

LIGHT

on the

SABBATH QUESTION

3rd Edition

By

HELEN APPLETON

WEGWEISER RESEARCH LIBRARY
and
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Bo-Bo Valley, via Ulong,
N.S.W. 2450. AUSTRALIA

Light on the Sabbath Question



Having been a Seventh Day Adventist for about twenty years, and having many friends among them still, I write the following with an inner knowledge of their "message" and with the hope that some may see its fallacy and replace it with the true gospel which is "able to make us wise unto Salvation." I write particularly on the Sabbath question because I realise that it is the undue importance S.D.A.'s place upon this subject which keeps them from seeing the more drastic errors which their "message" includes. Others have written exposing the fallacies of their "Sanctuary" teaching, which amounts to a plain contradiction of the gospel of atonement made at Calvary and I can recommend articles on the subject to any interested enough to enquire. I feel, however, that with many the Sabbath looms so large and important upon the horizon of their thinking that they cannot see beyond it to the all-important truths of salvation, and so it is necessary to remove what has become such an obstacle to faith. With a desire that all Adventists may have the joy of realising that their salvation is **assured**, that here and now they may be **certain** that they are elect, I write the following :—

There is a fundamental error in Adventist teaching which is the cause of their false deductions with regard to Sabbath keeping in the Christian dispensation. Get this point clear. This error is in their misapprehension of the Biblical use of the term "the law." This term is used very widely indeed. The concordance says:—"The law" commonly included the whole of the five books of Moses. Take a few examples of the Bible use of the term.

In 1 Cor. 14 : 34 we read :— "Women . . . are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." Where does the law say this? In Gen. 3 : 16. So "Genesis" is in "The Law."

In Rom. 7 : 7 we read :— "The law hath said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" Where does the law say this? In Exodus 20 : 17. So "Exodus" is in "The Law."

In Matt. 22 : 36 we read :— "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus quoted Deut. 6 : 5 and Lev. 19 : 18. So "Deuteronomy" and "Leviticus" are in "The Law."

In Matt. 12 : 5 we read :— "Have you not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless?" Where is this to be read? In Numbers 28 : 9. So "Numbers" is in "The Law."

Consequently when we read "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul," we have a much larger field of scripture to explore, than is usually conceded by S.D.A.'s. Also they confuse the eternal law of love implanted in man's heart at creation and replanted at conversion, with the Jewish code of laws given at Mt. Sinai, which we are told in the New Testament passed away with the old Covenant of which it was the central feature. To explain the many scriptures speaking of the abolition of the old covenant law Adventist teachers make a division in it, retaining one portion and allowing the other portion to be "done away." They say that the law is divided into two parts. (1) The moral law, written on two tables of stone and called the Law of God, and (2) The Ceremonial law, written in a book placed in the side of the Ark and called The Law of Moses and exclusive of the Ten Commandments. They further claim that what was nailed to the Cross (Col. 2 : 13-15) was this Law of Moses written in the book of the law. Now I propose to show that the book of the law contained the Ten Commandments and that in the Scriptures themselves there is no such division as claimed above. "The law" was given to Israel as a unit and has been superseded also as a unit. We may not pick out portions to retain when God has not retained them. Only by holding to this wrong and unscriptural division of the law can S.D.A.'s retain even a semblance of feasibility

in their arguments. They calmly claim that when the term "law of Moses" is used in the Bible, it refers only to the ceremonial law—not to the Ten Commandments, and when the term **law of God** is used it refers only to the Ten Commandments. Let us now see how absurd is this contention in the light of the Scriptures.

All the words that God spoke to Moses are written in the "book of the law," Moral, Ceremonial, Civic, etc. This can be easily ascertained by reading Deut., Chapters 28-31. For instance chapter 28 : 1, "If thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do **all His Commandments** which I command thee this day, the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth, v.2, and these blessings shall overtake thee, etc., v. 9. The Lord shall establish thee an holy people unto Himself—if thou shalt keep the **commandments of the Lord thy God**, v. 15. But it shall come to pass if you wilt **not** hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do **all His Commandments and His statutes**, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, etc., v. 45." "Moreover, all these curses shall come upon thee—till thou be destroyed, because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God to keep **His Commandments and His statutes** which **He commanded** thee, etc."

Notice v. 58 : 59, "If thou wilt **not** observe to do all the words of the law, that are **written in this book**, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, 'The Lord thy God.' Then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, etc." Ch. 29 : 24-27. "Even all nations shall say, 'Wherefore hath the Lord done this?' Then men shall say 'Because they have forsaken the Covenant (see Deut. 5 : 1-22 and Deut. 4 : 13) of the **Lord God of their fathers**, which He made with them when he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt'—for they went and served other gods (2nd Com. broken)—and the anger of the Lord was kindled against this land, to bring upon it all the curses that are **written in this book**." Ch. 30 : 1, 2, 3, And it shall come to pass when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, and thou shalt call them to mind, and shalt return unto and obey the **voice of the Lord** and do **all His Commandments** which I command thee this day, and v. 9, The Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, if thou wilt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, v. 15. See I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil, v. 16. In that I command thee this day to **love the Lord thy God**, to walk in His ways, and to keep **His Commandments and His statutes and His judgments**, ch. 31 : 9. (Surely this includes the whole law, Ten Commandments and all?) And Moses wrote this law,

and delivered it unto the priests, v. 10, and Moses commanded them saying, "At the end of every seven years, v. 11, when all Israel will come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel, v. 12. Gather the people together, men, women and children, and thy stranger, that they may hear and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God and observe and do all the words of this law, v. 24, and it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished, v. 25, that Moses commanded the Levites, saying, v. 26, Take this **book of the law** and put it in the **side of the ark of the Covenant** of the Lord your God.

Now who shall say in the light of the foregoing that all the words of the Lord **including the Ten Commandments** were not written in the book of the law. (**His Commandments, His Statutes, and His Judgments.**) What was nailed to the Cross? S.D.A.'s say—the book of the law. (If so, then the Ten Commandments were too.) There is no division here.

If God's law was indeed divided as they say, surely we would find a careful discrimination made in the Bible when referring to matters of **moral or ceremonial** importance? Yet this is not so. Indeed we find the terms "**Law of God**" and "**Law of Moses**" and just "**law**" referring to the

same instance over and over again, e.g., Luke 2 : 22-24-39. The parents of Jesus did according to the **Law of Moses** and the **Law of the Lord** in offering a sacrifice; similarly, in Neh. 8 : 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18. "They spoke unto Ezra the Scribe to bring the **book of the law of Moses**, which the Lord had commanded to Israel," and v. 2, "Ezra brought the **law**—and he read therein—and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the **law**—so they read in the book of the **law of God** distinctly" (S.D.A.'s Ten Commandments) "and they found written in the **law which the Lord had commanded by Moses** that the children of Israel should dwell in booths—and there was very great gladness—and also day by day—he read in the book of the **law of God**. And they kept the feast seven days." So you see, there is no such discrimination of terms as S.D.A.'s make. Ezra read from one book. All terms are used indiscriminately referring to the same matter. So S.D.A.'s are wrong in their claims of a law divided into two different parts. It is all **one law** according to the scriptures.

Now having shown that the **Law of God** and the **Law of Moses** are **one law** and that the **book of the law** contained all God's words, including the Ten Commandments, there is no need to go into all the Adventist arguments based upon a **contradiction of these facts**. If the foundation is wrong—the whole superstructure is unsound.

If the law of commandments contained in ordinances was nailed to the cross, then the whole law was nailed there. Let us see now what place "the law" holds in the Christian dispensation as taught in the New Testament. Read Heb. 7 : 11. "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another priest should rise, after the Order of Melchizedek and not be called after the **Order of Aaron,**" and v. 12, "For the **priesthood being changed** there is made **of necessity a change also of the law,**" v. 18. For there is verily a disannulling of the Commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof, v. 19. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a **better hope** did; by which we draw nigh unto God. Ch. 8 : 6. "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." (God's promises, not the people's.) v. 7. The promises were of a heavenly kingdom not an earthly one as formerly. "For if the **first Covenant** had been faultless then should no place have been sought for the **second,**" v. 8. "For finding fault with them he saith, 'Behold the days come—when I will make a **new Covenant,**'" v. 9. **Not according to the Covenant I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt,** v. 13. "In that He saith

a **new Covenant** he hath **made the first old,**" etc. (Duet. 5 : 1-22). Heb. 3 : 1-6—"Christ Jesus was counted worthy of **more glory** than Moses in as much as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house—and Moses verily was faithful—as a **servant** for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken **after,** but Christ as a **son** over His own house." Heb. 12 : 18-29, "For ye are **not come** unto the Mount that might be touched and that burned with fire—and so terrible was the sight that Moses said, 'I exceedingly fear and quake' (the old Covenant at Sinai), but ye are **come** unto Mount Zion—the heavenly Jerusalem—and to Jesus the Mediator of the **New Covenant,** etc."

We find in the foregoing Scriptures that Jesus and His ministration and Covenant of which He was the Mediator has superseded Moses and his ministration and covenant. This same truth is expressed again and again in the New Testament as for example in Heb. 1 : 1-2; "God who spake **in time past** unto the fathers by the **Prophets** (Moses was one of them) hath **in these last days** spoken unto us by His **Son.**"

Jesus Himself claims precedence over Moses in His teachings as evidenced in Matt. 5 : 21, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, etc. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time—**but I say,**" etc., so if we would enter into the spirit

of the New Covenant, we must look to its **Mediator** for our instructions and guidance on the way of life, and not go back to Sinai and the old Covenant which has **given place to the new**. With regard to Sabbath keeping, if indeed it was to be required of Christians, surely when the Saviour was giving all those beautiful teachings on the Mount He would at least have mentioned it. If again it was to be a matter of life and death as taught by S.D.A.'s it would have been **stressed** as the **most important** of all requirements. Instead of this we find Jesus when asked (Matt, 22 : 36-40), "What is the great commandment in the law," replying that there were two great principles upon which **all the law of the Prophets** hang, namely, (1) love to God and (2) love to man. He did not put a "halo" round the Sabbath Commandment to call the attention of all to it as S.D.A.'s claim, He taught that **it and all other Commandments** hung on these two great eternal principles, nor did He say that these two principles hung on the Ten Commandments. This was evidenced again in His teaching in Matt. 12, when the Pharisees complained to Him of His disciples picking ears of corn on the Sabbath. Notice in v. 7 He says, "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." The principle of love behind all God's Commands had not been sensed by the Pharisees. Jesus also explains that the temple law could set aside the

Sabbath law as was done every Sabbath by the priests who "**profaned**" the Sabbath and were "**blameless**," v. 5. If that was so Christ Himself could set it aside because in v. 6 He claimed to be—greater than the temple, and v. 8 **Lord even** of the Sabbath day. This clearly shows that the **principle** of love comes before all rules, and is clearly the **foundation** upon which God's government rests.

Those (as S.D.A.'s) who claim that the so-called **ceremonial law** could be set aside, but the Ten Commandments could not, must admit that when Jesus makes the Sabbath give place to the ceremonial laws of the temple, it is quite possible that the Sabbath too had ceremonial significance. This is just what is taught in Heb. 3 : 7 to ch. 4-11. The Sabbath was a **type** of the rest we may have by believing. We rest from our work as **God did** from His and as the **Israelites** did when leaving Egypt, Deut. 5 : 15. Note : Ch. 4 : 3, "For we which **have believed do** enter into rest." There is no **doubt** about our salvation because it depends upon an accomplished and perfect work—that of Calvary, so we may rest in perfect assurance, when we believe in that perfect work. This spiritual rest is the true Sabbath. It is ours always to enjoy and needs no special day for its observance.

In the light of all the foregoing Scriptures read again 2 Cor. 3 : 5-17 where it is said the ministration of death written and engraven in stones (the Old Covenant, Deut. 5 : 1-22) was glorious but the ministration of the Spirit (the New Covenant, v. 6) **is so much more glorious**, that the glory of the first is as nothing in comparison. Notice v. 11, "If that **which is done away** was glorious, how much more that which remaineth is glorious. In other words the **giving of the law** was **glorious**—but now its glory is as nothing in comparison with the glories of the New Covenant, the ministration of the spirit. That is what Paul means in v. 6, where he says he is a minister of the New Testament **not** of the **letter but** of the **spirit**, for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life. Our Adventist friends are willing to admit that the Old Covenant is gone but not completely, they hold on to its **ten letters**. If they will read Duet. 4 : 13, they will see that these Ten Commandments are so much a part of the Old Covenant that they are here declared to be **one and the same**. "He declared unto you His Covenant, which He commanded you to perform **even Ten Commandments**," etc. So if the Covenant is superseded by a new one I should conclude that "**even Ten Commandments**" are also superseded. I have had Adventist friends reply to this (v. 6), "Oh, no, the New Covenant includes

the spirit **and** the letter." May we thus roundly deny the plain Scriptures, **not** the letter, **but** the spirit? How can we then **ever know the truth?**

Adventists try to make us believe that because Jesus said in Matt. 12 that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, that **all mankind** was required to keep the Sabbath. When one remembers the circumstances under which this statement was made, one can see that Jesus was teaching **that a man was more important than a day**. Verses 3 and 4 show that David's hunger was sufficient reason for him to break the temple law (regarding the shewbread). Verse 5 shows that the temple laws could set aside the Sabbath law, as was done by the priests every Sabbath. So Jesus argued, the disciples' hunger was sufficient reason for setting aside the Sabbath law in the same way. Added to this is the extra reason that the Sabbath was made **for** man and **not** man for the Sabbath (Mark 2 : 27). Our Adventist friends love to quote the first half of this statement and draw a deduction quite different from what the **whole passage** indicates and which the latter half of the statement emphasises. It is most evident that man's need means far more to Jesus than does the keeping of the Sabbath. Man was not made to be inconvenienced by or to suffer because of, the Sabbath. It was made **for** him to be a blessing. Right here we are brought to the realisa-

tion that the Sabbath command in itself was not a moral law, because not even God Himself could break a moral law and "be blameless." Yet as v. 5 says the priests in the temple regularly break the Sabbath law and are blameless. Furthermore, it is most clearly stated that the law including the Sabbath was given **only to the Jew**. See Deut. 5 : 1-3. God made **not** This Covenant with any before Sinai and when the words of the Covenant are written we find they are— the Ten Commandments. (Reminding one of Duet. 4 : 13.) Notice in v. 15 an additional reason for keeping the Sabbath is given and the word **Remember** (so beloved of S.D.A.'s) is used. "Remember **thou** wast a **servant** in the land of Egypt— and that the Lord thy God brought **thee** out thence—**therefore** the Lord thy God commanded **thee** to keep the Sabbath day." Those coming from Egypt were so commanded. This reason **could not apply** to any Jew previous to the Exodus, or to any other **people**. There are many other places in the Bible stating that "the law" as a **code** was given for a limited period only and to the Jews only. Notice Gal. 3 : 16-19, "Here we learn that the law was given 430 years after the Covenant of salvation by faith made with Abraham, bringing us to Sinai, and was to last till the first coming of Christ. This is in harmony with the statement in Luke 16 : 16. "The law and the prophets were **until John**, since that time the Kingdom of God is preached." Even the preamble to the Ten

Comandments given in Ex. 20 states plainly in v. 2, that God was speaking to the Jews— "I am the Lord thy God which **brought thee out if the Land of Egypt.**" Rom. 2 : 14 makes the statement that the Gentiles "have not the law." (Now, here we come to a point that the S.D.A.'s miscontrue in v. 15.) "Yet show the work of the law written in the heart." Just compare this with Rom. 5 : 13, 14. "For until 'the law,' sin was in the world but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses." Plainly this is teaching that there was **some** law before "the law" given at Sinai. This **must** have been that eternal law Jesus speaks in Matt. 22 : 36-40 **upon which the Jewish Code hung**. So, with the expiration of "the law" we come back to the same ground that Abraham stood on, that of salvation by faith, with those two principles of love to God and love to man written in the heart. It may be opportune right here to notice that we are also under the same Priesthood that Abraham was under—that of Melchizedek. See Heb. 6 : 20, ch. 7 : 1-28. It is interesting to read the first two chapters of Romans and to notice how the Gentiles are declared to be under judgment because they **rejected God** when thy knew Him, and then when we come to ch. 3, the Jews are shown to be even more guilty because they had the law to enlighten them (which the Gentiles did not have). Verse 19 declares, "Now we know that what things

so-ever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." (This is manifestly the Jews because ch. 2-14 says the Gentiles didn't have the law.) And so "**all the world**" Gentile and Jew becomes guilty before God. The Jews were quite sure that Gentiles were sinners, but here they are shown to be even more guilty because of their greater opportunity in having "the law" to teach them (which law was holy, just and good).

This fundamental, eternal law is referred to in James 2 : 8 as the "Royal Law." The New Testament amplifies these two great principles and so we get many **moral precepts** and exhortations, much more comprehensive than those outlined in the Old Covenant, yet inclusive of all. So now Jew and Gentile meet on a common ground as stated in Eph. 2 : 14-16. "For He is our peace, who hath made both one and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having **abolished** in his flesh the enmity, even the **law of commandments contained in ordinances**, for to make Himself of twain, one new man so making peace," etc. When we remember that the dictionary meaning for "ordinances" is simply, "an established degree, statute or law," we realise that under the New Covenant we are to look away from Sinai altogether (as in Heb. 12 : 18-28) and come to the New Testament and to Christ its Mediator with "the law" a thing of the past—left

among the shadows of the old dispensation. The "true light" now shineth. Christ says, "I am the light of the world" and in that light what need have we to go back to the way that was merely leading up to the light. The whole law was a schoolmaster leading us to Christ—when we reach His day and ministration what further need have we for a schoolmaster? Gal. 3 : 24-25. Since then the Kingdom of God is preached Luke 16 : 16, not the earthly Kingdom (promised and received) under the Old Covenant. Now we have something far more glorious, 2 Cor. 3 : 8-10, which remains, when the old ministration written and engraven in stones is done away. So, as it says in Heb. 12 : 28, "Wherefore we, receiving **a Kingdom which cannot be moved**, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and Godly fear." So we have two Covenants and two kingdoms, the old covenant with its earthly temporal kingdom and the new Covenant with its everlasting Kingdom—the Kingdom of God. In abolishing "the law" God does not thereby declare it to have had anything wrong with it. It was "holy, just and good," but when the "light of the world" shines, all lesser lights are unnecessary. The law has been all "fulfilled." Now we are not "without law" but "under law to Christ." 1 Cor. 9 : 19-22.

Our worship now is removed from a legal basis. As Jesus Himself said to the woman of Samaria in John 4:23-24, "The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in **Spirit** and in truth." It is not now a question of days, be it Sabbath days or Lords Days—the heart worship **at all times** is acceptable to God and He leaves it to us to set aside such time as is most convenient for public or private worship. "We are under the ministration of the Spirit **not** the letter, 2 Cor. 3:6, and now, one man may esteem one day better than another or he may esteem every day alike—who are we to judge? Rom. 14:4-6. This is the New Testament teaching. It seems to me that when, for one day in the week (as Sunday) there is comparative quiet and leisure, we could well as Christians be thankful for the privilege of a splendid opportunity for public worship. So why "shatter" the institution of Church attendance on Sunday, and its sacredness, as a certain S.D.A. minister claims to do, seeing as we have proved there is no Biblical requirement for the legal observance of any particular day? There is, however, a spiritual significance about the first day of the week, in that the resurrection of Christ on that day assures us of our justification, Rom. 4:25, and the early church most evidently valued that day highly. I might go a little further and point out that God in giving the Sabbath to the Jews in Palestine knew what He was doing.

There was no difficulty there in one small country in keeping the identical twenty-four hours, as there is on a round earth. For instance, Australian Adventists have kept ten hours' Sabbath before English Adventists begin to keep it. Similarly Australians have finished their "sacred hours" the same length of time before the English folk. If God and the angels keep the identical twenty-four hours with the family on earth, with what body of people do They keep them? By trying to make a local law apply **universally**, our S.D.A. friends make an absurdity of the whole thing. Considering also the teaching by S.D.A.'s that the keeping of these identical twenty-four hours is the "seal of God" and the keeping of the following twenty-four hours is the "mark of the beast," how necessary would it be to have a **stable date line**. Our date line now reckoned from Greenwich, runs North and South through the Pacific east of Australia. Yet at one time it was reckoned from Washington and so fell to the West of Australia. The change thus affected made Australia's Sunday into Saturday—so that all who may have been keeping Sunday (the so-called mark of the beast) now, without any volition of their own kept Saturday (the so-called seal of God). How absurd to teach that man's eternal Salvation hangs on such **uncertainties** as this! It may be news to the average Adventist to know that the date line has also been reckoned at various times from (1) Canary Is., (2) Tenereffe,

(3) Ferro, (4) Paris, (5) Berlin, and (6) Jerusalem. It is quite possible that another change may be made at any time, causing similar changes in the days of the week at certain places. How will our S.D.A. friends be **sure** of the identical "twenty-four hours" which they claim it is so important to keep? This importance is never claimed for Sunday and so Sunday is adaptable to world conditions. As an example of local difficulties encountered in the changing of the day line we may quote Alaska, which was settled by Russia ages ago before the present day line existed. They brought their reckoning with them and hence their Sunday was on America's Saturday. In 1867 America bought Alaska and it became part of the United States. The day America took possession her laws changed Alaska's Sunday to Saturday, all by human authority. In Pitcairn Is. in the Pacific a somewhat similar happening occurred. Let me quote Mr D. M. Canright; "Pitcairn . . . was settled . . . by persons who brought their reckoning eastward from Asia. But it happens to be on the American side of the present day-line. Hence their Sunday was our (America's) Saturday and they all kept it 100 years as Sunday. According to Adventists this was an awful thing, for Sunday is . . . the 'mark of the beast!' So . . . Adventists went there and converted them all to keeping Saturday. How? They simply induced them to change their reckoning of the day line a few miles and lo! their

Sunday was Saturday! Now they are all pious Sabbath keepers, while before they were all keeping Sunday, the mark of the beast! and yet they are keeping exactly the same day they always kept!" I believe at the present time in Tonga Seventh Day Adventists and Sunday keepers worship on the same day and so both must have, according to S.D.A. teaching, the **same mark**, either the 'mark of the beast' or the 'Seal of God.' I wonder which it is!"

Is it not better to accept the New Testament teaching as outlined above and let one's religion be a **matter of the heart** and our worship be established upon a basis of grace not law? In this way, instead of causing division in the "household of faith" our Adventist believers may join hands with others of God's children and together work for the evangelisation of the world in readiness for the coming of the Lord. The "message" then would be the "greatest story ever told," the story of God's love to lost mankind revealed at the cross; the message the whole world needs; the message all Christians should be exerting their influence to give. Any other message will not do. This is the saving message: "Christ has for sin atonement made. What a wonderful Saviour!" I venture to say that the S.D.A. "special message" is a downright contradiction of this and the time taken

up preaching it is more than so much waste time—it brings the preachers thereof under the curse pronounced in Gal. 1 : 8-9. Any teaching which denies the fact of atonement at Calvary by the shedding of the blood of Christ is **another gospel**. For this fact is the **very centre** of the gospel. In the type (see Lev.16 : 30), when the High Priest made an atonement, its purpose was “to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.” So, in the anti-type, when Jesus “**had purged** our sins and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High” He had made atonement. Because atonement has been made we are reconciled to God (God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself). (While we were yet sinners, we were reconciled to God by **the death** of His Son.) Unless a full and satisfactory **atonement** for sin had thus been made, reconciliation could not have been effected. If S.D.A.’s will read in their own standard work “Desire of Ages,” page 834, they will find this truth taught and yet they persist in preaching its contradiction. Can anything be more absurd? Is it any wonder that an organisation which can so **confuse the simple gospel** can also get tangled up in the types and shadows prefiguring the gospel? It is no wonder at all! And so I would say to all interested in Salvation—the veil over the face of our friends in reading the Old Testament (2 Cor. 3 : 13-15) is taken away in Christ. Let

us turn to Him as revealed in the full blaze of New Testament light—leave the shadows and types where they belong—interpret them if you will, in the clear light of the Gospel, but do not try now to interpret the gospel by the shadows. We have come past the time when that was necessary. “The true light now shineth”—the Old Covenant is “done away” (read what was included in it in Deut. 5 : 1-22 and Deut. 4 : 13) and then turn from it to the new one which is **not** of the letter. With atonement made, a Saviour who lives to keep us true, and the great law of love “written in the heart,” let us go on until “we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.”

H. APPLETON.

" YES MEN "

"Yes Men," is a term which has taken a place among our popular expressions, perhaps because there is so many such people about, men whose aim is to "keep in" with someone or everyone, at whatever sacrifice of truth and independence.

It is a man's proud right to think for himself, and all men worth their salt take pride in exercising that right. But the "Yes Man" gives no sign of having a mind capable of being seriously made up on any serious matter. If there is a crowd the "Yes Man" will be found to be in agreement with the crowd. He will never be in a situation in which the weight of argument or the laugh is against him. He goes with the mass—right or wrong. Or he agrees with some more powerful person because "it pays."

Something Better

Our powers of reasoning place us above the animal creation, and if a man chooses not to use those powers, how much better is he? When someone happened to excuse an effort to be popular with the plea that one must go with the flowing tide, the sharp retort of an eminent thinker was— "Any dead dog can do that. And any live dog can lick a master's boots, but we want something better than that."

No man should so sacrifice his individuality. If he chooses to try to keep in everybody's good books, depend upon it everybody deems him no sort of man to be a friend or an ally. He is of no account. Or as old John Earle said of such a person— "He hath staid in the world to fill a number, and when he is gone, there wants one, and there's an end." Yes, he counts as one—just that and no more.