

Is the . . .

**SABBATH OF THE
FIRST COVENANT
BINDING UPON
CHRISTIANS TODAY?**

By S. H. HALL

Introductory

This tract is being published and sent out at the earnest request of a large number who have heard me in some of my discussions with the Adventists. It does not claim to be an exhaustive study of the question, but the ground is sufficiently covered to enable me to say that there is not a man on the earth who can make just one argument that will stand the testing in behalf of binding on God's people today the fourth command of the Decalogue.

Most assuredly I would have no objections whatever to keeping the Sabbath command if it were the will of my Lord now for me to do so. But the Sabbath command is no part of the New Covenant under which God's people today live, hence it is not binding on us today. We have a different day altogether that is brimful of meaning because of its relationship to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

We pass this on to the reading public, asking for it an unprejudiced study. The author is perfectly sure that you will find enough in the following pages to forever settle the Sabbath question with any unprejudiced heart.

S. H. HALL

The Adventists' Offer

The Adventists are great people for offering rewards for Scriptures in behalf of *the first day of the week* being sanctified or set apart for any purpose. The following is their latest, put out the first week in February, 1937:

\$5,000 and a new 1937 Pontiac given for a text of Scripture stating the sanctification of Sunday, or the first day of the week; or that calls it a holy day, or Sabbath day; or that commands Christians to keep it. Bring the text and get the cash.

Now, that sounds big, but we will puncture it to show that it is only a windbag. Of course, wholly unprejudiced hearts will have to judge as to whether we produce the Scripture, and it will not be left to the Adventists to say the Scripture has not been produced, nor for us to say it has. I accept the challenge and suggest a perfectly just course to pursue in this matter—namely, that we select an unprejudiced judge of one of our courts here in Nashville: let the Adventists name one; then these two name the third. I will be glad to meet any man they produce, and before these judges, as well as the invited public, our case will be presented and we will abide their decision. Of course I will not use the money for my own personal use, but now agree to give it to some worthy educational institution or orphans home. We leave it with our Adventist friends to come forward with their \$5,000 and 1937 Pontiac and have them ready for delivery. But you will hear no more of this from our Adventist friends. They have much to say about rewards for this Scripture

and that one. It is all hot air, and we ask the unprejudiced reader to please listen for the disposition they make of what I have said above.

But you ask: "Where are some of the Scriptures they call for?" We will give a few, but you will find this subject fully discussed on the pages that follow in this booklet.

1. "Sanctify" means to "separate, or set apart for a certain use." One of the definitions is: "To separate and appoint anything to a holy or religious use." That our Lord has done this for the first day of the week the pages that follow abundantly teach; but a few plain statements just here that you may know now that we stand on the immovable rock of truth in our faith and practice, so far as the first day of the week is concerned.

2. Study carefully Ps. 118: 22-24: "This is the day which Jehovah hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." That this refers to the first day of the week can be established beyond a doubt. Language could not declare the sanctification and setting apart of a day for holy use more strongly than these words. But you will find this fully discussed further on in this booklet.

3. Study carefully 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." Certainly giving of our means for the work of the Lord is a holy thing. Here the first day of the week is sanctified and set apart for such holy use. Each child of God is here taught to check up on his income at the close of each week, and at the beginning of the next week, the first day of that week, place in God's treasury a part of his income for the work of the Lord.

Adventists argue that this laying by him in store has

no reference to the regular collections we have in our congregations on the first day of the week, but rather laying by in a separate place the Lord's money in our homes. I do not need to argue this here. Let the Adventists answer these questions: (1) Does not the Bible here name the first day of the week for this to be done? (2) And does this not sanctify and set apart this day for such holy use?

4. Study Acts 20: 7: "And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them." This breaking of bread was the Lord's Supper. Is it not a holy thing? Does this Scripture not teach that the first day of the week was sanctified and set apart for such assembling? Of course our Adventist friends say this breaking of bread was a common meal; but they forget that Paul was in this meeting, and he plainly commands that there be no coming together for such a meal, but that such a meal rather be eaten at home. (Study 1 Cor. 11: 20-34.) Of course there was such a thing as their having food for refreshment in their prolonged meetings, as in this case, for Paul ate at midnight for his own physical needs. You will note in verse 11 that only Paul did this eating. A man can hardly preach all night and a part of a day without eating something for his own physical strength. But the point I make is that the *coming together* on the first day of the week was to eat the Lord's Supper, a thing in which they all participated, and that Paul teaches against such assembling for an ordinary meal, but rather advises that that be eaten at home.

Perhaps the Adventists turn and twist more at this Scripture than at any other, trying to get the eating done on some day rather than the first day of the week. They claim that the first day of the week began after six o'clock Saturday evening, and they want to know just when that

midnight eating took place, whether it was Saturday night at twelve o'clock or what we call Sunday night at twelve.

Let it here be stated that in giving us the New Testament Scriptures the Holy Spirit did not reckon the day as beginning at six o'clock in the evening and going to six o'clock the following day. Take not my word for it, kind reader. Let us go to the Book that forever settles it. Turn to Matt. 28: 1: "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," the women came and found the sepulcher empty. Note the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the dawning of the first day of the week are close together. "Dawning" here, as all know, means the beginning of the light of a new day. Now read Mark 16: 2: "And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Matthew says they came to the sepulcher as the first day of the week was *dawning*, and Mark says *at the rising of the sun*. And you will note, as already stated, they came "*in the end of the sabbath*." This makes the day be reckoned from sun to sun, instead of from the setting of the sun till another setting of the sun. Then in John 20: 19 you have this statement: "*Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week*." Read all of this chapter from verse 1 through verse 19, and you have the story of our Lord's resurrection on the first day of the week and his meeting the disciples not until the evening of that day. But evening came after six o'clock, and according to the Jewish way of reckoning a day's ending and beginning, it would have been the next day and not the same day. I would love for some one to tell me why the Holy Spirit put in that parenthetical expression—namely, "*being the first day of the week*"—anyhow. Paul says every Scripture inspired of God is profitable—that is, it was given for some definite purpose. What is the purpose of this parenthetical expression? It has no purpose under the heavens

except to let us know that the Holy Spirit, in writing the New Testament, reckoned the day from sun to sun, and the day did not end after six o'clock.

5. Now read the plain command to assemble: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching." (Heb. 10: 25.) I think the definite article "the" set before "day," making it "the day," should be enough to show unprejudiced souls that the Holy Spirit is talking about a specific, definite day that had been sanctified and set apart for such meetings. Of course the Adventists here try to make this the judgment day. But the idea of our exhorting one another to assemble in the judgment day! I guess we will assemble there without any exhortation. This is a day they could see approaching, and a day on which they could neglect to assemble. Here is the command to assemble, and a definite day is declared to exist. Acts 20: 7 and 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2 declare what day it was.

And I can even go back to the Old Testament and prove the *sanctification* or *setting apart* of the first day of the week for holy use. Read Lev. 23: 9-11. It plainly says, "On the morrow after the sabbath" the sheaf of the first fruits of the harvest had to be offered. The morrow after the Sabbath was the first day of the week, as you well know. The first fruits of the harvest were a type of our Lord's resurrection. (1 Cor. 15: 20.) The first day of the week was selected by Jehovah more than fifteen hundred years before Jesus was born as the day for him to arise from the dead. He did not arise by accident on that day. (Mark 16: 9.) This proves the sanctification of the first day of the week with a vengeance.

But enough just now on the call for the Scripture that teaches that the first day of the week has ever been sanctified or set apart for any holy use. I have given you enough already, but read the following pages of the book-

let, then let me know what you think of it by addressing S. H. Hall, Noelton Lane, Nashville, Tenn. And I thank you.

Weighed in the Balances of God's Truth

Solomon says: "Buy the truth, and sell it not." (Prov. 23: 23.) Well may we heed this timely advice, for it is by the truth that we are to be judged in the last day. Christ says the truth makes us free. (John 8: 30-32.) James says it saves our soul. (James 1: 21.) Foolish, indeed, is the man who allows himself, because of prejudice or preconceived ideas and notions of his own, to cast Jehovah's truth aside and receive it not. The awakening of such souls to the folly of their way will be fearful in the judgment to come. In the very beginning let me insist that we open the "Grand Old Book" and let it have its own way in our hearts.

I. RIGHTLY DIVIDING THE WORD OF TRUTH

The Spirit says, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, *rightly dividing* the word of truth." (2 Tim. 2: 15.) The Revised Version reads, "Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, *handling aright* the word of truth." *Handling aright* and *rightly dividing* the word of truth mean one and the same thing. Peter says some wrest the scriptures unto their own destruction. (2 Pet. 3: 16.) Paul speaks of those who "would pervert the gospel of Christ." (Gal. 1: 7.) How careful we should be not to be of this number.

No man *handles aright* the word of truth who does not recognize the dividing line between the Old and the New Covenants, when one ended and the other began. This is one of the principal causes of so much confusion over

Bible teaching. Should we not remember that *rightly dividing* the word of truth is as much a command as to study? Mix these two covenants in your Bible study, and you get confusion worse confounded; but recognize the difference between them, when one ended and the other began, and the Bible is as plain as day.

But does the Bible speak of two covenants and teach that they must not be mixed? Indeed it does. Now listen carefully to this reading: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: *for these are the two covenants*; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar (Old Covenant) is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. . . . Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman (Old Covenant) and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman (New Covenant). So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman (Old Covenant), but of the free (New Covenant)." (Gal. 4: 21-31.) Could language be stronger, teaching us that these two covenants cannot exist together?

But suppose we read more. Of what testament were the apostles made ministers? Hear Paul: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the *new covenant*; not of the letter (Old Testament), but of the spirit (New Testament): for the letter (Old Testament) killeth, but the spirit (New Testament) giveth life. But if the ministration of death (Old Testament), written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the

glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit (New Testament) be rather glorious? . . . For if *that which is done away* was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: and not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of *that which is abolished.*" (2 Cor. 3: 6-13.) Should not this satisfy the hungry soul? Does not this show conclusively that we are not under the Old Testament, but under the New? Truly it declares, "The law (Old Testament) was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." (John 1: 17.)

II. A NEW COVENANT IS PROMISED

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *new covenant* with house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, *A new covenant*, he hath made the *first old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. 8: 8-13.) Now let some one try to express, in stronger terms than this, the fact that we have the two testaments or covenants spoken of in the Bible and that one had to end.

When God speaks, he has to mean something. The above language could not mean anything else. Hence it means that.

This Old Testament was added to the promise God made to Abraham, because of transgression, till the Christ should come. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. . . . Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed (Christ) should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. . . . 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 (Old Testament).*" (Gal. 3: 16, 19, 24, 25.)

Please to note that the law spoken of here was added four hundred and thirty years after the promise was made to Abraham (see verse seventeen), and was not what the Adventists are pleased to call the ceremonial law, added by Moses to the Ten Commandments immediately after they were given to Moses.

Before the Old Testament could end, Christ must come and fulfill it and he himself take it out of the way. Hence, Christ was born under the law (Old Testament) and lived by it till the time came for it to end, and then he removed it. "But when the fulness 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." (Gal. 4: 4, 5.) He told the people in his personal ministry that "one jot or one tittle" should "in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5: 18), thus giving them to understand that when it was fulfilled it would pass away.

But did Christ "finish it"? Did he take it "out of the

way"? If so, when? These are important questions. Now hear the Spirit and let us see about the matter. "Then said he (Christ), Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first (Testament), that he may establish the second (Testament)." (Heb. 10: 9.) This declares that one of the purposes for which Christ came to the earth was to remove the "First Testament," and that it was God's will that this be done. May I not insist then that you who are still trying to bind the Sabbath, etc., of the Old Testament on people now stop praying "thy will be done" until you are willing to let the things that pertained to the Old Testament stay where Christ left them? When did Christ take the first out of the way? Listen:

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.*" (Col. 2: 14-17.)

Could God tell us in stronger and plainer sentences that the Old Testament has ended and when it ended? Certainly not. Sabbath days, new moons, eating meats, etc., belong to the *First Testament*. Since that testament has been taken out of the way, no one has the right to come along and judge us about these things. Kind reader, have you let men judge you about these things, and persuade you to go back to the observance of days under the Old Testament? Some of the people whom Paul had converted were led by perverters of the truth to do such things. Paul, in writing to them, says: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am

afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (Gal. 4: 10, 11.)

Our Adventist friends claim that the days mentioned in Colossians were types or shadows, but that the seventh day, Sabbath, was not a type or shadow. Their claim here is that God rested on the seventh day before sin entered into the world and before types were made. But in this they are wholly wrong. Adam was certainly made before sin entered, but Adam was a type or shadow. (See 1 Cor. 15 : 22, 45.)

It not only declares that Christ came to fulfill and end the First Testament, and that he did take it out of the way when he died on the cross; but Christ while dying declared, "It is finished." (John 19: 30.) Furthermore, Paul says: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (Heb. 7: 12.) The law, then, had to change. "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." (Heb. 7: 22.) "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9: 15.)

III. THE FIRST COVENANT WAS THE TEN COMMANDMENT COVENANT

It is taught that the *First Testament* that Christ took out of the way did not contain the Ten Commandments. This is done by those who make the Sabbath an idol in their effort to save it. Now let us see about this. (1) What covenant was to be done away and superseded by a new covenant? It was the covenant that God made when he led the children of Israel out of Egypt. "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." (See Jer. 31: 31, 32; Heb. 8: 9.) (2) Did this covenant contain the Ten Commandments on tables of stone? Indeed it did. In fact, the Ten Commandments was the covenant then made. All else was written "after the tenor of these words." (See Ex. 24: 3, 4; 34: 27.) Hear Solomon "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." (1 Kings 8: 21.) Now what was in that ark anyway? Listen, "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt." (See ninth verse of the same chapter.) The man that says the Ten Commandments were not the covenant then made says that this scripture is false. But more still, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." But what, was this covenant never before made? Read right on and let's see. After stating that this covenant was not made for the people under the patriarchal dispensation that lasted from Adam to Moses, you find all of the Ten Commandments named, the reason given for the fourth commandment in the fifteenth verse, then in verse twenty-two it says: "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." (See Deut. 5: 1-22.) Turn and read this for yourself. That man is fighting against God who tries to make that *First Testament* that Christ took out of the way anything else but the *Ten Commandment covenant*.

But do not understand us to teach that none of the Ten

Commandments are binding on us today. Reading Rom. 13: 8-10 you have five of the Ten Commandments. In Eph. 2: 3 you have another. In fact, nine of the ten are in the New Covenant. But the fourth commandment was made. (See Mark 2: 27.) All the other commandments were right in the very nature of things and did not have to be made. They belong to the moral law. There is no such thing as one day being more sacred than another except God makes it so. Here study Rom. 14: 5, 6. He made the seventh day sacred when he gave it to the Jews to observe in memory of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. (See Deut. 5: 15.) But he has made another day based on something of greater importance to us, viz.: our Lord becoming the "head stone of the corner" by his resurrection. (See Psalm 118: 22-24.) But more about this later.

Only those commandments in the *First Testament* that have been brought over and incorporated in the *New Testament* are now binding upon us. And they are binding, not because they were in the Old, but because Christ made them a part of the New. Just like a new constitution that this state might make—only that found in the new constitution could be used as a basis of our government. The new constitution might contain things that were in the old, but they would be binding because they had been made a part of the new and not because they had formerly been in the old.

IV. THE SUM OF THE WHOLE MATTER

Now let us restate some of these things in a more orderly and condensed way. Nothing is so powerful as God's eternal truth. If error you want to crush, just keep hammering away with what God has to say. God says, through Jeremiah, that his word is "like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces." (Jer. 23: 29.)

1. God made a covenant with the children of Israel

after he led them out of Egypt.—Proof (1 Kings 8: 21): "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt."

2. This covenant was the Ten Commandments written on tables of stone.—Proof (1 Kings 8: 9): "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt."

How could language be plainer? It declares that the covenant God made with Israel when he brought them out of the land of Egypt was in the ark, and then declares that *there was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone* that contained the Ten Commandments. Is it not strange that any one would contend in the face of these scriptures that the covenant then made was not the Ten Commandments?

3. This covenant never had been given before.—Proof (Deut. 5: 2-22): "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, . . . saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before me. . . . These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me."

4. In this covenant the Sabbath was made known.—Proof (Neh. 9: 13, 14): "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and

gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments. And madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant."

As has been stated before, the Sabbath command was placed in this covenant because of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. (See Deut. 5: 15.) The rules and regulations pertaining to the Sabbath were given before they were written on tables of stone. At the giving of the manna the rules governing the Sabbath were given (see Ex. 16) just as our Lord gave the Lord's Supper, and some of its rules before he died on the cross, looking forward to his death (see Matt. 26: 26-30). It would be interesting to begin at Ex. 19 and read to chapter 31: 18. You find not only the Ten Commandments given by God, first speaking them to Moses (see Ex. 20: 1), but that all the law written after the tenor of those words (Ex. 34: 27) was also spoken to Moses and he wrote it in a book. The rules concerning the building of the tabernacle were given also. Then in chapter 31: 18 it says, "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." Chapters thirty-two and thirty-three tell of the golden calf, of Moses casting the tables down and breaking them, etc. Chapter thirty-four tells of Moses' return to the mount and obtaining the second set of the tables of stone. The procedure when a man was found picking up sticks on the Sabbath (Num. 15: 32-36) shows beyond a doubt that the Sabbath law was a *new* law to the people, and before executing the law it had to be explained. If the Sabbath law had been in existence from Adam to Moses and its penalties imposed, this man would not have been put in ward until it was declared what should be done unto him. Turn and read this case and think for yourself. It is claimed that Gen. 2: 3 teaches that God started

man to observing the Sabbath from the beginning. Well, if he did, this would not prove that we must observe it. We find altars and sacrifices before the law was given at Sinai, and we find altars and sacrifices continuing after the law was given at Sinai till the Christ came. Does it follow, therefore, that we must erect altars and burn animals today? But turn to Gen. 2: 3 and read it. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it *he had rested* from all his work." Moses through whom the law at Sinai was given, wrote the book of Genesis. The Sabbath was commanded to be observed in memory of their deliverance from bondage (Deut. 5: 15), and because God *had rested* on that day (Ex. 20: 11). He commanded them to observe it because *he had rested* on that day, which shows conclusively that this was done at some subsequent time.

5. God promised to make a new covenant, said it would not be like the one made at Sinai.—Proof (Jer. 31: 31, 32): "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."

Here a new covenant is certainly promised and it is declared not to be like the covenant made at Mount Sinai in which the Sabbath is commanded. While there are many points wherein the two differ, as the Sabbath is now under consideration, I want to put you on guard and ask you to notice this one point of difference, viz.: the Old Covenant made at Mount Sinai had *the Sabbath command*; but the New Covenant, under which we are living, has no command to observe the Sabbath, but does contain the command *not to observe it*. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of

an holyday, or the new moon, or of the sabbath days."
(Col. 2: 16.)

6. Paul declares that this prophecy was fulfilled by Christ—Proof (Heb. 9: 15): "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the *first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Again (Heb. 8: 9, 13), "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord . . . In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

7. But before he could establish the New Covenant, he had to take away the first.—Proof (Heb. 10: 9): "Then said he, Lo I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away *the first*, that he may establish *the second*."

But are we certain that *the first* here has direct reference to the covenant made at Mount Sinai which contained the Sabbath? Indeed, we are. Drop back into the ninth chapter of the same book, and begin at the first verse and we will learn what that first covenant contained. Here it is: "Then verily the *first covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread;

which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the *tables of the covenant*." The tables of the covenant were the Ten Commandments. Paul says the *First Testament* had these and that Christ took the *first* away. Thank God, every sincere soul can see this. But those who are not hungering will close their eyes and stop their ears to keep from seeing and hearing. (See Matt. 13: 15.)

8. But when did Christ take the *first* out of the way? The Book declares that he did it when he died on the cross.—Proof (Col. 2: 14): "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (See also Eph. 2: 14, 15.)

Not only is this true, but Christ while dying said: "It is finished." (John 19: 30.) And this is not all. Who can make things as strong as Jehovah? To make *surety doubly sure*, God has not only told us that the *First Testament* contained the Sabbath and that it had been taken out of the way, but in the very place where he tells us when this was done, he warns us to let no man judge us concerning the Sabbath. Please read it with me again: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." Tell me not, kind reader, that you do not see this. Yet in the face of these plain scriptures, teachers are going over the country spending their time and the people's money trying to get people to violate God's law in keeping the Sabbath. No wonder they do not like debates. It affords too good an opportunity to expose their errors.

9. But did any of the prophets in prophesying of the New Covenant include in that prophecy the fact that the Sabbath was to cease? Indeed, they did. Let us turn to Hos. 2: 11 and read: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemen feasts." But is surety made doubly sure here? Do we know that the prophet has in mind the time of the establishment of the New Covenant? Indeed, we do. Let us read a statement that comes before this one, chapter 1: 10, and also one that comes after, chapter 2: 23, and see what time is referred to. Here it is: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them. Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." "And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God."

But does this refer to things under the New Covenant? Now we will read Paul's quotation of this very prophecy applying it to the New Covenant: "Even us, whom he also called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles? As he saith also in Hosea, I will call that my people, which was not my people; and her beloved, that was not beloved. And it shall be, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called sons of the living God." (Rom. 9: 24-26, R. V.) (Note here Paul takes Hos. 1: 10; 2: 23 and binds them together. Between these two Hos. 2: 11 is the prophecy that all their Sabbaths were to cease.)

V. A FALSE NOTION THAT SOME JEWS ENTERTAINED WHO DID NOT WANT ANY LAW AT ALL

Some of the Jews entertained the false idea that when the Sabbath was gone they would be left without law,

left free to be dishonest in their dealings with their fellow man. Hence they asked the question, "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit?" (Amos 8: 5.) ~~And here let me say that those people had the same erroneous idea that the Adventists now have.~~ Meet an Adventist and tell him the covenant on tables of stone has been done away, and he will at once declare that people may lie, steal, and do almost anything mean. Talk with one now and see.

But the prophet told them plainly—when ~~the Sabbath would be gone.~~ Read the ninth verse of this chapter and see: "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." Now when did this take place? Read Luke 23: 44: "And it was about the sixth hour (noon), and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened." How could God make things plainer? This is the only time the sun ever ceased to shine at noon. This was when the Old Testament was nailed to the cross. This was when Christ declared, "It is finished." And to put it beyond the possibility of controversy turn to Col. 2: 14-17 and read it carefully. This is where Paul declares that Jesus nailed the Sabbath law to the cross and took it out of the way, and commands us to let no man judge or condemn us for not being governed by the Sabbath law now.

But to make it still more certain, let us read the ninth chapter and eleventh verse of Amos and see still more evidence of the truthfulness of the fact that the prophet is speaking of the time of the New Testament: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." Now turn

to Acts 15: 15-17, where James quotes this prophecy to show that the New Covenant had to be established and that the Gentiles were included in it and did not have to observe the law of Moses (verses 5, 19, 24): "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord."

"Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment."

VI. "THE DAY WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE"

We wish to state, in the first place, that the position of the church of Christ is that there is no such thing as Sabbath observance taught in the New Testament; we have the *first day of the week* or *Lord's day*, on which the disciples meet to eat the Lord's Supper in memory of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, but this is nowhere called the Sabbath day or a Sabbath day. In the New Testament we are commanded: "*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.*" (Col. 2: 16.) But we are commanded to *not forsake the assembling of ourselves together*—which assembling took place on the *first day of the week* (Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2)—but to exhort one another, and so much the more as we see *the day approaching*. (Heb. 10: 25.)

But now for the proof of the above position:

1. David, in prophesying the Christ, says: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous

in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." (Psalm 118: 22-24.)

Now look this Scripture squarely in the face. When David says, "*This is the Lord's doing,*" to what does "*this*" refer? Absolutely to the stone's becoming "the head stone of the corner." It cannot refer to anything else. Very good. May I ask then to what the next "*this*" in verse twenty-four refers? It cannot refer to a thing beneath God's skies except to what the first "*this*" refers, viz.: to that *rejected stone* becoming "*the head stone of the corner.*" These two statements of David look forward to what is to be done at some time after David's day. Nothing could be more unscriptural and absurd than to try to make the statement, "*This is the day which the Lord hath made,*" look back to the Sabbath day God made for the children of Israel when he brought them out of Egyptian bondage, and the other statement, "*The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner,*" look forward from David's day to the Christ. And we know the statement concerning the stone has direct reference to Christ. Peter, in preaching to those who put Christ to death, says, "By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. *This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.*" (Acts 4: 10, 11.) So "surety is made doubly sure here," that David was prophesying of the Christ and, therefore, of *the day* Christ was to *make*. This stone belongs to the New Testament of which Christ is Mediator, hence *the day* spoken of *must* belong to the *same testament*.

2. But it would be well for us now to learn when Christ became the headstone of the corner, that we may learn when he received the power or authority to make this day. He certainly is Mediator of the *New Testament*

(Heb. 9: 15), and we ought not to be surprised if we find that he made a *new day* for that *New Testament*.

(1) Christ, before he could receive authority from his Father to establish the *New Testament* and, therefore, a *new day*, had to come and live and die under the old law that it might be taken out of the way.—Proof (Gal. 4: 4, 5): “But when the fulness 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.” Hence, Christ was circumcised when he was eight days old (Luke 2: 21) and his mother offered for her purification the turtle-doves or pigeons, when the child was thirty-three days old (Luke 2: 22-24.) He observed the Passover (Matt. 26: 17, 18), the Sabbath days, and taught that none of it should pass away till all was fulfilled. (Matt. 5: 18.)

(2) After being thus born under the Old Testament and living in obedience to it, he finished it (John 19: 30) when he died on the cross and took it out of the way. (Col. 2: 14; Heb. 10: 9.) Christ, the night of his betrayal, said to his disciples, “Hitherto (until now) have ye asked nothing in my name,” showing that during his personal ministry they did not pray in his name, for his *Testament* was not yet established.

(3) And after he rose from the dead, he declared that he had all authority and power: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,” said he. (Matt. 28: 18.) Read Matt. 28: 16-20 for the great commission as given by Matthew after our Lord arose from the dead and just before his ascension. If the Sabbath is now binding on us, Jesus must bind it as he has all the authority God has in heaven and on earth. But this he did not receive until after his resurrection. Now read Luke 24: 44-53 and you find Jesus telling his apostles that he had to die and rise from the dead before “repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all

nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” (See verses forty-six and forty-seven.) And Paul in Eph. 1: 19-21 declares that our Lord’s exaltation to God’s right hand where he now rules with all the authority God has in heaven and earth took place after he rose from the dead. “And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”

(4) Christ could not become the cornerstone till he was perfected. “*The third day*,” which must refer to his resurrection, he himself declares as the day on which he was to be perfected. (Read Luke 13: 32.) “And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” (Heb. 5: 9.)

(5) That *this day*, the day of his being *perfected* as a Savior, was the first day of the week, goes without controversy: “Now when Jesus was risen *early the first day of the week*.” *(Mark 16: 9.) (See also Luke 24: 16.)

Jesus had declared not merely to his friends, but also to his enemies, that he would let them kill him, but the *third day* he would rise again. This bold statement of Jesus haunted the enemy. So after he was dead and buried, a conference is called and here is what is said:

“Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them. Ye have a watch: go your

way, make it as sure ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." (Matt. 27: 62-66.)

In spite of all their efforts to keep the body in the sepulchre, the third day, the first day of the week, Jesus stepped forth the conqueror of death and to the consternation of all his enemies.

Some have had the audacity to claim that Jesus arose on the Sabbath day—just before it ended. Carefully reading Luke 24: 1, 6, 7, 13, 21, you find it forever settled that the *third day was the first day of the week*. "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." And so did this joy begin in the evening of that day when Jesus first met his disheartened disciples. (See John 20: 1, 19, 20.)

(6) On this day Christ was declared to be God's Son with power: "And declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. 1: 4.) On this day he came from the tomb with the keys of hell and of death in his hands: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." (Rev. 1: 18.) On this day he "brought life and immortality to light." (2 Tim. 1: 10.) And it was on this day that the living hope was given. (See 1 Pet. 1: 3.) No wonder David declared, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." May God pity the man that neglects this day for the old Jewish Sabbath that has been abolished. Such conduct is like the children of Israel worshipping the brazen serpent as an idol after it had served the purpose for which God had it made. (2 Kings 18: 4.)

The headstone or keystone. Just a thought about what such means. This stone was the stone that made all the others useless if it was left out. May I ask: What would

destroy every ray of hope if the enemy could take it from us? Is it not the *resurrection* of Jesus? Take his resurrection from us and all is gone. But give us this resurrection and all his claims are proven true. Our hope of seeing loved ones gone before is based on his resurrection. (See 1 Thess. 4: 13, 14.) The absolute certainty of a judgment to come is based on his resurrection. (See Acts 17: 30, 31.) But Jesus became this *headstone* or *chief cornerstone* when he rose from the dead. This is the day the Lord hath made, and what took place on that day is the grounds or reason for the Lord making it the day for meeting and commemorating our Lord's death and resurrection.

(7) This day was fixed by Jehovah in type as the day of Christ's triumph. The "sheaf of the firstfruits" of the harvest was a type of Christ's resurrection. This was brought on the first day of the week, or the morrow after that Sabbath, which is the first day of the week. (See Lev. 23: 10, 11; 1 Cor. 15: 20.)

This was also the day set for the Holy Spirit to descend upon the apostles and the law of Christ to go forth from Jerusalem. By reading Lev. 23: 16 you will learn that Pentecost came "on the morrow" after the seventh Sabbath from the bringing of "the sheaf of the wave offering." The morrow after the seventh Sabbath, of course, is the first day of the week and the fiftieth day, which Pentecost means, making Pentecost come on the first day of the week. Notice that on this day, the first day of the week the *new meat offering* was offered, which was a type of the New Covenant. Let us now read Acts 2: 1-4: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with

the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Thus we see Christ was not only declared to be God's Son with power on this day, but the Holy Spirit came to guide the apostles into all truth on this day, and it is declared to be the *beginning*. (See Acts 11: 15.) No wonder then that David should say: "*This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*"

Christ said the Holy Spirit would bring to their memory what he had taught them (John 14: 26) and guide them into all truth (John 16: 13). One thing it brought to their memory or guided them into was teaching the members of the New Covenant to assemble on the first day of the week to break bread in memory of Jesus: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." (Acts 20: 7.) Too, the Holy Spirit commanded them not to forsake this assembling, but to exhort one another, and so much the more as they saw the day approaching. (Heb. 10: 25.)

(8) This day is called *the Lord's day*. (See Rev. 1: 10.) Adventists say that the Lord's day in Rev. 1: 10 is the Sabbath day. The word "*Lord*" here refers to Christ and not to Jehovah, as it often does in the Old Testament. Since Christ has come and suffered, perfected himself as a Savior, God has declared that we must confess Christ is Lord. (Phil. 2: 5-11.) All days are the Lord's. But there is a day *preeminently* his, because it must be devoted to him. Then we have a supper *preeminently* called the *Lord's Supper*. (1 Cor. 11: 20.) All meals we eat in our homes are the Lord's because they are gifts from him. But there is a supper we eat that is his in a greater sense. It is the Lord's Supper because it must be eaten in his memory and to show forth his death till he comes again. (1 Cor. 11: 23-26.) Certain it is that this supper is a *new supper* instituted by Christ, made a part of the New

Testament, and not the Passover supper of the Old Testament. Just that certain, too, is it that the *Lord's day* in Rev. 1: 10 is the day Christ made for the New Testament and not the Jewish Sabbath. The Corinthians came together to eat this supper, as 1 Cor. 11: 20 and 33 clearly show. 'Tis true they had erred in adding a meal that God had given them to be eaten with thanksgiving in their dining rooms, but Paul rebuked them for this addition and encouraged them to continue to meet for the Lord's Supper.

(9) But we are reminded of the fact that Christ said he was Lord of the Sabbath. (Mark 1: 28.) Indeed, he was. To be *Lord* of a thing is to stand above it and hold the power to abolish it, if necessary. This Christ did for the Sabbath observance. Any unprejudiced reader can turn to Mark 2: 23-28 and read it thoughtfully and see that Jesus there teaches that man himself is of more importance than the Sabbath, that the day was made for man's good and can be set aside if the needs of man require it. We are sometimes asked: "If we are not to observe the Sabbath now, what must we observe?" This is an easy question: *Observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded*. (Matt. 28: 20.) Where has he commanded us to observe the Sabbath? It is sometimes argued that he observed it during his personal ministry. Indeed, he did. But he was also circumcised when he was eight days old, turtledoves were offered when he was thirty-three days old, and he observed the Passover—all these things done in his personal ministry. And well that they were, for that law he did not end till he died on the cross. Come this side of the cross, if you please, and find the Sabbath command, and we will observe it.

But our Adventist friends, still hoping to hold their Sabbath, contend that the Sabbath day is the only day spoken of as the day that God has *made*. But here they

fly in the face of the fact that in Psalm 118: 22-24 it declares another "day which the Lord hath made," viz.: the day Jesus arose from the dead and became the headstone of the corner.

(10) The first day of the week was sanctified and set apart as the day to lay by in store as God has prospered us. Of course, it is true our Adventist friends try to make this a thing we do in our homes, and not while assembled together in one place. But this laying by in store was to be done that no collections or gatherings be done when Paul got there. If it means they took it out of their purses and put the offerings for the Lord in another place in their homes, there would have still remained the need of gathering these gifts into one common fund after Paul got there. I call your attention to this to show the utter unreasonableness of their contention.

But let this mean what they claim, viz.: that they just laid it by in their homes by putting it into a different place. Then I ask: *Why did he command them to do this on the first day of the week?* Why did he not say the second day or even the seventh day? That the first day of the week or Lord's day was the day the early Christians met for worship and to commemorate our Lord's death and resurrection goes without a doubt to those who believe the Bible.

"The stone (Christ) which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day (the day this stone became the headstone) which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

So let the saints do is my humble prayer.

VII. QUESTIONS FOR ADVENTISTS

1. We all admit there was the Sabbath command under the Ten Commandment covenant, and that this was the seventh day of the week. ~~We also are agreed that this~~

~~command was plainly stated and had its penalties, viz.:~~
~~(1) No work to be done (Ex. 20: 10); (2) abide in your~~
~~places (Ex. 16: 29); (3) kindle no fires (Ex. 35: 3);~~
~~(4) death the penalty (Ex. 35: 1, 2); and in Num. 15: 32-~~
~~36 we have an example of this punishment being inflicted~~
~~on the Sabbath breaker.~~

Question: If this Sabbath law is still binding, are the penalties to be still imposed on the transgressor? If not, why not? Give one argument that shows these penalties are not now binding that does not show the command itself is not now binding.

~~2. Do we not, in the New Testament, find all the other~~
~~nine commandments with different penalties? How does~~
~~it happen that these commands are found in the New~~
~~Testament with different penalties, while there is nothing~~
~~said about the Sabbath command with different pen-~~
~~alties?~~

~~3. Does not Heb. 7: 12 state emphatically that the law~~
~~had to be changed? Is not the fact that we have all the~~
~~nine commands in the New Testament, with different pen-~~
~~alties, with the Sabbath command left out entirely, one~~
~~of the changes? If not, why not?~~

~~Allen Walker, a leading Adventist preacher with whom~~
~~I debated in Macon, Georgia, says: "If Christ 'kept the~~
~~law perfectly' we find that he could do this and at the~~
~~same time ignore some of the wilderness regulations for~~
~~he did depart from his dwelling on the Sabbath and~~
~~walked through cornfields, attended the place of worship,~~
~~etc. This shows that certain wilderness regulations did~~
~~not obtain after their journey was over." (In his answer~~
~~to questions by S. H. Hall in GOSPEL ADVOCATE, November~~
~~21, 1935.) So our Adventists have God changing the~~
~~Sabbath from its original status and making it more~~
~~liberal after they entered Canaan. This just goes to show~~
~~that God was Lord of it, and could change it whenever~~

man's needs required. Why cannot our Adventists see, that he took it out of the way entirely when he made the New Covenant? (See Col. 2: 14-16.)

4. In Ex. 23: 10-12 do we not have the Sabbath year, etc.? Give one argument that shows that we are not under these that does not release from the seventh day Sabbath also.

5. Does not Heb. 10: 9 declare that God sent his Son into the world to take the first covenant or testament away that he might establish the second? Does not Heb. 9: 1-4 teach that that first testament had the tables of the covenant by which is meant the Ten Commandments? (See Ex. 32: 16; Deut. 9: 11.)

6. Does not Paul in Col. 2: 14 declare that the first was removed when Christ died on the cross? And in verse sixteen are we not commanded, because of this removal of that first covenant, to let no man judge us about the Sabbath command or any of the other days under that law?

7. Do not our Adventist friends try to dodge this by saying that these days were shadows of things to come, hence were days instituted after man sinned, but that God rested on the seventh day before sin entered the world and that there were no types or shadows till after sin came? But in this are they not wide of the mark since Adam himself was a type of Christ, and he certainly existed before sin came? (See 1 Cor. 15: 45-47.)

8. But was not the Sabbath day a type as well as a memorial? It was a memorial of their continued rest from Egyptian bondage (Deut. 5: 15) and also a type of absolute remission that Jesus gave the day he arose when he ascended to the Father and gave all his sleeping dead absolute remission, a thing they could not have under that law. (See John 20: 16, 17; Heb. 9: 15, Heb. 10: 1-4.)

9. Does not Paul declare in Heb. 4: 3 that *believers now*

have entered into that rest? This rest or absolute pardon of sins is the antitype of what the seventh day rest was only a shadow of. Do not our Adventist friends say that all the shadows are gone? Does this not make the seventh day Sabbath go with them?

10. Does not Heb. 4: 8 (Revised Version) plainly declare that if Joshua had given them rest another day would not have been spoken of? Did not Joshua have the seventh day Sabbath? Do we not have then a day that Joshua did not give?

11. Does not Heb. 1: 1, 2 teach that God in these days speaks to us through his Son? Did not God tell us when he spoke from the mount of transfiguration that we must hear Christ now? Does not Acts 3: 22, 23 teach that we must hear Christ in all things whatsoever he teaches? Where has he commanded us in his testament to keep the Sabbath?

12. It will not do to say that Christ kept the Sabbath during his personal ministry before his death, for he observed the Passover before his death and taught offerings for cleansing for leprosy before his death. (See Mark 1: 40-44; Luke 22: 7, 8, 14, 15.) Christ was born under the law and lived and died under it, and said not one jot nor tittle should pass till all was fulfilled. (See Gal. 4: 4, 5; Matt. 5: 17, 18.) Christ's testament could not go into effect till after his death. (See Heb. 9: 15-17.) The apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, after our Lord had returned to the Father. This Holy Spirit was to bring to their memory all that Jesus before had taught them and was to guide them into all truth. (See John 14: 26 and John 16: 12-14.)

Question: Beginning with the teaching of the apostles on the day of Pentecost, after the Spirit came to guide them, show where they ever taught Christians to keep the Sabbath command. Just because Christ kept the

Sabbath before his death makes it no more a part of his New Testament than the fact that he kept the Passover makes it a part of the New Testament. This you know. Or the fact that he taught during his personal ministry that sacrifices must be offered for the purification of lepers is a part of the New Testament. This you also know.

13. Did not Christ tell Peter he would give him the keys of the kingdom and whatsoever he bound on earth should be bound in heaven? (See Matt. 16: 18-20.) Is it not true that Peter did not begin this binding and loosing till he was baptized by the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the first time he was allowed to preach that Jesus is the Christ? See Matt. 16: 20 for the fact that Peter could not preach that Jesus was the Christ during our Lord's personal ministry. Read Acts 2: 36 and you find after Peter was baptized in the Holy Spirit he did preach him as *the Christ*. Beginning on that day, show where Peter, or any of the other apostles, bound Sabbath observance on Christians. Is it not true that we are released from *all the law* except that which the apostles brought over and made a part of the New Covenant?

14. Going to Acts 15, is it not true that a conference was called in Jerusalem for the sole purpose of deciding whether the Gentiles should be circumcised and required to keep the law? Was not Peter there to say whether the law was binding on the Gentile world? If ever there was a time the Sabbath command should have been given to the Gentiles, was not this the time? Does Peter bind it on the Gentiles or even mention it? It is true that our Seventh Day Adventist friends try to dodge this by saying they came to settle the question of circumcision and not the Sabbath question? But does it not say in Acts 15: 5 that the false doctrine they were condemning was this, viz.: "But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to

circumcise them (the Gentile), and to command *them* to keep the law of Moses." (See also verse twenty-four.) The false doctrine being combatted was the doctrine that the Gentile world had to keep the whole law given by Moses. This was false. Only that *part* of the law that was brought over and reincorporated in the New Covenant must we keep. Where did the apostles bring the Sabbath command over? To submit to circumcision made you a debtor to keep the whole law. (See Gal. 5: 1-4.)

15. But our Adventist friends ask, Where did they command us to meet on the first day of the week? The question is easily answered. They try to make a difference in what the apostles taught and what Jesus taught. The fact of the business is the sum total of the gospel of Christ or the doctrine of Christ we get from the apostles. Here let Paul forever settle this question: "*If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.*" (See 1 Cor. 14: 37.)

16. Does not the apostles teach us that the disciples met in Troas on the first day of the week to break bread or eat the Lord's Supper, and that all of his companions remained there till the first day of the week, that they ate the supper, then some of them left for Assos while Paul tarried for some extensive teaching that the church needed, continuing there till the following day? (Read Acts 20: 1-14.) Note in this reading that they all took part in the breaking of bread for which they assembled on the first day of the week. (See verse seven. Read this in the Revised Version.) There was a breaking of bread or eating purely as a matter of strengthening Paul for his arduous task of speaking all night that took place after midnight. But note that Paul only did that eating and he did it to be strengthened. (See verse eleven.) Verse thirteen shows that Paul's companions had gone on to Assos.

17. Does not Paul in Heb. 10: 25 command us not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, but to exhort one another and so much the more as we see the day approaching? Does not Acts 20: 7 and 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2 teach beyond a doubt that the first day of the week was the day on which all knew to assemble? Our Adventist friends try to dodge this by saying it is the judgment day here that Paul is talking about. Think of the absurdity of such a statement! Will we not assemble in the judgment without being exhorted to do so? Will we not assemble there whether we want to or not? Is not the day here referred to a day they could see approaching, that they could assemble on or neglect to assemble on? It was a set recurrent time that the early church knew as the day for assembling together to lay by in store as they had been prospered and celebrate our Lord's death and resurrection. Is not the assembling mentioned in 1 Cor. 11: 20 for the purpose of eating the Lord's Supper and to proclaim his death till he comes? And reading from the twentieth verse to the close of the chapter, do we not have Paul's reasons for telling them that they could not really eat the Lord's Supper the way they were conducting themselves when they assembled? Hence, he taught them how to assemble for the Lord's Supper and not bring condemnation upon themselves.

18. It is contended by some of the Adventists that only what Jesus actually said or did before he died on the cross is in the New Covenant. Their contention is based on the fact that our Lord's will could not go into force until after his death, and that after a will has been confirmed you cannot add to it. But there they get themselves into much trouble. In John 16: 12, 13 Christ emphatically declared to the apostles that there were some things in his will he could not tell them in person and they would have to wait for the coming of the Holy Spirit to tell them. *Are these new and additional things in the*

will of our Lord? Of course, they are. Teaching Christians to meet on the first day of the week to celebrate the Lord's death and suffering is one of the additional things after Jesus died. It is significant that Jesus himself began to meet with them after his resurrection on the first day of the week. (See John 20: 19.) Jesus met with them in the evening of the first day of the week on which he arose. He intentionally did not meet with them any more till the next first day of the week. (See verse twenty-six where it says that "after eight days" he met with them again while they were assembled.) Our Adventist friends try to dodge this by saying that after eight days would put this second meeting on Wednesday week from the first meeting. They do this by saying that Monday would be the first day after that first meeting, Tuesday the second, etc. But they fly in the face of the fact that the Jewish way of saying things makes "after eight days" the "eighth day" after this first meeting. The following first day of the week is the eighth day, and this they know. As an example you are asked to turn to Matt. 27: 62-64 and see "*after three days*" and "*the third day*" mean identically the same thing. According to the Adventist, our Lord would have to have arisen on Tuesday morning. He was crucified on Friday. If they start to counting after three days by saying Saturday was the first day after, then Sunday would be the second day after, and Monday the third day after, making his resurrection come Tuesday morning. The Jewish way of speaking was to count a part of a day for a whole day, hence would mean the same thing when they would say "*after three days*" that they meant when they would say "*the third day,*" or the same thing when they would say "*after eight days*" and "*the eighth day.*" It is sad to see people have a false doctrine they want to sustain to that degree that they *wrest* the scriptures to their own destruction to sustain it—handle our Lord's word *deceitfully*. When you have the right doctrine, this you do not have to do.

The Adventists are wrong from every angle you view them, and I pray that those who read these questions will think seriously-of the error of their way. (See 2 Pet. 3: 14-16; 2 Cor. 11: 13-15.)

19. Our Adventists state that the law concerning the Sabbath was changed from that that governed in the wilderness wanderings and what they were to do after they got into the promised Canaan. They say that the command to kindle no fires, to not go out of their homes, etc., was dropped after they entered Canaan. May I ask where is there a shadow of an intimation that such a change took place? It is true that they were not to go out of their homes on the Sabbath during the wilderness wanderings, but that they did go out after they entered Canaan. But this only shows that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, as our Lord declares in Mark 2: 23-28; that he is *Lord* of it, *bigger* than the Sabbath, and can change it to meet man's needs when his needs so require. Do you see this? Study thoughtfully Mark 2: 23-28 and you can see this very point. The time came when it was best for our Lord to remove the Sabbath altogether, and this he did when he died on the cross. See Col. 2: 14-16.)

20. Christ emphatically declares, in Matt. 5: 17, 18, that not one jot nor one tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled. The preposition "till" means "to the time of; up to; until." It simply means that when Jesus fulfilled the law, at that time, and not until then, could one jot or tittle pass. But it just as clearly declares that a jot or tittle could be removed after Jesus fulfilled the law. He fulfilled it when he died on the cross, and declared while dying, "It is finished." (Read John 19: 28-30.) And in Rom. 10: 4 Paul declares that Christ is the *end of the law*. He fulfilled it by actually living it, fulfilling its every requirement. Now our Adventists try to dodge this by saying Christ, when he came to John to be baptized, said "Suffer it to be so now:

for thus it becometh us to turn an *Agreement*... if Christ ended the law in fulfilling it, then he ended baptism in fulfilling it by being baptized. He certainly ended it so far as his obedience to it was concerned. But where does he anywhere intimate that something may not pass from the law till he fulfilled all righteousness in being baptized? In speaking of the law passing, he clearly teaches that something can pass when he fulfills it. He fulfilled it when he died on the cross, and so declared while dying. We should look now for some changes to be made—for something to pass from the law and other things never before commanded to come in. But where is this little word "till" used in connection with or in reference to his fulfilling all righteousness in baptism? Besides this, after he was baptized, had arisen from the dead, he declared all the authority God had in heaven and earth had been given to him, and for that reason commanded his apostles to go and teach all the nations, baptizing the ones they taught, and then to teach the ones they baptized to observe all things he commands. (See Matt. 28: 16-20.) Here is the command for baptism after Christ had fulfilled his part of it. Now where does he command us to keep the Sabbath after he had fulfilled the law? Please tell us, WHERE?

21. But, finally, let the Adventists who desire give us some light on the following question:

Beginning with the epistle of Paul to the Roman brethren and going through Jude, we have twenty-one epistles written to congregations and individuals about how to conduct the work of the local church and to live as Christians. In all of these epistles there is not one thing said about the Sabbath question by way of commandments except one time, and that is in Col. 2: 16, and here we are commanded to let no man judge or condemn us for not keeping it. In all of these epistles not one soul is approved for keeping the Sabbath or reproved for not keeping it. How can any sane soul believe the Sabbath

command of the Decalogue is any part of the New Testament with this before him? The Sabbath command is no part of the New Covenant. We are in rebellion to our Lord when we add it to the New Covenant. ---

The Adventists are great people to offer one thousand dollars for this or that scripture. I do not like such methods of dealing with sacred things. Solomon says, "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." (See Prov. 26: 5.) So I now offer any of our Adventist friends one thousand dollars for one reference to the Sabbath command, beginning with Romans and going through the twenty-one epistles teaching us how to live under the New Testament, where we are taught to observe it, reprov'd for not observing it, or commended for observing it.

22. One Adventist tried to answer this challenge by referring us to Matt. 24: 14-22 where Christ taught his disciples to pray that their flight from the destruction of Jerusalem be not on the Sabbath. Jerusalem was destroyed in A.D. 70. This makes it take place after the New Covenant had been in existence for about thirty-seven years. They say that Christ here shows that he knew the Sabbath would still be a sacred day under the New Covenant. Well, what teaches too much does not teach anything. He asked them to pray that their flight be not in the winter. Read it now and see. Does this make him teach the winter is a sacred season of the year? He also said, "And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!" Does this make him teach such is a sin?

This flight was to be a physical flight, and such a condition of the women would make it difficult for them to flee. In winter seasons the roads were not so good, sometimes impassable, hence pray that your flight be not in that season. Jerusalem was controlled by unbelieving Jews, those who continued to keep the Sabbath, and on

the Sabbath the gates of the city were locked that there be no coming in or going out. (See Neh. 13: 19.) This was why Christmas were taught by our Lord to pray that their flight be not on the Sabbath. You will be surprised when I tell you that when pressing W. W. White, of Nashville, Tennessee, on this point he went to Ezek. 46: 1 to teach that the gates of Jerusalem were kept open on the Sabbath. Turn now and read that. Ezek. 46: 1 is talking about the gate of the inner court, the house of worship within the wall of Jerusalem. Certainly it was open on the Sabbath. But there is quite a difference in this and the gates of the city.

23. Pardon me again for referring to one thousand dollars. Such is little and beneath the dignity of religious controversy. But our Adventist friends indulge in it, and they say much and their friends say much about their one thousand dollar offers. Here is my offer—ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR ONE ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF KEEPING THE FOURTH COMMAND OF THE DECALOGUE THAT I CANNOT PROVE TO BE ABSOLUTELY UNSCRIPTURAL. Now when your Adventists come around, face them with this offer and see if you can get them to meet me in a discussion for this purpose. Tell them they have said enough about their thousand dollar offers—to put up or shut up.

24. They have much to say about the apostles going into the synagogues on the Sabbath after the church was established on Pentecost. Certainly they went into the synagogues on the Sabbath every chance they had, for it was the Jews' day of worship; they were assembled in the synagogues and that is where the people who needed to be converted from the Old Covenant to the New were to be found. But arguing that they were keeping the Sabbath because they went in on the Sabbath proves too much. If their going into the synagogues on the Sabbath proves they were keeping the Sabbath as a sacred

day, then the fact that they reasoned daily in the market would prove they were keeping or running the market. If not, why not? (See Acts 17: 17.) It would also prove that Paul was running the school of Tyrannus for two years because he used that as a place of preaching for two years. But a question for our Adventists: If Paul and his companions were keeping the Sabbath, why did those Jews run them out of their synagogues and force them to go the Gentiles and to the school of Tyrannus for a place or places to preach? (Read carefully Acts 18: 4-6; 19: 8-10.) If Paul and his companions were keeping the Sabbath according to the law, tell me why the following charge against him before Gallio? "And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat, Saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law." (See Acts 18: 12, 13.)

No, there is not one argument they can make for the Sabbath under the New Covenant. I am asking again, when they come your way, to press them with all your might for a public discussion of this question. Tell them we stand ready to affirm in public discussion what we believe and practice on the Lord's day, the first day of the week. And that we agree to sign a statement that the discussion shall be kept on a high plane and the Spirit of our Lord to govern throughout the discussion, so far as we are concerned. They will tell you the Bible teaches that debates are wrong. Just answer and tell them that we know the Bible condemns certain kinds of debates; but we also know that the Bible commands us to have the right kind. "Debate thy cause with thy neighbour himself; and discover not a secret to another." (Prov. 25: 9.)

VIII. CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY DECREE

The Adventists, in their preaching on the mark of the beast, try to show that the first day of the week was not

observed as a sacred day till thus decreed by Constantine. But here they fly in the face of all history on the subject and the positive statements in the New Testament. In Acts 20: 7 it declares the disciples came together to "break bread." This breaking of bread was the Lord's Supper. (See Acts 2: 41, 42; 1 Cor. 11: 20.) They never assembled for the ordinary daily meal. They were commanded to eat such at home and not confuse it with the Lord's Supper. (See 1 Cor. 11: 20-22, 33, 34.) In Heb. 10: 25 we are commanded not to forsake the assembling of our together, but exhort one another, and so much the more as we see the day approaching. Reading from verse nineteen through twenty-five you see that this day of assembly belongs to the "new and living way, which he [Jesus] hath consecrated for us." It is not the judgment day, as our Adventist friends would have you believe. We will assemble there without being exhorted to do so. (See 2 Cor. 5: 10.) The very idea of any sane soul trying to teach that we must exhort people to assemble at the judgment, and so much the more as we see the day approaching!

But now to Mosheim. Our Adventist friends say that Mosheim teaches that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, or from the seventh day to the first. They are as unreliable in handling history as they are the Bible. In Chamber's Encyclopedia, in speaking of the effect of the edict of Constantine, the emperor of Rome, he writes:

"A new era in the history of the Lord's day now commenced; tendencies toward Sabbatarianism, or the confusion of the Christian with the Jewish institution, beginning to manifest themselves. These were slight till the end of the fifth century, and are traceable chiefly to the evils of legislation."

Mosheim shows, beyond a doubt, that the regular meeting of Christians on the first day of the week to commemorate Christ's death and resurrection was their cus-

tom from the beginning of the church in A.D. 33. Even before Constantine had openly accepted Christianity, Mosheim says:

"The remarkable kindness of Constantine to the Christians, which was a prominent trait of his character, most certainly did not proceed from any love for the religion professed by the Christians; for at that time he was quite ignorant of this religion. Neither did it proceed from any magnanimity, justice, equity, or any similar characteristics of his mind; for these were very imperfect in him, before he became a Christian." (Mosheim, Vol. 2, page 449.)

Again from the same book, page 448, we have these words:

"Constantine, as soon as he had obtained power and the title of Caesar, granted to the Christians in his provinces full liberty to profess their religion, and to worship God according to the divine prescription. His father, as we have already seen, had forbidden the Christians to be molested; but he had not confirmed this by a public law; nor had he given the liberty beyond the limits of Gaul of assembling publicly for worship, of holding councils, of rebuilding their prostrate temples, or of creating bishops. But Constantine freely bestowed on them all these privileges, and his not in a private way, but by issuing a public edict. That edict is the oldest of all his religious statutes."

Now this was the beginning of his edicts in favor of Christians. But later he issued one even more liberal. Mosheim, Vol. 2, page 455, says:

"The victorious Constantine entered the city, and not long after, with Licinius, his colleague, issued an edict which gave the Christians the fullest liberty of living according to their own principles, institutions, and usages. And the next year, A.D. 313, he confirmed and defined this liberty more precisely in an edict drawn up at Milan."

Hear Mosheim once more: "The first day of the week (on which Christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God), Constantine required, by special law, to be observed more sacredly than before." (Murdock's Translation, Vol. 1, page 278, section 5.)

The point I am endeavoring to drive home to your heart is that Christians were meeting on the first day of the week to commemorate our Lord's death and to proclaim it till he comes again before Constantine was born. Christians were so numerous when Constantine began to seek the throne that he saw it was to his advantage to make legislation favorable to Christians. That Constantine, in his ignorance, thought of it as a Sabbath day and issued his rest decree, may be true. But as to his changing the Jewish Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week, that is not true. He recognized the first day of the week as the day Christians met for their regular worship.

We will hear Mosheim about this day, as to his understanding as to how long it had been the Christian's day for worship and praise and why:

"It may, I think, unquestionably be taken for a fact, that the first day of the week, i.e., the day on which our blessed Savior triumphantly burst the bonds of death, and arose from the grave, was expressly appointed by the apostles themselves, during their continuance at Jerusalem, for holding of these general solemn assemblies of the Christians for the purposes of public worship. In Acts 20: 7, we see the Christians at Troas assembling together on the first day after the Jewish Sabbath in order to celebrate the Lord's Supper and the feast of love, and St. Paul addressing them, when thus met, in a discourse of inconsiderable length . . . Now who, I would ask, can entertain a doubt but that the Christians at Troas, in dedicating this day to divine worship, were guided by apostolic authority, and the practice of the church at Jerusalem, which

it is well known that all of the other Christian assemblies took for their models? or, who can believe that the apostle Paul, intimately acquainted as he must have been with the discipline of the church in Jerusalem, would have sanctioned the appointment of any other day for the public worship than the one on which he knew that the rest of the apostles were accustomed to hold their solemn religious assemblies in that city?" (Mosheim, History of the I Century, Vol. 1, pages 149, 150.)

This is only a tithe of the historical testimony that might be presented.

IX. THE MARK OF THE BEAST

Our Adventist friends have much to say about the "mark of the beast," and they would have you believe that those who meet on the first day of the week to commemorate Christ's death and suffering and to proclaim his death till he comes again (1 Cor. 11: 20-34; Acts 20: 7; Heb. 10: 25) have this mark. Revelation, beginning at chapter thirteen and reading through chapter seventeen, pretty well covers the discussion of the beast. It is my judgment that the "beast" was old Pagan Rome, and the woman that was riding that "beast" was the Roman Catholic Church or Papal Rome. It must be remembered that Roman Catholicism once made and unmade kings. It controlled the crowned heads of Europe. But it got its power by getting the church and state united.

WHAT IS THIS MARK?

Here I do not wish to be dogmatic. From the description of the "man of sin," the "mystery of iniquity" described in 2 Thess. 2: 1-12, it is a spirit that "sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." That is, he claims a power or right that God only has a right to exercise—to make laws and change laws. He even exalts himself above all that is called God. Read it for

yourself in 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4. That the Roman Catholic Church and the pope claim such powers goes without saying.

But how about my Adventist friends? They are as well marked as the Catholic Church. In Mrs. E. G. White you have one that sustains the same relationship to the Adventists as the pope does to the Catholic Church, and Joseph Smith to the Mormons. From her own works I propose to prove this. A book entitled "Early Writings of Ellen G. White," pages 32-35, gives her vision in which she claims to have learned that the Sabbath command is still binding. She was caught up into paradise and saw things. I am wondering if you think she was caught up there? In 2 Cor. 12 Paul tells us that he was caught up there, but it was not lawful for him to tell what he saw and heard when he got back. Will some Adventist tell us why it was not lawful for Paul to tell when he got back, and yet all right for Mrs. White not only to tell, but write a book on it? There is where the Adventists really got their start in growth here on earth. This was in 1847.

But Mrs. White claims that Christ took her into the holy of holies, where the ark of the covenant was found, in which she saw the two tables on which the commandments were written. But what did she see? She saw things Moses never saw, through whom God gave the law. She saw things never before heard of—that is, that the fourth commandment, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy," was more important than any other command of the ten, even more important than the first, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This command was more glorious than all the rest and had a halo of glory around it. This is taking a defunct command that had served its purpose and been taken out of the way, and exalting it even above God himself. This is what the "man of sin" was to do. Where is the Adventist that

can look honest souls in the face and declare he believes Mrs. White's revelation? Yet, they believe her and claim her as their prophetess. What she says is law and gospel to them, and they cannot deny it.

She claims that she went to heaven and that God sent her back to the earth to bear testimony unto the people. I prefer to give her words: "I saw the fruit of the tree of life, the manna, almonds, figs pomegranates, grapes, and many other kinds of fruit. I asked him to let me eat of the fruit. He said, 'Not now; those who eat of the fruit of this land go back to earth no more. . . .' And he said, 'You must go back to the earth again, and relate to others what I have revealed to you.' Then an angel bore me gently down to this dark world." (Early Writings, pages 19 and 20.) She claims that this is when she learned that the Sabbath is still binding on the people. Strange indeed. The Adventists claim that the Bible teaches that we should now observe the seventh day of **the week**. If it does, how did it happens that Mrs. White had to go all the way to heaven to find it out? Paul says, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." (Col. 2: 16.) He also says, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 8.) This, I am going to do. Of course, Mrs. White did not go to heaven; but if she did go, she got her message from the wrong angel; hence we must let her and the angel both be accursed; for their gospel is different from the one Paul preached.

But does she claim power equal to that of the pope of Rome because of this heavenly visit? Indeed she does. She is the interpreter for the whole church. Here is the mark of the beast. I challenge every Adventist on earth to the contrary. Why will people be thus led astray by

the claims of such beings as the pope of Rome, Joseph Smith, Mrs. White, Anne Hutchinson, and others?

Now for the proof: (1) "God has seen fit to thrust me into positions in which he has not placed any other one in our ranks; he has laid upon me burdens of reproof that he has not given any other one." (Testimonies for the Church, by Mrs. E. G. White, Vol. 3, page 315.) Don't you see? Yes, the pope claims a position in the Roman Catholic ranks that is above all others. Here is your mark of the beast. (2) A brother and sister "A" in the Adventists' rank did not depend as much as they should on the counsel of Mrs. White and her husband. This led to the following words from her: (3) "After those who have led out in this work have labored hard to prepare the truth and bring the work up ready to your hand, you embrace it, and go out to labor, presenting the precious arguments which others with inexpressible anxiety have searched out for you." (Same book, page 317.) How about this for the mark of the beast? (4) But more: "Men who now go forth to preach the truth have things made ready to their hand. The truth has been brought out link after link till it forms a clean connected chain. To bring the truth out in such clearness and harmony has required careful research." (Page 327.) (5) "The instructions that I have given by pen or voice have been an expression of the light God has for years been impressing on my mind and writing on my heart." (Testimonies, Vol. 5, page 691.) (6) "If you desire to know what the Lord revealed through her, read her published works." (Same book, page 696.) (7) Her writings are called "Testimonies to the Church." She says, "In ancient times God spoke to man by the mouth of prophets and apostles. In these days he speaks to them by the testimonies of his Spirit." (Vol. 4, page 148.) Testimonies of his Spirit have reference to her writings. Here is the mark of the beast.

But what if we do not hear Mrs. White's testimonies? Listen to Her Majesty: (8) "Those who would in any way lessen the force of the sharp reproofs which God has given me to speak must meet their work at the judgment." . . . "God has not given my brethren the work he has given me." (Vol. 5, page 677.)

(9) "If you feel just as safe in following your own impulses as in following the light given by God's delegated servant, the peril is your own, you will be condemned because you rejected the light which heaven had sent." (Same book, page 688.)

The pope claims this light, Joseph Smith claims it. Smith claims that the angels of Rev. 14: 6 came to him and restored to him the everlasting gospel. Whom shall we hear? Here is the mark of the beast. Now the climax is reached, hear it: (10) "And now, brethren, I entreat you not to interpose between me and the people and turn away the light which God would have come to them." (Testimonies, Vol. 5, page 691.) From this you see she is a mediator between God and the people. Others must not "interpose between her and the people." Here is the mark of the beast. Be not deceived, kind reader, when Adventists come crying aloud about the mark of the beast. It is like the man who, after stealing some goods, ran down the street, saying, "Stop, thief! Stop thief!" This crying is to hide the mark they have.

(11) "Christ gives power to the voice of the church. 'Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' . . . God has bestowed the highest powers under heaven upon his church. It is the voice of God in his united people in church capacity which is to be respected." (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 3, pages 450, 451.)

Can the Catholics beat this? Think of it: "God has

bestowed the highest powers under heaven upon his church"! I thought Christ had all the power and authority God has in heaven and on earth, and here Mrs. White takes it from Christ and gives it to the church! So, friends, you can see where the Adventists get their robes, that creed they make you confess, then voting on you, and wearing the name "Seventh-Day Adventist" instead of the name God has given his people. Here is the "mark of the beast" with a vengeance!

But more. Now listen to the following words from Mrs. White in condemning one who did not do to suit her:

(12) "It is impossible for E to be fellowshipped in the church of God. He has placed himself where he cannot be helped by the church, where he can have no communion with nor voice in the church . . . He has followed the inclinations of his corrupt heart, has violated the holy law of God, and has disgraced the cause of present truth. If he repents ever so heartily, the church must let his case alone. If he goes to heaven, it must be alone, without the fellowship of the church." (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 1, page 215.)

Will our Adventist friends give us something the pope of Rome has done or said that can beat this?

SCRIPTURE SERMONS

By

S. H. HALL

Twenty-Six Sermons or Lessons on Vital Questions

Price—\$1.50

Send All Orders to

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

P. O. Box 150
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE