof of her fraudship inadvertently placed in their hands by one of their "own." After spending over a dozen years with unlimited access to every word that Ellen White wrote, he reached the following conclusions:

1. She made fraudulent claims.
2. Her personal character was seriously flawed.
3. She appeared to have produced her so-called "visions" when necessary to defeat her opposition.

It would seem that Ron Graybill knew more about the stupid stuff Ellen White had written than anyone else alive. A logical mind would conclude that no testimony against her could be more powerful. Reason would demand that Adventist leadership respond to this astonishing revelation of Ellen White's deceptions by demanding that the Church immediately repudiate her and organize campaigns to burn her books in front of every Seventh-day Adventist Church in the world. Unfortunately, as Bill Hohmann points out in another chapter, religion should make sense, but often it doesn't.

At that moment these SDA leaders received conclusive proof that she was a fraud, and they became accountable to God to stand on the side of truth. Nothing of this sort happened. Similarly, in 1982 Adventist leaders were confronted with D. A. Carson's reply to Samuele Bacchiocchi's 1977 defense of the Sabbath, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, in the form of the book, *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*. Carson's book proved to the point of over-kill and from a variety of perspectives that the Bible teaches squarely against the idea that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath, including proof beyond any reasonable doubt that there was no Sabbath given to Adam and Eve. This book led to The Worldwide Church of God renouncing Sabbatarianism in 1995. Although this church was the "sister church" of Seventh-day Adventists, SDA leadership chose not to follow the "family" out of Sabbatarianism and into the light of the Gospel. Unfortunately, the Church keeps taking in enormous amounts of money from its deceived flock, who give generously of their tithes and offerings for no other reason but that they believe Ellen White was God's Mouthpiece and that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath. The many SDA leaders who know the truth about the Adventist "truth," therefore, are hirelings. The Constitution guarantees religious freedom in America, but its intent is to provide that people can practice their sincere beliefs without interference-- not to enable dishonest people to perpetrate religious fraud by bilking innocent people out of their hard-earned money.

APPENDIX IX

The Adventist Sabbath Paradox: William Miller/Samuel Snow calendar calculations.

Editor's Note: This excerpt from CARM makes the most sense when it is understood that with the exception of Seventh-day Adventists, the scholarly world greatly prefers A.D. 33 as the date for Christ's crucifixion, based on a variety of considerations, including astronomy.—Kerry Wynne

By "Troubleshooter"

http://adamoh.org/TreeOfLife.lan.io/Comms/CARM-cashed/Troubleshooters_CARM-Blog/William_Miller_Samuel_Snow_calendar_calculations.htm

William Miller (1782 – 1849) was an American Baptist preacher whose followers were called Millerites....

...he is credited with the beginning of the Advent movement of the 1830s and 1840s in North America...
...among his direct spiritual heirs are Seventh-day Adventists...
...who formed following 'the great disappointment' when Jesus did not return.

Prior to 1843/1844 William Miller held to a 33AD date for the crucifixion of Christ in accord with most of Christendom...

...but changed his position to the 31 AD date to fit his 2300 day/year prophetic schema...
...which he saw as having the same start date in 457 BC as the 'seventy-sevens' (Dan 9:24)...
...then by converting the days to years in Daniel 8:14 using the extra-biblical year for a day principle...
...found the 2300 days/years terminus in 1844 on 22 October, the Karaite date of the Day of Atonement that year.

Question: How did changing to a Karaite luni-solar calendar make 31 AD a viable date?

Answer: On a luni-solar calendar every Passover falls on a weekly Sabbath day.

This is how it works...

...on a lunar calendar, weekly Sabbaths were calculated from the first appearance of the New Moon each month...

"In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein." Lev 23:7...

The first day of the month was New Moon day, the day following the sighting of the New Moon, it was a rest day...

...then six work days were counted until the first Sabbath of the month that was always on the eighth day of the lunar cycle...

...so the 15th, the 22nd and the 29th were also weekly Sabbath's...

...then the New Moon was again sighted and the weekly cycle repeated.

So weekly Sabbaths in the Karaite luni-solar calendar were determined by the sighting of the New Moon each month...

...and not by the perpetual weekly cycle we use now.

For the Hebrews the lunar year began with the month Nisan...

...the 1st day of Nisan was calculated from the first sighting of the New Moon following the Barley Harvest...

...Barley naturally ripens according to the solar cycle, so this device kept the lunar year in sync with the solar year...

...with the occasional extra intercalated or leap month added to the end of the year.

The Passover lamb was killed on the 14th Nisan...

...and eaten that night, the night of the full moon (Passover Moon)...

...this was the beginning of the 15th Nisan which was a lunar weekly Sabbath every year.

So on the Karaite luni-solar calendar every Passover fell on a lunar weekly Sabbath...

...and William Miller/Samuel Snow relied on this Lunar calculation to place the crucifixion in 31 AD...

...to calculate 2300 days/years from 457 BC via 31 AD through to 1844...

...establishing 22 October 1844 as the Day of Atonement on which Miller believed Jesus would return.

...this is also the date that Seventh-day Adventists claim as their origin.

However, this created for Seventh-day Adventism a Sabbath paradox...

...when they later adopted a Saturday/Sabbath based on the Julian/Gregorian calendar...

...so their prophetic origin was determined by a lunar calendar that calculated weekly Sabbath from the New Moon each lunar cycle....

...but they observed a successive Saturday/Sabbath determined by the Roman Julian/Gregorian calendar...

...which cannot be reconciled with the conditions for a 31 AD crucifixion.

This pattern of weekly Sabbaths is also seen in the first month Nisan...
...and the third month Sivan (and possibly demonstrated in the fourth month)...
...three months in a row Sabbaths fell on the same days of the month...
...which can only happen using a luni/solar calendar but not in a Julian/Gregorian calendar.

**The Manna then ceased just prior to the Jericho campaign...
...again notice the dates.**

Joshua 5:10-13 "And the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal, and **kept the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month** at even in the plains of Jericho. 11 And they did eat of the old corn of the land on **the morrow after the Passover, unleavened cakes, and parched corn in the selfsame day**. 12 And **the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land**; neither had the children of Israel manna any more; but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year. 13 And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?"

The 14th Nisan was Passover (eaten in the evening beginning/evening of the 15th)...
...on a lunar calendar the 15th was always a weekly Sabbath...
... 'the morrow' then that the Manna ceased was the 16th day Nisan...
...which was one month short of 40 years since the Manna was first given.

Then the campaign is described in Joshua 6:3-4...

"And ye shall compass the city, all *ye* men of war, *and* go round about the city once. Thus shalt thou do six days. 4 And seven priests shall bear before the ark seven trumpets of rams' horns: **and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times**, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets."

The seven day period is confirmed in the New Testament...

Hebrews 11:30 "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were **compassed about seven days**."

The Book of Jasher also recounts the history of Israel and Jericho.

"And it was in **the second month, on the first day of the month**, that the Lord said to Joshua, Rise up, I have given **Jericho** into your hand with all of its people; and all your fighting men shall go round the city, once each day, in this manner shall you do **for six days**. 15 And the priests shall blow upon trumpets, and when you shall hear the sound of the trumpet, all the people shall give a great shouting, that the walls of the city shall fall down; all the people shall go up every man against his opponent. 16 And Joshua did so according to all that the Lord had commanded him. 17 **And on the seventh day they went round the city seven times**, and the priests blew upon trumpets. 18 And at the seventh round, Joshua said to the people, Shout, for the Lord has delivered the whole city into our hands." Jasher 88:14-18

According to the Book of Jasher...
...the Jericho campaign began on the first day of the second month Lyar...
...this was a New Moon day...
...so the Jericho victory was complete on the seventh day of the month...
...the day before the first lunar Sabbath of the month on day eight.

So with reference to a luni/solar calendar...
...the Jericho campaign continued for seven days without violating the Sabbath command.

With a perpetual seven day cycle, one day of the seven would have to be a Sabbath.

It would seem strange if the Lord would have Israel keep Sabbath for forty years...
 ...and then have them break it as soon as they entered Canaan to defeat Jericho...
 ...but the anomaly is solved by reference to the succession of Lunar weekly Sabbaths.

By using the luni/solar calendar evident in the biblical text and historical documents...
 ...there is no conflict between the conditions of the Sabbath command to Israel and the defeat of Jericho.

Here is the month of Lyar highlighting the seven Jericho campaign days.

Lyar							
1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	Sa	
							<u>1</u>
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							
7:	14:	21:	28:				

The Book of Jasher specifies "...the second month, on the first day of the month..."...
 ...so day 1 is New Moon day...
 ...then an additional 6 days till day 7 which is the day before the Sabbath on day 8.

Footnote:

The Book of Jasher is mentioned twice in Holy Writ...

Joshua 10:13 "And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this **written in the book of Jasher**? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day."

2 Samuel 1:17-19 "And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan his son, 18 and he said it should be taught to the people of Judah; behold, it is **written in the Book of Jasher**. He said: 19 "Thy glory, O Israel, is slain upon thy high places! How are the mighty fallen!"

The Book of Jasher was first translated into English in 1840...

...Ellen White regarded it as reliable history and quoted/paraphrased/plagiarized from it about sixteen times.

APPENDIX XI

Excerpts From:

From Sabbath to Saturday: The Story of the *Jewish Rest Day*

By John D. Keyser

Editor's Note: This work is abridged so that only elements of Keyser's article relevant to direct support for the lunar Sabbath principle and the possibility that some Jews and Christians kept the Sabbath according to the lunar calendar long after the death of Jesus are included. The disconnection of thought that results is the fault of the editor and does not suggest that the writer's thoughts are disjointed. Some portions of this work are quoted elsewhere.----- Kerry Wynne

It is also mentioned, in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, that "the Hebrew *Sabbathon* conveys the idea of propitiation or appeasement of divine anger and [it] is...the opinion [of Professor Jastrow] that the Hebrew Sabbath (i.e. CREATION SABBATH) was originally a *Sabbathon* -- i.e. a day of propitiation and appeasement; marked by atoning rites...it was celebrated at intervals of seven days, CORRESPONDING WITH CHANGES IN THE MOON'S PHASES, and was identical in character with the four days in each month, i.e. 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th! (The MacMillan Company, 1899. P. 4180).

The same encyclopedia adds (p. 4173) that:

The word "Sabbath" is a feminine form/word. The ROOT (of Sabbath) has NOTHING to do with resting in the sense of enjoying repose; in transitive forms and applications, it means: "to sever"; "to put an end to"; intransitively, it means "to desist" -- "to come to an end." In a transitive sense -- "the divider" -- indicates the Sabbath as dividing the month. It certainly cannot be translated 'The Day of Rest.'"

In the *Encyclopedia Biblica* (1899) we find stated that "the stars served to mark divisions of time. They are set in the firmament 'to divide the day from the night,' and to 'be for signs, and for moeds/signs/festivals/appointed times, and for days and years!' The Hebrew month is a lunar month and THE QUARTER OF THIS PERIOD -- ONE PHASE OF THE MOON -- appears to have determined the WEEK OF SEVEN DAYS" (The MacMillan Company. P. 4780).

The Babylonian Connection

In the year 1869 the late George Smith, a well-known pioneer student of Assyriology, discovered among the cuneiform tablets in the archives of the British Museum in London "a curious religious calendar of the Assyrians, in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days or 'Sabbaths,' are marked out as days on which *no work* should be undertaken." Some six years later Sir Henry Rawlinson published this calendar in the fourth volume of his standard collection of cuneiform inscriptions.

Records Hutton Webster --

It appears to be a transcript of a much more ancient Babylonian original, possibly belonging to the age of Hammurabi, which had been made by order of Assurbanipal and placed in his royal library at Nineveh. The calendar, which is complete for the thirteenth or intercalary month, called Elul II, and for Markheshwan, the eighth month of the Babylonian year, takes up the thirty days in succession and indicates the deity to which each day is sacred and what sacrifices or precautionary measures are necessary for each day (***Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality***. New York: The MacMillan Company. 1916. P. 223).

Webster continues by saying –

All the days are styled "favourable," an expression which must indicate a pious hope, not a fact, since the words ud-khul-gal or umu limnu ("the evil day") are particularly applied to the SEVENTH, FOURTEENTH, nineteenth, TWENTY-FIRST, and TWENTY-EIGHTH days...With regard to the reasons which dictate the choice of the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days, two views have been entertained. It has been held, in the first place, that the "evil days" were selected as CORRESPONDING TO THE MOON'S SUCCESSIVE CHANGES; hence that the seventh day marks the close of the earliest form of the seven-day week, A WEEK BOUND UP WITH THE LUNAR PHASES (*ibid.*, p.224).

S. Langdon, in his book ***Babylonian Menologies and the Semitic Calendars***, mentions the Asurbanipal calendar –

Asurbanipal in the seventh century promulgated a calendar with a definite scheme of a seven-day week, a regulation of the month by which all men were to rest on days 7, 14, 19, 21, 28. The old menology of Nisan made the TWO DAYS OF THE DARK OF THE MOON, 29, 30, rest-days, so that each lunar month had 9 rest-days, on which neither the sick could be cured nor a man in difficulty consult a prophet; none might travel and fasting was enforced (London: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. 86-87).

"A similar *association with the moon's course*," explains Hutton Webster, "is set forth in the case of a seven-day period in a text which specifically indicates *the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days* as those of Sin, the moon god." "Another text," continues Webster, "connects several days of the month with the moon's course in the following order: first day, new moon; seventh day, moon as 'kidney' (half moon); fifteenth day, full moon."

"Finally," writes Webster, "in the fifth tablet of the Babylonian 'Epic of Creation,' a work which in its original form is traced to the close of the third millennium B.C., it is told how the god Marduk, having created and set in order the heavenly bodies, *then placed the moon in the sky to make known the days and DIVIDE THE MONTH WITH HER PHASES.*" "Although this interesting production, in its present mutilated state," elicits Webster, "*mentions only the seventh and fourteenth days*, we are entitled to believe that the original text also referred to the *twenty-first and twenty-eighth days of the month*" (***Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality***, pp. 228-229).

The Babylonian "Shabattum"

These cuneiform records of ancient Babylonia contain a term *shabattum*, which has been generally accepted as the phonetic equivalent of the Hebrew [word] *shabbathon*, more than likely an intensive form of *shabbath* or *Sabbath* -- referring to a Sabbath of particular solemnity. Writes Hutton Webster --

Shabattum, a word which has been found as yet only five or six times in Assyro-Babylonian documents, occurs in a lexicographical tablet containing the equation *shabbattu(m) = um nukh libbi*. The accepted translation of the latter expression is "day of rest of (or for) the heart" (s.c., "of the angered gods"). Various scholars in England and Germany...have therefore explained *shabattum* and its equivalent phrase by the five "evil days" found in the calendar already noticed. This identification was based on the observation that these seemed also to be penitential days, when by special observations the gods must be appeased and their anger averted. (***Rest Days***, pp. 235-236).

As is wont with all humankind, the original meaning and intent of the Sabbath day, as revealed by YEHOVAH God to Adam and his descendants, became perverted after the flood and associated with pagan gods. However, the *timing* of these Sabbath or rest days was kept intact. Continues Hutton Webster --

A lexicographical tablet from the library of the Assyrian king Asshurbanipan gives the names attached to several days of the Babylonian month; and among these is the designation *shabattum*, applied to the FIFTEENTH day [of the lunar month]. Still more recently a similar use of *shabattum* has been found in a text which contains an account of the *moon's course* during the month. Reference is here made

to the *first appearance of the new moon*, its ash-grey light until about the seventh day thereafter, its opposition with the sun on *the fourteenth day*, its aspects on *the twenty-first, twenty-eighth*, and twenty-ninth days, and finally its disappearance on the thirteenth day, being the time of conjunction with the sun. In this description, which for minuteness recalls the Polynesian naming of the nights from successive aspects of the moon, *the fifteenth day again appears as shabattum (ibid., pp. 238-239).*

In the next several pages of his book, Hutton Webster makes these observations –

The choice of the *FIFTEENTH DAY as the shabattum* was obviously determined by the length of the Babylonian month, which in the earlier period was regularly taken at thirty days duration. We have seen, however, that, where lunar reckonings are employed and the month begins at sunset with the visible new moon, the *fourteenth day* more commonly coincides with the full of the moon. SHABATTUM being the technical expression *for the FIFTEENTH day* as the time of full moon, it is only reasonable to conclude that, if not the name, at any rate the observances belonging to this day would be often transferred to the *fourteenth of the month*, or to any other day on which the moon became full...And if for practical purposes the fourteenth day might be a SHABATTUM, it is not difficult to assume that this was also the case with the days (*seventh, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth*, perhaps, also, the nineteenth), which marked other characteristic *stages of the lunation*. In the developed Babylonian cult all these were "evil days," when the gods must be propitiated and conciliated. In the primitive faith of Semitic peoples they were occasions observed with superstitious concern as times of fasting, cessation of activity, and other forms of abstinence (***Rest Days***, pp. 240-241).

Webster goes on to associate the Babylonian "shabattum" with the Hebrew "Sabbath" as found in the Old Testament:

"And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah." This *remarkable association of the Sabbath with the day of the new moon* had been previously noticed by such acute critics as Wellhausen and Robertson Smith, who were unable to offer a satisfactory solution of the problem thus presented. When, however, the cuneiform records disclosed the fact that the *Babylonian SHABATTUM fell on the fifteenth (or fourteenth) day of the month and referred to the day of the FULL MOON*, it became clear that in these Biblical passages we have another survival of what must have been the PRIMARY MEANING of the Hebrew term SHABBATH [SABBATH]. As late, then, as the eighth century B.C., popular phraseology retained a lingering trace of the original collocation of the new-moon and full-moon days as festival occasions characterized by abstinence from secular activities. How long-lived were the *old ideas* is further illustrated by the provision

in Ezekiel's reforming legislation that the inner eastern gate of the new Temple at Jerusalem should be shut during the six working days, but should be opened on the Sabbath and on the new-moon day for the religious assemblage of the people. That the term SHABBATH [SABBATH], *the designation of the full-moon day*, should have come to be applied to *every seventh day of the month* seems to be quite in accord with BOTH Babylonian and Hebrew usage, which, as we have seen, led the month itself to be called after the new-moon day.

The Hebrew seven-day week, ending with the Sabbath, presented so obvious a resemblance to the Babylonian septenary period, which closed with an "evil day," that scholars have felt themselves compelled to seek its origin in Babylonia (*ibid.*, pp. 252-252).

The Common Semitic Antiquity

The Hebrew seven-day week, ending with the Sabbath, did not, of course, originate in Babylonia. The Sabbath day -- both Hebrew and Babylonian -- originated with the creation week and was transmitted down through the flood to Babylonia where Abraham was born. "The celebration of new-moon and full-moon festivals," remarks Hutton Webster, "which BOTH BABYLONIANS AND HEBREWS appear to have derived from a *common Semitic antiquity*, underwent, in fact, a radically unlike evolution among the two kindred peoples." "To DISSEVER the week from the lunar month," continues Webster, "to employ it as a recognized calendrical unit, and to fix upon one day of that week for the exercises of religion were *momentous innovations*, which, until evidence to the contrary is found, must be attributed to the *Hebrew people alone*" (**Rest Days**, p. 254).

According to M. Jastrow, there is a passage in the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Old Testament) which was in dispute several centuries before the Messiah concerning its meaning. In the 23rd chapter of Leviticus the word "Sabbath" appears to be used in a sense precisely THE SAME as that of the Babylonian SHABBATTUM, *referring to the FIFTEENTH DAY OF THE MONTH*. In this passage it is directed that on "the morrow after the Sabbath" the sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest is to be brought to the priest, who shall wave it before YEHOVAH God and then count fifty days from "the morrow after the Sabbath" to the commencement of the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost.

Professor Jastrow clearly shows that the word "Sabbath" is used in Leviticus 23, not in its later sense of a seventh day of rest, but as a *survival of the old designation of the Sabbath as the FULL-MOON DAY!* Jastrow concludes by saying, "The two references in Leviticus stand out as solitary signposts of an abandoned road" ("The Day After the Sabbath," **American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures**, 1914, xxx, 104).

The fact that the Babylonians kept Sabbath days that lined up with the phases of the moon is noted by a number of different sources. According to the ***Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*** by James Hastings --

The Babylonian...seven-day week...is the week with which we are so well acquainted...this was the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days of every [lunar] month. Of special interest in connection with the seven-day week is the 19th of the month, which was a "week of weeks" from the first day of the preceding month."

In the ***Ten Commandments*** by Joseph Lewis we find written:

In 1869 George Smith, well known as a pioneer student of Assyriology, discovered among the cuneiform tablets in the British Museum "curious religious calendars of the Assyrians, in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days, or 'Sabbaths,' are marked out as days on which no work should be undertaken." Authorities contend that this reckoning of the days of the week and the taboo prescribed for the seventh day [which falls on the moon's phases] probably belonged to the age of Hammurabi.

The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, also acknowledges that:

The idea of the week, as a subdivision of the month [was found]...in Babylonia, where each lunar month was divided into four parts, CORRESPONDING TO THE FOUR PHASES OF THE MOON. The first week of each month BEGAN WITH THE NEW MOON, so that, as the lunar month was one or two days more than four periods of seven days, these *additional days* were not reckoned at all. Every seventh day (*sabbatum*) was regarded as an unlucky day. This method of reckoning time spread westward through Syria and Palestine, and WAS ADOPTED BY THE ISRAELITES, probably after they settled in Palestine (vol. 10, p. 482. Article "Week.").

The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia states that "among ALL early nations the lunar months were the readiest large divisions of time...(and were divided into 4 weeks), corresponding to THE PHASES OR QUARTERS OF THE MOON. In order to connect the reckoning by weeks with the lunar month, we find that ALL ANCIENT NATIONS observed some peculiar solemnities to mark the day of the New Moon (1904, p. 1497).

Almost all scholars today agree that the primal seven-day calendar, as used among the very ancient Semites (including the Babylonians and Hebrews), was based upon the moon. Furthermore, this unique weekly cycle was observed in tandem with the lunar phases. An example of the early week, based upon the phases of the moon, is described in the ***Fifth Tablet of the Semitic Story of the Creation*** (12-18). Note that the moon is

said to "*make known the days*" and its horns "*the seasons*," creating the Sabbath on the 7th and 14th days of the lunar month --

[The **moon**] He caused to shine, ruling the night:
He set him then as a creature of the night, **to make known the days**.
Monthly unfailing, He provided him with a tiara.
At the beginning of the month then, appearing in the land,
The horns shine forth to make known the seasons.
On the seventh day the tiara perfecting,
A sa[bath] shalt thou then encounter, mid-[month]ly.
(From *Hastings*, on Sabbath: Babylonian).

Another ancient reference -- a writer by the name of Aristobulus -- refers to Sabbaths and Holy Days being associated with lunar phases rather than with the modern practice of consecutive days. Notice!

Homer and Hesiod let us know, what they learned out of our books, that the seventh day was a holy day. Thus, says Hesiod: There is the **first day of the 'month,'** and the fourth, and **the seventh, that holy day** (Eusebius' *Praep. Evang.* 13:12, 13).

The seventh day of the lunar 'month' implies knowledge of a lunar-phase calendar! Aristobulus continues by saying:

The seventh day is also a day illuminated by the Sun [*when the crescent of the Moon is illuminated*].....All things were made by sevens in the starry heaven; and go around in circles in all the years succeeding one another [*again, implies a sequence of lunar quarters*]. (*Ibid.*).

Like the ancient lunar calendars, the Hellenistic calendar counts days from sunset to sunset and not from sunrise to sunrise or midnight to midnight. To the ancients in Athens, Jerusalem and Babylon, each new month began with the appearance of the young crescent moon in the evening sky and not when the moon was dark, i.e. the new moon. This evening was celebrated with the lighting of torches and bonfires, to announce to all in the countryside that the new month had officially begun. The second day of the month began on the following evening and the third day began on the third evening.

According to Janet and Stewart Farrar in *The Witches' Goddess*, "The modern use of seven day weeks also stems from the ancient lunar calendar. The first of every lunar month was marked as the first day of a new week and a Sabbath was celebrated every seventh day *to mark the 4 quarters of the moon*. The last week was followed by the *days of the dark moon* when the goddess was held to be menstruating and so *an extended*

Sabbath was observed until the waxing crescent moon reappeared and the new month began" (Phoenix Publishing, pp. 24-25, p.106).

The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia records --

The association of sabbath rest with the account of creation must have been *very ancient* among the Hebrews, and it is noteworthy that no other Semitic peoples, even the Babylonians, have any tradition of the creation in six days. It would appear that the primitive Semites had FOUR CHIEF MOON DAYS, probably *the first, eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second of each month*, CALLED SABBATHS from the fact that there was a tendency to end work before them so that they might be celebrated joyfully. Among the Babylonians these seventh days through astrological conceptions became ill-omened, while the sabbath in the middle of the month [15th] was made a day of propitiation, and its name was construed as meaning "the day for ending the wrath of the gods." The Israelites, on the other hand, made the sabbath the feasts of a living and holy God. The work of man became symbolic of the work of God, and human rest of divine rest, so that the sabbaths became preeminently days of rest. Since, moreover, the LUNAR MONTH had 29 or 30 days, the normal lapse of time between sabbaths was six days, although sometimes seven or eight; and six working days were accordingly assigned to the creation, which was to furnish a prototype for human life. THE CONNECTION OF THE SABBATH WITH LUNAR PHASES, however, WAS [LATER] DISCARDED BY THE ISRAELITES..." (pp. 135-136).

In a statement that may have a bearing on the Egyptian captivity, the ***Encyclopedia Biblica*** makes this comment:

Hosea takes it for granted that in/during captivity, the CREATION LUNAR WEEKLY SABBATH will be suspended, like all the other feasts, because in his day, a feast implied A SANCTUARY (= 6944 = qodesh = a sacred, consecrated, dedicated Most Holy Place)! The Sabbath marks Israel's separation from the heathen/pagans/Gentiles (1899, p. 4177).

The Wilderness of Sin

After the ten plagues and the exodus from Egypt at the end of the 12th and 13th dynasties, YEHOVAH God led Moses and the Israelites to the Wilderness of Sin where He revealed to them His TRUE Sabbath day. We read about this in Exodus, chapter 16 --

And they departed from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came to the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sina; and ON THE FIFTEENTH DAY, IN THE SECOND MONTH after their departure from the land of Egypt, all the congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron. And the children of Israel said to them, Would we had died smitten by the Lord in the land of Egypt, When we sat by the flesh-pots, and ate bread to satiety! for ye have brought us out into this wilderness, to slay all this congregation with hunger. And the Lord said to Moses, Behold, I will rain bread upon you out of heaven: and the people shall go forth, and they shall gather their daily portion for the day, that I may try them whether they will walk in my law or not (Septuagint version).

This passage highlights TWO main points, (1) the Israelites murmured against Moses and Aaron on THE 15TH DAY OF THE SECOND MONTH after leaving Egypt and, (2) YEHOVAH God was planning to test the Israelites to see if they would WALK IN HIS LAW OR NOT. The intriguing part of this whole passage is where Moses mentions THE EXACT DAY that the Israelites murmured against him and Aaron in the wilderness. NOWHERE ELSE in the narrative of the Israelites' journey from Egypt to the Promised Land is an exact date mentioned! This clearly indicates that this date was VERY IMPORTANT TO YEHOVAH GOD -- and that He wanted the Israelites to remember it. Also, on this same date, He was going to teach the Israelites something very important; He was going to test them and see if they would obey Him or not. What was this important lesson? Let's continue on Exodus 16 –

"And it shall be on the sixth day that they shall prepare what they bring in, and it shall be TWICE AS MUCH as they gather daily." Then Moses and Aaron said to all the children of Israel, "At evening you shall know that the Lord has brought you out of the land of Egypt. And in the morning you shall see the glory of the Lord; for He hears your murmurings against the Lord. But what are we, that you murmur against us?"....Now it came to pass, as Aaron spoke to the whole congregation of the children of Israel, that they looked toward the wilderness, and behold, THE GLORY OF THE LORD APPEARED IN THE CLOUD. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel. Speak to them, saying, 'At twilight [between the two evenings] you shall eat meat, and in the morning you shall be filled with bread. And you shall know that I am the Lord your God.'" So it was that quail came up at evening and covered the camp...(Verses 5-13).

This day -- the 15TH DAY OF THE SECOND MONTH -- was so important to YEHOVAH God that He appeared in the cloud before the Israelites, and then caused thousands (maybe millions) of quail to be blown into the Israelites' camp "between the two evenings," i.e. the afternoon of the 15th. WHY was this day so important to YEHOVAH? Writes Herbert W. Armstrong –

I will show you that God was speaking to them [the children of Israel] on a SABBATH. It is evident that the Eternal first preached to men on the FIRST SABBATH. Adam was created on the sixth day of the creation week. Evidently he was created in the late afternoon, since the creation of man was the last act of creation on that day. When the sun had set, immediately after Adam's creation, God *preached to him*, offering him the GIFT of eternal life (through the tree of life), and warning [him] that the wages of sin is DEATH (Gen. 2:15-17).

And here God is *again* preaching to Israel, through Moses, ON THE SABBATH (***Which Day is the Christian Sabbath***. Ambassador College Press, pp. 30-31).

Now let's continue with the narrative in Exodus 16:

...and in the morning the dew lay all around the camp. And when the layer of dew lifted, there, on the surface of the wilderness, was a small round substance, as fine as frost on the ground. So when the children of Israel saw it, they said to one another, "What is it?" For they did not know what it was. And Moses said to them, "This is the bread which the Lord has given you to eat."

And now YEHOVAH God starts to teach the Israelites about the Sabbath –

So they gathered it every morning, every man according to his need. And when the sun became hot, it melted. And so it was on THE SIXTH DAY, that they gathered TWICE AS MUCH BREAD, two omers for each one. And all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. Then he said to them, "This is what the Lord has said: "TOMORROW IS A SABBATH REST, A HOLY SABBATH TO THE LORD. Bake what you will bake today, and boil what you will boil; and lay up for yourselves all that remains, to be kept until morning!" So they laid it up till morning, as Moses commanded; and it did not stink, nor were there any worms in it. Then Moses said, "Eat that today, for today is a Sabbath to the Lord; today you will not find it in the field. SIX DAYS YOU SHALL GATHER IT, but on the SEVENTH DAY, which is THE SABBATH, there will be none."

As is normal with human nature, some of the Israelites went out on the seventh day looking for the manna (bread) –

Now it happened that some of the people went out on the seventh day to gather, but they found none. And the Lord said to Moses, "How long do you refuse to keep My commandments and My laws? See! For the Lord has GIVEN YOU THE SABBATH; therefore He gives you on the sixth day bread for two days. Let every man remain in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." So the people RESTED ON THE SEVENTH DAY (verses 13-30).

We see here that, starting on the 15th day of the month, YEHOVAH God provided food for all the Israelites. Then, on the seventh day after the 15th, He did not provide any manna -- thereby showing that this day (the 22nd day of the month) was a SABBATH. Obviously, if the 15th was seven days before the 22nd, it too was a Sabbath day! This Herbert Armstrong clearly understood. We can see here that YEHOVAH God was revealing *His weekly Sabbath cycle* for the Israelites. If the 15th and the 22nd were Sabbath days, so too were the 8th and the 29th days of the month! So we here see a pattern -- the 8th, 15th, 22nd and 29th. What significance do these dates have? Just this -- THEY CORRESPOND TO THE PHASES OF THE MOON!! YEHOVAH God was showing the Israelites that His Sabbath days were to fall on the days of the month CORRESPONDING TO THE MOON'S PHASES, thus revealing that the weekly Sabbaths were to be observed using THE SAME CALENDAR or reckoning used to determine the annual Sabbaths or feast days!

Unfortunately, Herbert Armstrong never made the connection (to our knowledge) between these Sabbath days in Exodus 16 and the phases of the moon.

In the article ***Creation Weekly Sabbath*** the author DOES make the connection, however he seems to have a problem with arithmetic!

In Exodus 16:1-30 Jahwah brought Israel into the Wilderness of Sin (which means "Moon") to teach them the set-time ordinance of the Weekly Sabbath. The keeping of the Sabbath was a test to prove Israel's obedience to Yahweh's Torah/instructions. They entered the Wilderness of Sin on the second month AND THE FIFTEENTH DAY that they left Egypt. Counting six days: 2/15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 -- the Sabbath fell on the 21st day of the month. (Lunar weekly Sabbaths fall on the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days of the month).

The author's arithmetic notwithstanding, if you count seven days from the 15th you will arrive at the 22nd -- not the 21st! Since he mentions that the weekly Sabbaths fall on the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th days of the month, it seems evident that he is going by lunar observations. The miscounting of the days may be intentional to make the Exodus 16 account fit the author's own personal theory.

Regarding the Israelites' new understanding of YEHOVAH God's weekly Sabbath, Hutton Webster makes the following observations --

The brief prohibitions of work found in the Pentateuch cannot be separated, by any subtleties of exegesis, from the numerous other taboos with which the institution was invested. The rest on the Sabbath is only one of the forms of abstinence in CONNECTION WITH LUNAR CHANGES; and if the Sabbath began as a festival

at NEW MOON and FULL MOON, it may well have been observed BY THE ISRAELITES BEFORE THEIR CONTACT WITH CANAANITISH CULTURE (*Rest Days*, p. 246).

From Joshua to the Babylonian Captivity

After wandering for 40 years in the wilderness because of their disobedience, the Israelites finally crossed into the Promised Land under the able leadership of Joshua. After conquering the various Canaanite tribes, the land was divided up and given to the 12 tribes as an inheritance. During this time, and up to the Assyrian captivity of the House of Israel, the lunar calendar was observed -- even though surrounding nations were moving away from this type of calendar.

In 1200 B.C. the Egyptian calendar was reformed to the Sothic calendar, in which the year started when they could see a new moon right after the star Sirius. The Egyptians were the first to replace the lunar calendar with a calendar based on the solar year. They measured the solar year as 365 days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each, with five extra days at the end.

Meanwhile, according to Hutton Webster, in Palestine "the Hebrews employed LUNAR SEVEN-DAY WEEKS, perhaps for centuries preceding the Exile; weeks, that is, which ended with special observances on the seventh day but none the less were TIED TO THE MOON'S COURSE" (*Rest Days*, p. 254).

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* mentions that during this time "the months of the year were LUNAR, and began with the NEW MOON (hodesh, which came to mean "month"). During the era of the Kings the new moon was observed by a TWO-DAY FESTIVAL (I Sam. 20:24-27)." (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, article "Calendar," p. 631).

This new moon festival, according to Webster, was "considered an exceptional solemnity as early [at least] as the time of Saul. The twentieth chapter of the First Book of Samuel records a conversation between David and Jonathan in which the former says, "Behold, tomorrow is the new moon, and I should not fail to sit at meat with the king." It appears from this chapter that the first two days of the month were marked by feasts at which all members of the household were expected to be present, unless prevented by some ceremonial uncleanness. The occasion was also observed by COMPULSORY ABSTINENCE from all servile work" (*Rest Days*, p. 249).

The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia comments that "in the pre-Exilic period all work and trade ceased on the New Moon, as on the Sabbath."

In I Samuel 20 the narrative continues with David saying "But let me go that I may hide in the field until THE THIRD DAY at evening" (verse 5).

Then, in verses 24-27, we read --

So David hid in the field. And when the NEW MOON had come, the king sat down to eat the FEAST. Now the king sat on his seat, as at other times, on a seat by the wall. And Jonathan arose, and Abner sat by Saul's side, but David's place was empty. Nevertheless Saul did not say anything that day, for he thought, "Something has happened to him; *he is unclean, surely he is unclean.*" And it happened the next day, THE SECOND DAY of the month, that David's place was empty. And Saul said to Jonathan his son, "Why has the son of Jesse not come to eat, EITHER YESTERDAY OR TODAY?"

Jonathan Brown, in his booklet *Keeping Yahweh's Appointments*, explains these verses in a cogent manner –

First, it appears from the context that it was a **special** gathering because in verse 5 he states "**behold**, tomorrow is the [chodesh -- new moon]," drawing attention to the fact that **at that time** he "should not fail to sit with the king at meat." If it were just an ordinary "day" then there would have been no need to deliberately associate the "sitting down to meat" with the **chodesh** [new moon]. He could have simply stated something like, "the king is expecting me for an appointment at dinner tomorrow." But the **chodesh** [new moon] is the FOCAL POINT.

Second, he is going to hide himself in the field "unto the third day at even." the point to which the term **third** may be referenced is the current **day** he is speaking in, i.e. the day **before** the **chodesh** [new moon].

Continues Brown:

Then in verse 27, Saul notices David's absence again **on the second** of the **chodesh** [new moon]. This shows the length of this special "new moon" gathering at the king's table to be TWO DAYS IN A ROW. He tries to explain to himself that David's absence was due to him being "unclean." The events then culminate in Jonathan shooting arrows as planned **on the third day** (counting from the day **before** the chodesh) **at even**. Saul doesn't ask again the next day why David didn't come. The special new moon gathering or **chodesh** appears then to have ended -- AFTER TWO DAYS. We can safely assume then that because there were **two** days in which David was expected, THAT PARTICULAR [LUNAR] MONTH WAS 30 DAYS IN LENGTH. We can also assume that both those days were not normal "work days" by the very existence of the feast. -- Pp. 57-58.

This also proves that up to the time of Saul and David the Israelites were still observing the weeks (and therefore the SABBATH) according to the LUNAR CALENDAR OR RECKONING!!

"So," concludes Brown, "with this story of David we can begin to understand how 'feasting' is attached to the *chodesh* or 'new moon.' Everyone just sort of went 'on hold' and enjoyed the barbeque! The sighting of the crescent moon then ended it because that was the day wherein the counting of the new month AND WEEK began again" (*ibid.*, p.58).

Further evidence is supplied by the *Encyclopedia Biblica* (1899) which says --

The New Moon and the Sabbaths alike called men to the sanctuary to do sacrifice as in: Isaiah 1:12-17, Isa. 56:1-7, and Ezekiel 20:10-20. Hosea takes it for granted that in captivity the Sabbath will be suspended along with the other feasts, because in His day a feast implied a sanctuary. The Sabbath is a Mark of Separation or division from the heathen. In I Samuel 20:18, 24, and 27, the New Moon was celebrated TWO DAYS. The Sabbath is on the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days FROM EACH NEW MOON. (Note: The dark side of the moon would be 1 or 2 days, i.e. intercalary days.) -- The MacMillan Company, p. 4177.

The same encyclopedia, on page 5290, notes that "the subdivision of the month was into weeks,...the week representing approximately a fourth. This quadripartite division of the month into weeks was suggested by THE PHASES OF THE MOON. The mode of reckoning AMONG THE ISRAELITES was by dividing the first 28 days of each month into 4 weeks, i.e. 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th day and by making THE FIRST WEEK OF THE NEW MONTH ALWAYS BEGIN WITH THE NEW MOON."

Further, on pages 4178 and 4179, we read --

The *four quarters of the moon* supply an obvious division of the month...it is most significant that in the older parts of the Hebrew scriptures THE NEW MOON AND THE SABBATH ARE ALMOST INVARIABLY MENTIONED TOGETHER. The (Lunar) month is *beyond question* an old sacred division of time COMMON TO ALL THE SEMITES; even the Arabs, who received the WEEK at quite a late period from the Syrians, greeted the New Moon with religious acclamations. Thus this must have been *an old Semitic usage*, for the word which properly means "to greet the new moon" (*ahalla*) is...etymologically connected with the Hebrew words used by any festal joy. Among the Hebrews...the joy at the New Moon became the type of religious festivity in general. Nor are other traces wanting of the connection of sacrificial occasions, i.e., **religious feasts with the phases of the moon** among the Semites. That the FULL MOON as well as the NEW MOON had a *religious significance* among the ancient Hebrews seems to follow from the fact that when the great agricultural feasts were fixed to set days, the Full Moon was chosen. In olden times these feast-days appear to have been SABBATHS....there seems to be in I Samuel 20:27, compared with verses 18 and 24, an indication that in old times the feast of the New Moon lasted TWO DAYS...It appears from Judith 8:6

that EVEN IN LATER TIMES there were *two days at the New Moon* on which it was improper to fast. We cannot tell (exactly) when the Sabbath became DISSOCIATED from the month (*ibid.*).

In pre-exilic times the individual months were usually designated simply by numbering according to their position in the year, from the 1st through to the 12th. However, four months were actually named prior to the exile in Babylon -- namely *Abib*, the first month (Exodus 13:4); *Ziv*, the second (I Kings 6:37); *Ethanim*, the seventh (I Kings 8:2); and *Bul*, the eighth (I Kings 6:38). The meanings of these names are strictly seasonal, thus giving additional proof of a luni-solar year that incorporated lunar months and weeks.

From Babylon to the Messiah

The exile of the House of Judah in Babylon had a profound effect upon the calendar used by the Jews, as upon many other aspects of their religious life. "It was during the Exile," states the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, "that they became acquainted with the names of the months which they retain to the present day, and to which a Babylonian origin is actually assigned by the Talmud" (edited by James Hastings. Vol. III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924, p. 117).

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* explains that "the ancient Hebrew names of the months disappeared in the Exile and were *replaced by Babylonian names* [as we saw above]; but...before the Exile the months were more commonly designated by numbers." The encyclopedia goes on to say that "in Babylon the Jews adopted the Babylonian names, seven of which (Nissan, Sivan, Tebeth, Ellul, Kislev, Shebat, Adar) occur in Nehemiah and Esther, while six, (Tammuz, Ab, Ellul, Tishri and Shebat) are mentioned in the *Assouan Papyri* (5th century B.C.)" (Vol. 4, p. 580. 1943).

According to *Scribner's Dictionary of the Bible* (1898), "In the time of the earliest prophets, the New Moon stood in the same line with ANOTHER LUNAR OBSERVANCE, THE SABBATH. Ezekiel, who curiously enough frequently dates his prophecies on the New Moon (See Eze. 26:1; 29:17, 31:1, and 32:1) describes the gate of the inner court of the (new) temple looking eastward as kept shut for the six working days, but *opened on the Sabbath and the New Moon*" (p. 521).

We find that in the book of Ezekiel the prophet begins his book by dating it while he was by the river Chebar in the 5th year of King Jehoiachin's captivity on the 5th day of the 4th month (Ezekiel 1:1-2). He was commanded by YEHOVAH God to go to the House of Israel and speak to them (Ezekiel 3:4-5). Then, he sat before them seven days (verses 15-16) and, in chapter 4, YEHOVAH commanded Ezekiel to act out a prophecy concerning both Israel and Judah. Acting out this prophecy required Ezekiel to lay on his left side for 390 days, then turn to his right side and lay on it for 40 days (Ezekiel 4:1-6). Upon

completion of YEHOVAH's instructions, Ezekiel again dated his prophecy in the 6th year, 6th month, and fifth day (Ezekiel 8:1) -- exactly one year and two months later.

Now if Ezekiel was using a purely solar calendar (such as we use today), this period of time should have been 425 days or possibly 432 days if it was the 28th year when an extra week was added. Adding up the days that Ezekiel counted (this does not include any travel time), we get $7 + 390 + 40 = 437$ days.

With this number of days in this period of time, *it is not possible* for the calendar to be a solar type -- as some people have proposed. Nor could it be a regular lunar/solar calendar year of 12 months. The only possibility is *a lunar/solar calendar year that has the extra month added*. Adding up the time allowed in a 13-month year plus two months, gives us a period of time that lasts 443 days plus or minus one or two days to correct for the variable number of 29 or 30-day months. This agrees with Ezekiel's account of 437 days plus a few days of traveling time.

It is obvious from scripture, then, that the calendar of Israel during the time of the prophets was a lunar/solar calendar of the type that incorporated weeks that were *determined by the phases of the moon*. It is also beyond doubt that the lunar weekly cycle was not lost from the time of the prophets to the time of the Messiah.

When the Dead Sea Scrolls were uncovered, the archaeologists found three manuscripts dating to around the first century B.C. that had one purpose in common: to synchronize the 354-day lunar calendar with the 364-day solar calendar. In addition, the archaeologists found that two of these manuscripts -- 4Q320 and 4Q321 -- record the beginnings of the solar months and the festivals. The third, 4Q321A, may have done so as well, but, unfortunately, the relevant portion of the text has perished. All of these texts designate the name of the *priestly rotation* in service at the temple in Jerusalem at the time in question. Twenty-four courses of priests served altogether -- rotating into service for a week at a time. The names of these courses follow the Biblical list found in I Chronicles 24:7-18.

Now in manuscript 4Q320 Mishmerot A (fragment 1, column 1) we find --

Line 7: On the SABBATH of the course of Hakkoz is THE THIRTIETH DAY OF THE LUNAR MONTH, on the thirtieth day of the second solar month.

Line 12: On the SABBATH of the course of Seorim IS THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF THE LUNAR MONTH, on the twenty-fifth day of the seventh solar month.

Going now to manuscript 4Q321 Mishmerot Ba (fragment 1, column 1) we read --

Lines 4 & 5: ...and the FIRST CRESCENT [of the moon] is on the SABBATH of the course of Pethahiah, ON THE NINTH OF THE MONTH.

Finally, in manuscript 4Q321A Mishmerot Bb we discover –

Line 5: The FULL MOON IS ON THE SABBATH of the course of Koz, on the thirtieth day of the second month...

Right here is plain evidence that the priests in Jerusalem were keeping the lunar-based calendar that included *weeks pegged to the phases of the moon!* This was in the first few centuries before the Messiah. In a note found in ***The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*** we find mentioned that without correction "the LUNAR CALENDAR of the scroll writers lost nearly half an hour a month. These differences might be relatively insignificant for a few years, but eventually the seasons would begin to wander through the year, and THE PHASES OF THE MOON would not correspond to what was expected" (Wise, Abegg, and Cook. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1996. P. 298).

The New Testament Era

One thing is self-evident -- the Messiah had absolutely no problem with the day of the week the religious leaders of his day (the Pharisees) were observing the Sabbath on! He had plenty to say about the wall of restrictions and the dos and don'ts surrounding the Pharisees' concept of the Sabbath, and blasted them for their nit-picking and hypocrisy. But he never once corrected them over the TIMING of the Sabbath. So *when* were the Pharisees -- and the main part of the populace -- keeping the Sabbath? And, later, *when* were the early Christians keeping the Sabbath?

In the article ***Shawui Sabbath: Ancient Sabbath Observance*** we find written the following: "Most theologians and some scholars assume that mainstream Jewish society, at the time of Jesus...was practicing a fixed seven-day week which was the same as the *modern fixed seven-day week*. *This is extremely doubtful*. The change, from a lunar to a fixed week, was brought about by the power and influence of Rome. As long as the Nazarenes held power in Jerusalem, all Roman practices and customs, including that of THE CONSECUTIVE WEEK, WERE HELD AT BAY" (<http://www.geocities.com/Athens/3607/sabat.htm>).

This article goes on to explain that:

Yeshua...observed a Sabbath, but this Sabbath was NEITHER SATURDAY NOR SUNDAY. The Nazarene Sabbath was a LUNAR Sabbath *observed on the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth day* of THE LUNAR MONTH. (A lunar month starts on the New Moon). This was standard practice among the Beni-Aumen Nazarene Order and most of the other orthodox Jewish sects of the time...Lunar Sabbath observance is an ancient Semitic custom concurrent and ante-dating the time Yeshua..." (*ibid.*).

Further, states the article, "it is a mistake to assume the ancient followers of Yeshua...kept the modern week consisting of Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. THEY DID NOT. Their week was a LUNAR WEEK which started over EACH QUARTER MOON. Most scholars agree that the modern concept of the week began in the first century and was made popular by Rome, although there is not unanimous agreement on this point."

At the time of the Messiah the observance of the weekly Sabbath was a national law for those in Judah. "All seven sects, including the Nazarenes and Osseans, observed it, although NOT ALWAYS ON THE SAME DAY. The Ben-Zadok Order appears to have observed the Sabbath on a fixed week irrespective of the lunar cycle, whereas the Ben-Aumen [Nazarenes] OBSERVED THE SABBATH ACCORDING TO THE LUNAR QUARTERS (on the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th day of the lunar month)" (*ibid.*).

But what of the gentile Christians? Did this early split-off from the Nazarenes also observe a lunar Sabbath cycle? Early historical records clearly confirm that at a very early date gentile Christians ALSO KEPT THE SAME SABBATH CALENDAR AS THE NAZARENES!

In the article ***Shawui Calendar: Ancient Shawui Observance***, the author expounds on the fact that "the Sabbath observed by Yeshua (Jesus) and His family, was on NEITHER A SATURDAY NOR A SUNDAY, and is calculated in a manner altogether different than the modern custom of weekday observance...The method of calculating weekdays on Yeshua's calendar is at variance with the modern fixed week system. According to the...system, each week begins on either THE NEW, FIRST QUARTER, FULL MOON, or LAST QUARTER OF THE MOON."

Continuing, we read: "After the fourth lunar week of the month ends on the 28th, THE NEXT DAY OR TWO IS A DARK MOON DAY which is *not* part of any lunar week. (A new week does not begin until the following New Moon occurrence.) This may seem odd to one used to using the modern fixed week, but to the ancients it made perfect sense to pause and prepare themselves before entering and beginning a new month and a new cycle of weeks" (*ibid.*).

James Dwyer, in his article ***Advanced Astronomy in Bible Texts***, writes that "the early Christian descriptions of a weekly cycle (containing periodic single days) are VERY CLEAR, and this information (coupled with evidence provided by the measurable lunar/solar phenomena) STRONGLY INDICATES THAT EARLY CHRISTIANS WERE PRACTICING A LUNAR-BASED CALENDAR" (p. 42).

The same author, in another article entitled ***A New Look At the Christian Sabbath***, expresses the fact that "it now seems almost certain that some additional definitions of

the early Sabbath Cycle are missing from the modern tradition of the seven-day week. Essentially, the modern week -- as a continuous cycle of seven days -- does not seem to equate to the definition of the week AS IT WAS USED DURING THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ERA."

Writing about his article, Dwyer asserts that "this new research looks at the Sabbath calendar -- as it would have been known to a MAINSTREAM JEW LIVING IN THE SECOND TEMPLE ERA -- and it finds *the Sabbath* to have been a rather sophisticated interface *with the lunar-solar system*. In this earlier time, the Sabbath Cycle -- surprisingly -- WAS DEFINED BY THE PHASES OF THE MOON, and -- even more surprising than this -- the Sabbath Cycle also revolved into precise alignment with the annual circuit."

Later on, in the second century A.D., proof that the Jews were still keeping the Sabbath day according to the lunar week can be found in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (circa 150-215 A.D.): "[Peter] inferred thus: 'Neither worship as the Jews...[for] IF THE MOON IS NOT VISIBLE, they do not hold the SABBATH, which is called *the first*, nor do they hold the NEW MOON, nor the FEAST OF UNLEAVENED BREAD, nor the FEAST, nor the GREAT DAY'" (*The Stromata*, or *Miscellanies*, chapter 5).

This clearly indicates that at this time the weekly Sabbath was still dictated by the moon's course. Further, in chapter 16 of *The Stromata*, Clement plainly writes that "in periods of SEVEN DAYS the MOON undergoes its changes. In the FIRST WEEK she becomes HALF MOON; in the SECOND [WEEK], FULL MOON; and in the THIRD [WEEK], in her wane, AGAIN HALF MOON; and in the FOURTH [WEEK] she DISAPPEARS."

This is about as plain as it can get. Obviously, in Clement's day, the week (as kept by the Jews) was still tied to the moon's phases and, by extension, the weekly Sabbath was also still tied to the moon! It appears, however, that by this time (150-215 A.D.) some of the Christians had gotten away from a week and Sabbath that was dependent upon the lunar reckoning.

The Christian Divorcement of the Sabbath

In the years following Clement of Alexandria's time, an ominous change started to take place that was to radically change the Christian concept of the Sabbath. "This intimate connection," records the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, "between the week and the month was soon dissolved. It is certain that the week soon followed a development of its own, and it became the custom -- without paying any regard to the days of the month (i.e. the lunar month) -- ...so that THE NEW MOON NO LONGER COINCIDED WITH THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK" (The MacMillan Company, 1899, p. 5290).

Then, on page 4179 of the same encyclopedia, we read: "The introduction...of the custom of celebrating the Sabbath every 7th day, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE DAY TO THE MOON'S PHASES, led to a complete *separation* from the ancient view of the Sabbath..."

In the article ***Shawui Calendar: Ancient Shawui Observance***, we find confirmation of this radical change in YEHOVAH God's calendar --

The [lunar]...calendar was used by ALL the original disciples of Yeshua...This original Nazarene lunar-solar calendar was supplanted by a Roman "planetary week" and calendar in 135 C.E. -- when the "Bishops of the Circumcision" (i.e. legitimate Nazarene successors to Yeshua) *were displaced from Jerusalem*. This began a three hundred year controversy concerning the TRUE CALENDAR AND CORRECT SABBATH:

This [calendar] controversy arose after the exodus of the bishops of the circumcision and has continued until our time" (***Epiphanius***, HE4, 6, 4).

"The groundwork for this supplanting of the true calendar", suggests the ancient historian Iranaeus, "began in Rome with a Bishop Sixtus (c.a. 116-c.a.126)."

According to Iranaeus, "Sixtus was the first to celebrate a Sunday Easter in Rome instead of the traditional Nisan 15 [full moon] date on the lunar calendar. This change from the luni-solar to a fixed solar calendar occurred in Rome during the repressive measures which were enacted against ALL Jewish customs and practices, INCLUDING THE LUNAR CALENDAR, during the reign of Emperor Hadrian. With the fall of the Nazarene headquarters...at Jerusalem, this new Roman calendar quickly spread throughout 'Christendom.' This NEW CALENDAR not only replaced yearly festival dates such as Passover, BUT IT ALSO REVAMPED THE CONCEPT OF THE WEEK AND ITS SEVENTH DAY."

Hutton Webster points out that "the early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish [lunar] seven-day week with its numbered weekdays, but by the close of the third century A.D. this began to give way to *the planetary week*; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests to the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism" (***Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality***. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916, p. 220).

It should be noted that the oldest dated Christian inscription to employ a planetary designation belongs to the year 269 A.D. (***Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae***, ed. De Rossi, 1861, i, No. 1).

In the article ***Shawui Sabbath: Ancient Sabbath Observance***, the author asks these questions --

But what of Gentile Christians? Did this early break-off of true Nazarene[s]...also observe a Sabbath cycle? Early historical records clearly confirm that very early Gentile Christians also kept the same [lunar] Sabbath Calendar as the...Nazarenes. This practice was first changed by [Pope] Sixtus in 126 A.D. and later officially changed by a royal Roman decree from the emperor Constantine. Observance of the Sabbath day was made illegal and observance of a "Sunday" of a FIXED WEEK was made mandatory for all except farmers. Previous to this time the ROMAN SATURDAY was the *FIRST DAY OF THE ROMAN WEEK*. The veneration of the Sun in the second century A.D. began to pressure Roman culture to *change* the first day of their week FROM SATURDAY TO SUNDAY. (Had the Jews been observing this same Roman calendar at this early date, as some maintain, then their seventh day Sabbath would have been on FRIDAY, which was the the traditional seventh day of this Roman calendar during the first century A.D.).

Hutton Webster adds that "the change from such [lunar] cycles to those UNCONNECTED WITH THE LUNATIONS would not have involved so abrupt and sudden a departure from the previous system of time reckoning as that from a bipartite division of the lunar month *to a week which ran continuously through the months and the years*" (***Rest Days***).

Babylonian Rabbis Divorce the Sabbath

While the influence of Rome caused the early Christians to adopt a continuous seven-day week with the Sabbath on every seventh day, the Jews came under a more subtle influence.

Following the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., the Palestinian Jews struggled hard to retain control of the sacred calendar. Notes the ***Encyclopedia Britannica***:

The calendar was originally fixed by observation, and ultimately by calculation. Up to the fall of the Temple (A.D. 70), witnesses who saw the new moon came forward and were strictly examined and if their evidence was accepted the month *was fixed by the priests*. Eventually the authority passed to the SANHEDRIN and ultimately to the PATRIARCH. When necessary, a second "Adar" was inserted in order that the reaping of the corn should come at Passover. Gradually observation gave place to *calculation*. The right to determine the calendar was reserved to the PATRIARCHATE; the JEWS OF MESOPOTAMIA tried in vain to *establish their own calendar* but the prerogative of Palestine was zealously defended.

Continues the encyclopedia –

So long as Palestine remained a religious centre, it was naturally to the homeland that the Diaspora looked for its calendar. Uniformity was essential, for if different parts had celebrated feasts on different days confusion would have ensued. IT WAS NOT UNTIL THE 4TH CENTURY A.D. THAT BABYLON FIXED THE CALENDAR...The Talmud speaks of *various* New Year's Days. It may be regarded as certain that in Palestine the New Year [Rosh Hoshana] began in NISSAN (cf. Exod. xii. 2) and IN BABYLON in TISHRI (volume 4, article "Calendar").

What is not realized by many is that control of the calendar implied ultimate POLITICAL AUTHORITY in Judaism. In other words, whoever controlled the calendar also controlled the destiny of the Jewish people -- for good or for evil!

"In the period after 70 C.E." writes Herschel Shanks, "THE RABBIS ARROGATED THIS AUTHORITY TO THEMSELVES. In the story that appears in the Talmudim, Rabbi Hananiah, an émigré Judean scholar, tried to assert the SUPREMACY OF BABYLONIAN JEWRY by asserting its right (that is, *his own right while in Babylonia*) to intercalate the calendar. His attempt was unsuccessful because it was SEVERAL CENTURIES TOO EARLY. This authority remained for some time with the rabbis in the land of Israel" (***Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism***, p. 197).

Notes Shanks --

All this BEGAN TO CHANGE IN THE THIRD CENTURY C.E. Ultimately the rabbis of Babylonia themselves cited, in retrospect, the return of one of their own, Rav (Abba), to Babylonia in 219 C.E., as the BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA in the relative status of the two great Jewish communities: "We have made ourselves [or, consider ourselves] in Babylonia like Eretz Israel -- from when Rav went down to Babylonia." While this may seem to telescope a long drawn out process into one identifiable event, the fact is that the date designated in that statement indeed POINTS ACCURATELY TO THE EARLY THIRD CENTURY, when Babylonia's star began to rise (*ibid.*, p. 262).

While the control of the calendar remained in the hands of the Palestinian Jews it was inviolate; but when control passed to the Babylonian Jews events transpired that affected the calendar and the keeping of YEHOVAH God's true Sabbath day. The environment that brought this about is discussed by Herschel Shanks in the following pages of his book –

As we enter the third century, we find that the Jews of Babylonia have at their head an EXILARCH (resh galuta, "HEAD OF THE DIASPORA") with [false] claims to

Davidic lineage...But the exilarchate did not rule the Babylonian Jewish communities single-handedly. Alongside the exilarch a new framework of leadership -- THE RABBIS OF BABYLON -- emerged.

Continues Shanks:

If the rabbis of Babylonia were PRUDENT in their relationship with the exilarch, they were EVEN MORE CAUTIOUS in defining and publicly stating their attitude toward the GOVERNMENT. As we have already noted, it is in Babylonia [not Palestine] that we encounter the well-formulated principle that "THE LAW OF THE GOVERNMENT IS LAW" (*ibid.*, pp. 263-264).

Shanks brings out the fact that there were very marked differences in the ATTITUDE TOWARD GOVERNMENT and the preservation of Jewish religion and life between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews. The Palestinian Jews jealously guarded their religion and way of life while the Babylonian Jews were clearly willing to accommodate the government of their area and COMPROMISE certain principles they held. This included the Sabbath day.

During this time a major revival of the Zoroastrian religion took place (226 A.D.) when the first Sassanian King, Ardeshir, came to the Persian throne. He made reforms to the old lunar-based calendar that had a far-reaching effect on his people (especially the Jews) who initially rejected his new calendar since it affected their religious observances. This resulted, for a while, in TWO CALENDARS, one decreed by the king and the other, older one, followed by the majority of the people in the Kingdom. Eventually, however, the new calendar won out and the Persians, as well as the Jews of Babylonia, began to organize their sabbaths according to the new solar calendar.

Hutton Webster makes mention of this fact, stating that

There is extant a Pehlevi tract, said to have been composed in Persia during the FOURTH CENTURY A.D., which mentions among other matters FIVE DAYS IN EVERY MONTH, namely, THE 1ST, 7TH, 14TH, 22ND, AND 30TH, as times to be observed by *abstinence from all worldly business*...These precepts are no longer observed; in fact, their very existence is unknown to most Parsis at the present day. See D.F. Karaka, *History of the Parsis*, London, 1884, i, 132 sqq. (***Rest Days: A Study in Early Law and Morality***. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916. Footnote p. 166).

In the early centuries of the Christian era many Christians became confused over the proper date for Passover. This is made clear by the early 5th century church historian Socrates Scholasticus (born circa 379 A.D. in Constantinople) in his ***Ecclesiastical History*** –

...In Asia Minor most people kept the fourteenth day of the moon, DISREGARDING THE SABBATH: yet they never separated from those who did otherwise, until Victor, bishop of Rome, influenced by too ardent a zeal, fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the Quartodecimans in Asia. Wherefore also Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, severely censured Victor by letter for his immoderate heat; telling him that although the ancients differed in their celebration of Easter [Passover], they did not desist from intercommunion. Also that Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who afterwards suffered martyrdom under Gordian, continued to communicate with Anicetus bishop of Rome, although he himself, according to the usage of his native Smyrna, kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, as Eusebius attests in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*. While therefore some in Asia Minor observed the day above-mentioned, OTHERS IN THE EAST KEPT THAT FEAST ON THE SABBATH INDEED, but differed as regards the month. THE FORMER [those in Asia Minor] THOUGHT THE JEWS SHOULD BE FOLLOWED, THOUGH THEY WERE NOT EXACT: the latter kept Easter [Passover] after the equinox, REFUSING TO CELEBRATE WITH THE JEWS; "for," said they, "it ought to be celebrated when the sun is in Aries, in the month called Xanthicus by the Antiochians, and April by the Romans." In this practice, they averred, THEY CONFORMED NOT TO THE MODERN JEWS, WHO ARE MISTAKEN IN ALMOST EVERYTHING, *BUT TO THE ANCIENTS*, and to JOSEPHUS according to what he has written in the third book of his Jewish Antiquities. Thus these people were at issue among themselves. But all the other Christians in the Western parts, and as far as the ocean itself, are found to have celebrated Easter after the equinox, from a very ancient tradition (book 5, chapter 22).

Notice here that the early Christians were sharply divided over the correct date for Passover. Two ideas were prevalent: (1) That Passover should be observed on the 14th day of the moon while *disregarding* the lunar weekly Sabbath cycle. (This belief was based upon the premise that "the Jews should be followed"). However, this idea was vigorously contested by (2) "Others in the East [who] kept that feast ON THE SABBATH indeed, but differed as regards the [use of a calendar based exclusively upon the whole moon] or month." "Based upon the Eastern practice," notes James Dwyer, "it was believed that the then Jews WERE NOT IN COMPLETE ADHERENCE WITH MORE ANCIENT JEWISH PRACTICES" (*A New Look at the Christian Sabbath*).

"Essentially," continues Dwyer, "one group adhered to the *practice of current Jews* (which was the determination of Passover by the 14th day of the Moon, and by a strictly lunar-based calendar). The other group adhered to a *more ancient Jewish determination* which computed the date of Passover according to the SABBATH CALENDAR (the same as the ancient Chodesh Cycle -- or fixed weeks plus renewal [or new moon] days" (*ibid.*).

This passage from Socrates Scholasticus clearly shows that the Jews had gone astray by the early 5th century and were no longer keeping the weekly Sabbath cycle (which was in tune with the moon's phases) as ordained by YEHOVAH God in Exodus 16. The fact that "others in the East kept that feast [Passover] *on the sabbath*" indicates that this group was still keeping YEHOVAH's lunar weekly Sabbath calendar -- under this calendar the first high day of Passover ALWAYS fell on a weekly Sabbath (the 15th of Nisan).

Saturn and the Sabbath

Talking about the time prior to the Diaspora, Hutton Webster tells us that

an old and still common theory derives the Sabbath institution from the worship of SATURN after which planet the *first day* of the astrological week [Saturday] received its designation. The theory is untenable for more than one reason. In the first place the Hebrews did not name their weekdays after the planets, but indicated them by ordinal numbers. In the second place SATURN'S DAY [SATURDAY] BEGAN THE PLANETARY WEEK, while the Jewish Sabbath was regarded as the LAST DAY of the seven, a suitable position for a rest day. And in the third place neither the Hebrews nor any other Oriental people ever worshipped the planet Saturn as a god and OBSERVED *HIS DAY AS A FESTIVAL* (*ibid.*, p. 243).

However, in the Diaspora, this soon changed with the influence of the Zoroastrian revival and the Roman planetary week:

These imported [from Babylon] superstitions eventually led Jewish rabbis to call Saturn SHABBTI, "the STAR OF THE SABBATH," [and]...*it was not until [after]the first century of our era*, when the planetary week had become an established institution, THAT THE JEWISH SABBATH SEEMS ALWAYS TO HAVE CORRESPONDED TO SATURN'S DAY [SATURDAY]" (*ibid.*, p. 244).

"*The association of the Sabbath Day with Saturday*," explains Webster, "was probably one reason why Saturn, a planet in Babylonian astrological schemes regarded as beneficent rather than malefic, should have come to assume in late classical times the role of an unlucky star (sidus tristissimum, stella iniquissima)...Dio Cassius [Roman historian born 155 A.D., died after 230 A.D.] also speaks of the Jews having DEDICATED TO THEIR GOD THE DAY CALLED THE DAY OF SATURN [SATURDAY], 'on which, among many other most peculiar actions, they undertake no serious occupation'...Tacitus [another Roman historian] (Historiae, V, 4) thinks that the Jewish Sabbath may be an observance in honour of Saturn..." (*Rest Days*, p. 244-245).

Notes the ***Universal Jewish Encyclopedia***: "With the development of the importance of the Sabbath as a day of consecration and the emphasis laid upon the significant number seven, the week became more and more DIVORCED FROM ITS LUNAR CONNECTION..."(volume 10, 1943. Article, "Week," p. 482).

Also, writes Hutton Webster, "the establishment of a periodic week ending in a Sabbath observed every seventh day was doubtless responsible for the gradual obsolescence of the NEW MOON FESTIVAL AS A PERIOD OF GENERAL ABSTINENCE, since with continuous weeks the new-moon day and the Sabbath Day would from time to time coincide" (*ibid.*, p. 255).

This obsolescence of the New Moon festival is also noted by the ***Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*** --

However, in the Diaspora the New Moon came to occupy a secondary position in contrast to the Sabbath; the prohibition against work and the carrying on of commerce was LIFTED, and the New Moon, although still celebrated by means of increased offerings, soon was *reduced* to the rank of a *minor of half holiday*. Its importance was confined to the fact that it remained of great value and necessity for the fixing of the festivals (volume 8, p. 171. Article "New Moon").

Eviator Zerubavel, in his book ***The Seven Day Circle: The History and Meaning of the Week***, observes that:

The Jewish and astrological weeks evolved quite independently of one another. However, given the coincidence of their identical length, it was only a matter of time before some permanent correspondence between particular Jewish days and particular planetary days would be made. A PERMANENT CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SABBATH AND "THE DAY OF SATURN" WAS THUS ESTABLISHED...[some time] later than the first century of the present era, Jews EVEN CAME TO NAME THE PLANET SATURN SHABTAI, AFTER THE ORIGINAL HEBREW NAME OF THE SABBATH, SHABBATH. Moreover, as they came into closer contact with Hellenism, their conception of their holy day was evidently AFFECTED BY THE ASTROLOGICAL CONCEPTION OF SATURN AS A PLANET that has an overwhelming negative influence (a conception which, incidentally, is still evident even from the association of the English word "saturnine" with a gloomy disposition). There are traditional Jewish superstitious beliefs about demons and evil spirits that hold full sway on the Sabbath, and an old Jewish legend even links the *choice* of "the day of Saturn" as the official Jewish rest day with the superstition that it would be an inauspicious day for doing any work anyway! (New York: The Free Press, 1985, p. 17).

Commerce and the Sabbath

On page 11 Zerubavel makes some interesting comments about the Jewish divorcement of YEHOVAH's true Sabbath day from the lunar phases --

...the dissociation of the week from a natural cycle such as THE WAXING AND WANING OF THE MOON can be seen as part of a general movement toward introducing a *supernatural deity*. Not being personified as any particular natural force, the Jewish god was to be regarded as untouched by nature in any way. Accordingly, *the day dedicated to this god* was to be regarded as part of a divine temporal pattern that *transcends even nature itself*. That obviously involved DIS-SOCIATING THE WEEK FROM NATURE AND ITS RHYTHMS. Only by being based on an entirely *artificial mathematical rhythm* could the Sabbath observance BECOME TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF THE LUNAR OR ANY OTHER NATURAL CYCLE.

Zerubavel goes on to say that:

A continuous seven-day cycle that runs throughout history *paying no attention whatsoever to the moon and its phases* is a distinctly JEWISH INVENTION. Moreover, the dissociation of the seven-day week from nature has been one of the most significant contributions of Judaism to civilization. Like the invention of the mechanical clock some 1,500 years later, it facilitates the establishment of what Lewis Mumford identified as "mechanical periodicity," thus essentially increasing the distance between human beings and nature. Quasi [lunar] weeks and [continuous] weeks actually represent TWO FUNDAMENTALLY DISTINCT MODES OF TEMPORAL ORGANIZATION OF HUMAN LIFE, the former involving partial adaptation to nature, and the latter stressing TOTAL EMANCIPATION FROM IT. The invention of the continuous week was therefore one of the most significant breakthroughs in human beings' attempts to BREAK AWAY from being prisoners of nature [and from under God's law] and create a social world of their own (***The Seven Day Circle***, p. 11).

The author further expounds, on page 8 of his book –

...the establishment of a seven-day week based on the *regular* observance of the Sabbath IS A DISTINCTIVELY JEWISH CONTRIBUTION [?] TO CIVILIZATION...it is crucial to remember that the ANCIENT DWELLERS OF MESOPOTAMIA themselves did not have a real seven-day week [as we know it today]. While...the seven-day intervals entailed in the regular observance of *the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days of the lunar month*...served as the model for the Jewish week, they themselves cannot be considered weeks. Such intervals, which I shall call *quasi-weeks*, undoubtedly bear a striking resemblance to the week and are often mistaken for it. Nevertheless, they are an essentially different phenomenon.

One of the most distinctive features of the [present] week is the fact that it is *entirely dissociated from the lunar cycle*. It is essentially defined as a precise multiple of the day, *quite independently of the lunar month*. Quasi [lunar] weeks, on the other hand, are generally defined as rough approximations of fractions of the lunar month, and are appropriately called "lunar weeks" by Francis H. Colson (*ibid.*).

Zerubavel concludes by saying that

...the indispensability of a CONTINUOUS week for the establishment of settled life with a high level of social organization, [was] particularly significant since the RISE OF A MARKET ECONOMY, which involved orderly contact on regular recurrent, periodic market days. Only by establishing a *weekly cycle of an unvarying, standard length* could society guarantee that the continuity of its life would never be interrupted by natural phenomena such as the lunar cycle. The DISSOCIATION OF THE WEEK FROM THE LUNAR CYCLE, is, therefore, the most significant breakthrough in the evolution of this cycle from its somewhat rudimentary and imperfect [?] predecessor. Only by defining the week as a precise multiple of the day, rather than...a fraction of the lunar month, could human beings permanently avoid the problem of having to handle LOOSE REMAINDERS and, thus, introduce into their lives the sort of temporal regularity that they could never attain with the quasi [lunar] week (*The Seven Day Circle*, p. 10).

Other Lands

While the weekly Sabbath was divorced from the lunar reckoning by the Babylonian rabbis, the lunar Sabbath continued to be kept in various parts of the world. Hutton Webster makes mention of the fact that

The Buddhist Sabbath, or *uposatha*, like the Jain *posaha*, owed its existence remotely to the Vedic lunar rites. As celebrated anciently in India and in modern times in Nepal and Ceylon [Sri Lanka], the *uposatha* falls on the DAY OF THE NEW MOON, on the DAY OF THE FULL MOON, and on the TWO DAYS which are EIGHTH from new and full moons. The *uposatha* is marked not only by fasting but also by *abstinence from secular activities*: during its continuance buying and selling, work and business, hunting and fishing are forbidden, and all schools and courts of justice are closed...The *uposatha*, as contrasted with the *upavasatha*, is a ceremony attached to ALL FOUR OF THE LUNAR PHASES, instead of to two only; moreover, it is a REST DAY as well as a fast day...Elsewhere the *uposatha* service is referred particularly to the FIFTEENTH DAY OF THE MONTH, "it being full moon" (*Rest Days*, pp. 155-156).

The Chinese festivals at the moon's phases reach back into the past as far as the historical eye can follow them.