

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM EXAMINED

- I. FORGING THE EVIDENCE**
Trying to Make a Case for Sabbath-Keeping
- II. DISTORTING PLAIN FACTS OF HISTORY**
Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?
- III. HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD
DECEITFULLY:**
 - a) Dishonoring Christ in the Atonement
Christ or Satan? Which is Our Sin-Bearer?
 - b) The Sabbath Question
What Does the New Testament Teach?

by J. B. Rowell
Pastor

Central Baptist Church
Victoria, B. C.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT 1952

by



Challenge Publishing Company

P. O. Box 467

Norwalk, California

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SECOND EDITION

Printed in U. S. A.

Foreword

by

DR. CARL M. SWEAZY

Evangelist and Representative
Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary

The message contained is one of vital importance, meriting close attention and an earnest study by all, particularly by the Seventh-Day Adventists themselves.

The author, Dr. J. B. Rowell, is especially qualified to investigate and analyze the teachings of the religious sects; and, at the same time, he has both the courage and the ability to state the case in the light of the Scriptures, furnishing the Biblical evidence to expose the error.

With clear and definite quotations from authorities which cannot be questioned, he furnishes in all his writings adequate documentary proof, convincing the reader as to his full knowledge of the subject in hand. A reader has the feeling that he is being guided in his thinking by one who speaks as led by the Spirit of God.

Dr. Rowell makes a studied attempt to be fair and to truthfully state the case, and he succeeds admirably, both in pointing out fatal departures from the Truth, and in presenting the teaching of the Scriptures. The present treatise is therefore of real value to any one who desires to deal first hand with the dangerous fallacy of Seventh-Day Adventism. Study groups, Sunday Schools, and Personal Work classes should avail themselves of this opportunity to know what this cult really is. May this booklet be used of the Lord to deliver many precious souls from its deadening influence.

Other publications by Dr. Rowell include: "Why Millions Do NOT Call the Pope 'Holy Father';" "Shall the Pope be 'Supreme Arbiter' Among the Nations?"; "Our Protestant Heritage"; "Greatest Hoax in All History"; "When a Mouse Eats the Sacrament"; "Open Letter to the Pope and Cardinals Regarding the Assumption of the Virgin Mary"; "Exposition of Hebrews Six"; "The Henceforth of a Deeper Devotion to the Person of Christ"; "Love Radiant," etc.

FORGING THE EVIDENCE

Trying to Make a Case for Sabbath-Keeping

Because there is not a shred of historical proof that the Pope changed the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday, Seventh-Day Adventist leaders have descended to shameful dishonesty in their effort to fabricate evidence calculated to bluff the people.

More damaging to the cause of Seventh-Day Adventism than any objections of critics, are the historical inaccuracies, the falsified quotations, and the seemingly deliberate intention to deceive unthinking people, the perpetration of which some Seventh-Day Adventist leaders are guilty.

For various reasons the present writer would rather not even refer to this deception, but for the sake of honest, well-meaning church-going people, who are being deceived, it seems necessary to give the facts to the public, who can then judge whether the above charge is true or false.

What is Taught

Seventh-Day Adventism teaches that Saturday was generally observed as the day of worship for more than 300 years after Christ. Under the caption "EARLY CHRISTIANS KEPT SATURDAY," the Seventh-Day Adventist publication "The Present Truth," says: "The seventh day was quite generally kept as the Sabbath by the Christian church from the apostles' time until the Council of Laodicea, in the year 364. For hundreds of years after our Saviour's death, no other day except the seventh was known in the church by the name of Sabbath." (p. 2)

The inference is that Saturday, or Sabbath, was generally observed, and not Sunday, or the Lord's Day.

Because the implications in this statement are absolutely untrue, Seventh-Day Adventist leaders have made up their **lack of proof** by inventing a story which they pass off as proof. It is easy for a public speaker, or a writer, to give quotations from various authors, but how many of his hearers, or readers, examine those quotations? In the majority of cases, the quotations from authorities are accepted as true, even though they are false. However, the admonition of Scriptures is, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Of course, no sensible person has any objection to another having his own opinion or viewpoint, or even his own interpretation of Scripture, since liberty of conscience is the common heritage of us all. When, however, religious leaders go out of their way to **deliberately misrepresent facts** in order to prove their case, they stand condemned by their own dishonesty. Even so, an unsuspecting public should be warned. It is safe to conclude that when any system, in order to support its claims, deliberately misquotes an author, and makes him teach something he never taught, then that system is unsound, and is not to be trusted.

A Disgraceful Mutilation

The present writer has before him a copy of *The Present Truth*, Vol. I, Number 9, published in Oshawa, Ontario, dealing with the question, "Who Changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?"

When I first read this paper, I noticed **omission marks** in a quotation, given in this Seventh-Day

Adventist publication, from, as they state, "No less eminent an authority than Schaff-Herzog." (p. 2) Knowing something of the writings and stand taken by Dr. Philip Schaff, I found it difficult to credit him with supporting the position taken by the Seventh-Day Adventists. So, I looked up the volume, and found the quotation. The purpose of this paper, "The Present Truth," is an attempt to show that the early Christians kept Saturday, and that the change to Sunday observance was not made until hundreds of years after our Saviour's death. In their attempt to prove this theory, they have mutilated the writings of Schaff-Herzog.

I shall first give the quotation as it is in this Seventh-Day Adventist paper, and then the full quotation from Schaff-Herzog, showing the OMITTED PORTIONS in emphasized type. First the quotation from the Seventh-Day Adventist publication:

"Thus it is plain how Sunday, the day devoted by the pagans to sun worship, came to be adopted by the Christian church. No less eminent an authority than Schaff-Herzog says:

'Sunday (*dies solis* . . . day of the sun because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The 'sun' of Latin adoration they interpreted as the 'sun of Righteousness' . . . No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.'—Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. IV, art. "Sunday," p. 2259, 3d. ed. 1891.

"These authorities have pictured before us the work of a great apostasy, a falling away from the pure principles of the gospel of Christ, and the gradual acceptance by professed Christians in the early centuries of a religious practice of paganism. Besides ob-

servance of the first day of the week, other heathen practices crept in." (Schaff-Herzog)

This quotation makes Dr. Philip Schaff and Dr. J. J. Herzog party to the spirit and argument of this S. D. A. publication, and consequently, to the affirmation that the observance of the first day of the week was without New Testament authority, but was a heathen practice brought into the Christian religion hundreds of years after Christ, and designated the work of a great apostasy.

By this quotation, we see how Seventh-Day Adventists have made an author say what they wanted him to say, and thus make it appear that they have certain scholars on their side supporting their teaching. Now we will give the quotation in full, and let Schaff-Herzog speak without interference. The portions omitted by the S. D. A. are in emphasized type.

"Sunday (*Dies solis*, OF THE ROMAN CALENDAR, 'day of the sun,' because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The 'sun' of Latin adoration they interpreted as the 'Sun of righteousness.' SUNDAY WAS EMPHATICALLY THE WEEKLY FEAST OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, AS THE JEWISH SABBATH WAS THE FEAST OF THE CREATION. IT WAS CALLED THE 'LORD'S DAY,' AND UPON IT THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH ASSEMBLED TO BREAK BREAD (ACTS xx.7; 1 COR. xvi. 2). No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined; YET CHRISTIAN FEELING LED TO THE UNIVERSAL ADOPTION OF THE DAY, IN IMITATION OF APOSTOLIC PRECEDENT. IN THE SECOND CENTURY ITS OBSERVANCE WAS UNIVERSAL." (See Schaff-Herzog, art. SUNDAY.)

To further emphasize to what extent the Seventh-Day Adventists have misrepresented Dr. Philip Schaff to prove their case, let me quote from his **History of the Christian Church**. He says, "The Lord's Day took the place of the Jewish Sabbath as the **weekly** day of public worship . . . the Jewish Sabbath was hedged around by many national and ceremonial restrictions, which were not intended to be permanent, but were gradually made so prominent as to overshadow its great moral aim, and to make man subservient to the sabbath instead of the sabbath to man. After the exile and in the hands of the Pharisees it became a legal bondage rather than a privilege and benediction. Christ as Lord of the Sabbath opposed this mechanical ceremonialism and restored the true spirit and benevolent aim of the institution. When the slavish, superstitious, and self-righteous sabbatarianism of the Pharisees crept into the Galatian churches and was made a condition of justification, Paul rebuked it as a relapse into Judaism.

"The day was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, not on the ground of a particular command, but by the free spirit of the gospel and by the power of certain great facts which lie at the foundation of the Christian church. It was on that day that Christ rose from the dead; that he appeared to Mary, the disciples of Emmaus, and the assembled apostles; that he poured out His Spirit and founded His church; and that He revealed to his beloved disciples the mysteries of the future. Hence, the first day was already in the apostolic age honorably designated as 'the Lord's Day.' On that day Paul met with the disciples at Troas and preached till midnight. On that day he ordered the Galatian and Corinthian Christians to make, no

doubt in connection with divine service, their weekly contributions to charitable objects according to their ability. It appears, therefore, from the New Testament itself, that Sunday was observed as a day of worship, and in special commemoration of the Resurrection, whereby the work of redemption was finished. The universal and uncontradicted Sunday observance in the second century can only be explained by the fact that it had its roots in apostolic practice." (See **History of the Christian Church**, Philip Schaff, vol. I, pp. 477-479.)

It is difficult to understand how professed religious leaders can so misrepresent the scholar who wrote the above statement as to bring him under their banner to help them promote their pet theory. If the cause of Seventh-Day Adventism needs such misrepresentation, then it is not worthy of a moment's consideration. Much less does it deserve to be accepted by those who love the Truth.

DISTORTING PLAIN FACTS OF HISTORY

Did the Pope Change the Sabbath

One of the strongest points of Seventh-Day Adventism is their claim that the Pope changed the Sabbath. To try and prove this, they warp history and misrepresent facts. They say the Pope of Rome is the only authority Sunday-keepers have; and that keeping Sunday, the first day of the week, instead of Saturday, the seventh day of the week, constitutes the Mark of the Beast. Their teaching may be summarized as follows:

- 1) ". . . history proves that Sunday was never observed by Christians as the Sabbath until several centuries after the crucifixion of Christ." ¹
- 2) "The seventh day was quite generally kept as the Sabbath by the Christian Church from the Apostles' time until the Council of Laodicea, in the year 364." ²
- 3) That, under the direction of the bishops, Constantine brought Sunday-keeping into Christianity in the fourth century. ³ "In the first centuries the true Sabbath had been kept by all Christians . . . In the early part of the fourth century, the emperor Constantine issued a decree making Sunday a public festival throughout the Roman Empire . . . He was urged to do this by the bishops of the church." ⁴

¹ **The Present Truth**, vol. 21, No. 13, p. 6.

² *ibid.*, vol 1, No. 9, p. 2.

³ **Bible Readings for the Home Circle**, pub'd. 1889, p. 61.

⁴ **The Great Controversy**, by Mrs. E. G. White, pp. 52, 53. (1907 ed.)

- 4) That "the change of the Sabbath is a sign or mark of the authority of the Romish Church," and that Sunday observance is a "child of the papacy."
- 5) That the Roman Church enforced the observance of Sunday at the Council of Laodicea in 364 A.D., and teaches in her catechisms that she made the change by her own authority.

The Time — Place — Power

So emphatic are Seventh-Day Adventists in declaring that the day of worship was changed from Saturday to Sunday in the fourth century, and that the Sabbath, and not the Lord's Day, was observed from the times of the Apostles until the Council of Laodicea, that Elder Waggoner, a leader among the Seventh-Day Adventists, when saying that the Sabbath was changed at the Council of Laodicea in 364, made bold to say, "I have shown the time, the place, and the power that changed the Sabbath."⁵

No Historical Proof

Seventh-Day Adventists bend every effort to prove their case, but though they make many quotations, they cannot produce any historical proof to show that the Pope changed the Sabbath. This same Elder Waggoner, who was one of their ablest advocates, was chosen to search for proof of their claims; and though "he searched the libraries of America and Europe," he found none. When he brought his findings together for publication, "not a single author did he quote saying that the Pope changed the Sabbath." (Canright)

⁵ Replies to Canright, pp. 141, 151—Canright, p. 244.

An Adventist's Confession

Rev. D. M. Canright, for twenty-eight years a prominent minister and writer in support of Seventh-Day Adventism, declared: "For many years I accepted these false statements of Sabbatarian writers as undoubted truths, as all their converts do. I had no means of knowing better. I preached strongly what I read in their books and led hundreds still more ignorant than myself to believe it. Gradually the truth dawned upon me that I was being misled. Now I have investigated the matter, 'till I am fully satisfied for myself that, to sustain their false theories, they have done great violence to the plainest facts of history."⁶

Our Position

We hold no brief for the Roman Church, since she is guilty of building up her claims on forgeries and misrepresentations. Here, however, we are dealing with Seventh-Day Adventists, who, in their effort to build up a case for themselves and their peculiar beliefs, follow the same dishonest methods.

It is historically true that the day of worship was not changed from Saturday to Sunday at the Council of Laodicea, or at any time during the fourth century; neither was the change made by the Roman Church at any time in her history. Especially is it true that the change was not made by the Roman Church during the Apostolic era, since that church, as she is now known, did not come into existence until centuries after the times of the Apostles. The observance of the Lord's Day, however, was practiced in the times of the Apostles, and from then on. All that Constantine did was to authorize its ob-

⁶ Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced (p. 248)

servance. However, in dealing with this question, we shall have to deal with it in the light of the relative statements of the Seventh-Day Adventists and the Church of Rome.

Quoting a "Catholic" Catechism

In spite of lack of proof, Seventh-Day Adventism persists in stating that the Pope changed the Sabbath, and that this change was made in the fourth century; particularly enforcing it at the Council of Laodicea in 364 A.D. In the effort to prove this unhistorical assumption, they bring in a "Catholic Catechism," to make it appear that the Roman Church supports their contention, even though that church definitely teaches that the first day was consecrated as the day of worship in the times of the Apostles.

The S. D. A. **Present Truth**, vol. 21, No. 10, after dealing with the Council of Laodicea, says, "A currently used Roman Catholic catechism calls attention to this eclipse of the Sabbath by Sunday:

"Q. Which is the Sabbath day?

"A. Saturday is the Sabbath.

"Q. Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

"A. We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the (Roman) Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 366), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday."—Peter Geiermann, **The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine**, (1942 ed.) pg. 50.

Is This Deception?

Either the Seventh-Day Adventists do not know all that Peter Geiermann wrote on this subject, or else they refuse to quote that which makes the difference. The above quotation is given to support the peculiar contention of the S. D. A., by making

it appear that this Romanist writer taught that his church changed the Sabbath at the Council of Laodicea. And yet this Romanist theologian actually taught that the Lord's Day was observed from the times of the Apostles.

I have before me a highly commended work by this Rev. P. Geiermann, C.S.S.R., entitled **A Manual of Theology for the Laity**, bearing the official **Imprimatur** and **Nihil Obstat**. In this we read: "The first Christians, besides, kept Sunday holy also, because on that day the Saviour rose from the dead, and the Holy Ghost came down on the Apostles. Later on, however, a dispute arose between the Jewish and the Gentile converts respecting the day which must be kept holy. Many of the Jewish converts maintained that all converts were bound by the entire law of Moses. TO REMOVE THIS ERRONEOUS IMPRESSION, and to free her children from the ceremonial law of Moses, the Church decreed in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364) that all Catholics should keep holy Sunday as 'the Lord's day' (Apoc. i. 10), AS HAD BEEN DONE SINCE APOSTOLIC TIMES (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2). This change the Church was authorized to make by the power conferred upon her by Jesus Christ . . ." (p. 326) (caps mine)

Let the Roman Church Answer

As we have seen, the Seventh-Day Adventists teach, quoting, "The seventh day was quite generally kept as the Sabbath by the Christian church from the Apostles' time until the Council of Laodicea," and then they quote Geiermann's Catechism, as above, to sustain their contention that the change of the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday was made at the Council of Laodicea.

Let us now see what the Roman Church has to say to this kind of argument. For this, I turn to **Radio Replies**, by Fathers Rumble and Carty, which professes to state Protestant **objections**, and then answer them. Objection "1164. Geiermann, a Catholic writer, says that the Church changed the day in the fourth century at the Council of Laodicea." Answer: "You have misunderstood him. The Church then merely gave a special precept ordering the faithful to keep to the Apostolic practice of observing Sunday. But the change was not made in the fourth century for the first time . . . Yet it is right to say that the Catholic Church changed the day in so far as the Apostles were representatives of that Church; for they, with the authority of Christ, sanctioned the change." (vol. i., p. 237)

Thus, Seventh-Day Adventists either use this oft-repeated quotation from this Romish catechism because of an insufficient knowledge of what Geiermann actually taught, or else it is a deliberate misrepresentation. Which ever we choose, we are left with the conviction that the S. D. A.'s are unsafe teachers of history, and men and women ought to be saved from being deluded by them.

Another Misrepresentation

Finding that quotations used by teachers of Seventh-Day Adventism are wrested from various works, and given a meaning and significance **contrary** to that intended by the author, we expect to find that other quotations, when examined, have been falsified to help support a false system. We quote again from a S. D. A. publication: "Here is a papal boast; In reply to a letter of October 28, 1895, to Cardinal Gibbons, asking if the church claimed the change of the Sabbath as **her mark**, the following was received:

'Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change was **her act** . . . And the act is a mark of **her ecclesiastical power and authority** in religious matters.—C. F. Thomas, Chancellor'." (See *The Present Truth*, vol. i., Number 9)

It will be noted, there is an ellipsis in this statement, perhaps just as serious an omission as that from Schaff-Herzog, exposed in our previous paper **Forging the Evidence**. However, we are not left to conjecture, since it is comparatively easy for us to discover what Cardinal Gibbons believed and taught. In his volume *The Faith of our Fathers*, he both eulogizes and quotes the Council of Trent. Turning then, to the highest authority on this subject, which speaks the mind of Cardinal Gibbons, viz. the **Catechism of the Council of Trent**, we read: "The Apostles ordained that the Lord's Day be observed instead of the Sabbath Day." (Part iii., Chapter iv., Ques. vii.) Cardinal Gibbons said nothing about the change of the day of worship having been made in the fourth century, as the Seventh-Day Adventists would like to **make him teach**. His teaching was the same as that given by other Romish writers, viz. "the Catholic church changed the day in so far as the Apostles were representatives of that Church." This is confirmed in the **Catechism of the Council of Trent**, which we quote again: "Why the Apostles consecrated to the Divine Worship, not the **Seventh Day of the Week, but the First**. But it pleased the Church of God, that the religious celebration of the Sabbath day should be transferred to 'the Lord's day;' whence also the Apostles would have it named 'the Lord's day.'" (Pt. iii., chap. iv., question xviii.)

It is clear then that the Roman Church teaches that the change was made in the times of the

Apostles, while Seventh-Day Adventist leaders date the change in the fourth century, emphasizing Constantine and the Council of Laodicea in 364, saying, as they do, “. . . history proves that Sunday was never observed by Christians as the Sabbath until several centuries after the crucifixion of Christ.” (P. T., vol. 21; No. 13) And yet they weave quotations from such as Cardinal Gibbons and Geiermann into their publications, (as “Who Changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?”), and seek to make them sustain their false thesis.

Council of Laodicea, Greek—Not Roman

After quoting Canon 29 of the Council of Laodicea, from Hefele's **History of the Church Councils**, the S. D. A. publication, **The Present Truth**, (vol. 21, No. 10), makes this comment, “In the original text the Greek word for Saturday is ‘Sabbath’.” There is nothing in this statement to favor the S. D. A. position.

A Few Observations

Having before me the **History of the Councils**, by Rt. Rev. Charles J. Hefele, D.D., I would like to make a few observations. While the S. D. A.'s emphasize that the Greek word for Saturday is ‘Sabbath’; it is worthy of note that this same Canon 29 of the “Synod of Laodicea” refers to the first day of the week as “the Lord's day,” not Sunday. (See p. 316, vol. ii) One word of importance in the S.D.A. comment, is the word **Greek**. Hefele says, “The sixty canons of the Synod of Laodicea were composed in Greek, and have come down to us in the original language.” (ibid. p. 298) The reason for this was that it was an Eastern Synod, not Western, not Roman. The preface to the Laodicean canons reads: “The Holy Synod which was assembled at Phrygia

Pacatiana from different provinces of Asia,” etc. All bishops participating in this Synod belonged to the Eastern Church, there being no representative from Rome.

Further, in studying the record of the Synod of Laodicea by Hefele, with the canons and comments, one cannot discover any connection whatsoever with Rome or the Latin peoples. Instead, the expressions used are **the Greek Church, the Greek Commentators**, etc. And this, for the simple reason that it was a Greek or Eastern Synod. Consequently, when the Seventh-Day Adventists point to the Council of Laodicea as **the time and place** when the change of the day of worship was made from the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, to the first, or Lord's day, they are deceiving unenlightened and unthinking people. And when they point to the Roman Church, or the Pope, as **the power** at this Council which changed the Sabbath, they do so without any historical support whatsoever. The Bishop of Rome had nothing to do with the Council of Laodicea, and the Council had no associations with the Roman Church. According to the lists of the General, or Ecumenical Councils, given by the great historians, the Council of Laodicea has no place, for the simple reason that it was but **local** in its scope.

A Conclusion

From this brief examination of the Seventh-Day Adventist claim that the Pope changed the Sabbath; and that all who observe the Lord's Day instead of the Seventh Day, bear the Mark of the Beast, and from an investigation of their unfair use of authors and quotations to build up their case; and judging all in the light of an unbiased study of history, it is evident that the S. D. A. advocates have utterly

failed to prove their claim, and stand condemned for the questionable manner in which they seek to impose their historically unsound system on the people. This conclusion is in perfect agreement with the statement of Rev. D. M. Canright, who was formerly one of their most ardent ministers for 28 years, when he said that, in order "to sustain their false theories, they have done great violence to the plainest facts of history."

Truth is too noble to need the support of falsehood.

"Truth crushed to earth, will rise again;
The Eternal Years of God are hers;
But error wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

Dishonouring Christ in the Atonement
CHRIST or SATAN? WHICH IS OUR SIN-BEARER?

Vastly more important than the question of Sabbath-keeping, is the grievous error regarding the fundamental doctrine of the Atonement. It seems impossible to believe that any Seventh-Day Adventist can really know that one of the most God-dishonouring blasphemies in all the history of the church is that taught in the standard works of the Seventh-Day Adventists, in which they advance the sacrilegious theory that Satan is the sinner's Saviour, not Christ. While in their public meetings the S. D. A.'s emphasize the keeping of the Sabbath Day instead of the Lord's Day, back of this is that teaching which robs Christ of His glory, viz. that the Devil is the sin-bearer.

Unreliable Teachers—The First Step

Let us look at their prophesyings which came not to pass. Their leaders prophesied Christ would come to earth in the Spring of 1844. Because He did not come, doubt and uncertainty prevailed. This is shown in the following significant quotation:

"WHEN THE TIME PASSED at which the Lord's coming was first expected, in THE SPRING OF 1844,—those who had looked in faith for his appearing were for a season INVOLVED IN DOUBT AND UNCERTAINTY."¹

Troubling the People—The First Confession

Doubt and perplexity filled the minds of their

¹ The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan, by Mrs. E. G. White.

followers. Because Christ had not come, as they had prophesied, it was necessary to offer some balm for their wrought-up feelings. This was found in a Scripture, which they divorced from its context to help them in their difficulty.

"AFTER THE DISAPPOINTMENT, this scripture appeared very significant: 'The vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry . . . The just shall live by his faith.'" ¹

The evident failure in prophesying caused much fanaticism and division, hence the confession,

"It was not the proclamation of the second advent that created fanaticism and division. THESE APPEARED IN THE SUMMER OF 1844, WHEN THE ADVENTISTS WERE IN A STATE OF DOUBT AND PERPLEXITY concerning their real position. ¹

Patching-up a Mistake—The Second Step

To deal with this unpleasant predicament, A NEW PROPHECY was advanced in order to cope with the doubt and perplexity. This they professed to discover by fresh light on Daniel 8:14. On this ground they affirmed that though they had made a mistake in prophesying Christ would come in THE SPRING OF 1844, now they were absolutely sure He would come in the autumn of that year. This is how Mrs. E. G. White, the prophetess of Seventh-Day Adventism told the story:

"In the summer of 1844, midway between the time WHEN IT HAD BEEN FIRST THOUGHT that the 2300 days would end, and the autumn of the same year, TO WHICH IT WAS AFTERWARD FOUND that they extended, the message was proclaimed in the very words of Scripture, 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh!' " (¹ p. 398)

Founded on Guess-Work

Because their first prediction had failed of fulfillment, these unsafe Bible teachers ventured another guess, regardless of the spiritual devastation such playing with prophesy would cause, even in their own ranks. It is on this daring fabrication, made up of one error piled upon another, that Seventh-Day Adventism is founded. We must let the same S. D. A. authority speak again:

"THAT WHICH LED TO THIS MOVEMENT was the DISCOVERY that the decree of Artaxerxes for the restoration of Jerusalem, which formed the starting-point for the period of 2300 days, WENT INTO EFFECT IN THE AUTUMN of the year B.C. 457, AND NOT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR, AS HAD BEEN FORMERLY BELIEVED. Reckoning from the autumn of 457, the 2300 days terminate IN THE AUTUMN OF 1844." (¹ p. 398)

The Exact Day This Time

As though God had entirely forsaken them, and left them to their own vain reasonings, they ventured to hazard the spiritual welfare of their people by another attempt at an even more exact date-setting for Christ's return; and this in spite of our Lord's warning, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." (Mt. 24:36)

"The tenth day of the seventh month, the great day of atonement, the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, which is the year 1844 FELL ON THE 22d. OF OCTOBER, WAS REGARDED AS THE TIME OF THE LORD'S COMING . . . THE CONCLUSION SEEMED IRRESISTIBLE." (¹ p. 400)

The Irresistible Conclusion—A Delusion

The date was set! It was another hope, but alas,

a vain hope, another hoax. However, it aroused great expectation, and led to serious extravagances. There was no need to maintain the ordinary duties of life—Christ was coming on October 22nd. There was no need even to reap the harvest—Christ was coming. This is clearly told in the standard work **The Great Controversy**:

“Like a tidal wave the movement swept over the land. From city to city, from village to village, and into remote country places it went, **UNTIL THE PEOPLE OF GOD WERE FULLY AROUSED . . .** Believers saw their doubt and perplexity removed, and hope and courage animated their hearts . . . Of all the great religious movements since the days of the apostles, **NONE HAVE BEEN MORE FREE FROM HUMAN IMPERFECTION AND THE WILES OF SATAN THAN THAT OF THE AUTUMN OF 1844 . . . ANGELS WERE SENT FROM HEAVEN** to arouse those who had become discouraged, and prepare them to receive the message . . . **FARMERS LEFT THEIR CROPS STANDING IN THE FIELDS, MECHANICS LAID DOWN THEIR TOOLS, AND WITH TEARS AND REJOICING WENT OUT TO GIVE THE WARNING.**”
(¹ pp. 400-402)

A Presumptuous Prophet—God’s Warning

However sincere some S. D. A. leaders may believe themselves to be, the force of God’s warning is inescapable: “And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, **THAT IS THE THING WHICH THE LORD HATH NOT SPOKEN**, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” (Deut. 18:21, 22)

It Came Not to Pass—The Second Confession

The passing of time compelled an acknowledgment of “failure as to the expected event.” This is told in the tragic narration of what took place:

“In like manner did unbelievers who flocked to the Adventist meetings . . . feel the convincing power attending the message, ‘Behold, the Bridegroom cometh!’ . . . Those who expected soon to stand face to face with their Redeemer felt a solemn joy that was unutterable . . .

“BUT AGAIN THEY WERE DESTINED TO DISAPPOINTMENT. THE TIME OF EXPECTATION PASSED, AND THEIR SAVIOUR DID NOT APPEAR.” (¹ pp. 402-403)

“With intense desire they had prayed, ‘Come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly.’ But He had not come.” (¹ p. 404)

“Through this **ERROR** the believers had suffered **DISAPPOINTMENT.**” (¹ p. 424)

What heartbreak, disillusionment and tragedy are spelled in this confession—Again they were destined to disappointment. Again their prophecies were proved untrue—they did not come to pass. And again God’s warning rings out, “If the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.”

On the Horns of a Dilemma—The Third Step

How could these humiliated leaders extricate themselves from so embarrassing a situation? They had preached Christ would come in the Spring of 1844—He did not come. They changed the date, and declared He would come in the Autumn. Again, He did not come. Next, we find them accommodating themselves to their failure in prophecy by another shifting in the meaning of prophecy. They reasoned, If Christ did not come to earth, He must

have come somewhere else. Though they confessed to error and disappointment, they must fix it up somehow. So their ingenious explanation was simply this, If Christ did not come to the earthly sanctuary, then He must have come to the heavenly sanctuary. This was, of course, a very convenient escape from their dilemma since no one could investigate Christ's ministry in heaven in the year 1844. Once again we quote direct from the S. D. A. standard work, **The Great Controversy**:

"The scripture which above all others had been both foundation and central pillar of the Advent faith was the declaration, 'Unto two thousand and three hundred days; THEN SHALL THE SANCTUARY BE CLEANSED.' (Dan. 8:14) . . . These prophetic days HAD BEEN SHOWN TO TERMINATE IN THE AUTUMN OF 1844. In common with the rest of the Christian world, Adventists then held that the EARTH, or some portion of it, WAS THE SANCTUARY. They understood that the CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY WAS THE PURIFICATION OF THE EARTH by the fires of the last great day, and that this would take place at the second advent. HENCE THE CONCLUSION THAT CHRIST WOULD COME TO EARTH IN 1844." (1 p. 409)

Interpretation of Prophecy at Fault—

Another Confession

It was just a human conclusion, not an understanding of prophecy. If at fault in an announcement so important, could they not be at fault in their understanding of other scriptures? Let us note what their prophethess said about this:

"BUT THE APPOINTED TIME PASSED, AND THE LORD HAD NOT APPEARED. The believers knew that God's Word could not fail; THEIR INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY MUST BE AT FAULT; but where

was the mistake? . . . No reason could be given for this, EXCEPT THAT CHRIST HAD NOT COME AT THE TIME THEY EXPECTED HIM." (1 p. 409)

Illogical Deductions—Illogical Conclusions

Was this not enough to stamp the system as altogether unscriptural and a delusion? How many times may people be deluded before their eyes are opened? In order to find some other place where the Lord might have come in the Autumn of 1844, since He did not come to earth as was their irresistible conclusion, they set forth something else as unquestionably true:

"At the termination of the 2300 days, in 1844, there had been no sanctuary on earth for many centuries. THUS, the prophecy, 'Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,' UNQUESTIONABLY POINTS TO THE SANCTUARY IN HEAVEN. But the most important question remains to be answered: What is the cleansing of the sanctuary?" (1 p. 417)

The attempt to associate the sanctuary in Daniel 8 with the sanctuary spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews as "heaven itself," (9:24) is nothing but puerile exegesis. The 2300 days and the cleansing of the sanctuary had nothing to do with the ministry of our Lord in the heavenly sanctuary. The 2300 days may be interpreted as having terminated in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, who defiled the sanctuary, which was later cleansed by Judas Maccabaeus. And yet the claims of Seventh-Day Adventism are based on this type of Bible teaching as found in their books. No wonder they made such glaring mistakes in their prophesyings.

Reaching Toward Another Dangerous Conclusion—

The Fatal Step

In spite of this unsound application of their favourite Scripture verse lifted out of its context, they proceeded to make it the foundation, in their vain reasoning, for their grievous and heretical teaching. They take the account of "the two kids of goats for a sin-offering," as given in Leviticus 16, and build up their strange and erroneous theory concerning the great doctrine of the Atonement, and declare **THAT CHRIST AND SATAN SHARE IN THE TYPICAL MEANING OF THIS ONE OFFERING.** (See particularly Lev. 16:8) They teach that when the high priest took the blood of the slain goat within the veil, the sin was "transferred in figure to the sanctuary;" following this, he took the sins upon himself, and bore them from the sanctuary and confessed them over the head of the live goat, thus transferring them from himself to the scapegoat, which then bore them away, and they were regarded as forever separated from the people. (1 pp. 418, 420)

Applying this to Christ and Satan

In applying this type to Christ and Satan, the Seventh-Day Adventists teach that Christ died and shed His blood, but that, after His ascension He **began His work as our high-priest**, and that for eighteen centuries He was in the holy place, the first compartment of the sanctuary, pleading His blood for sins still on the books of record; and that, when Christ came not to earth in 1844 as they had prophesied, He came to, or entered, **the most holy place of the sanctuary in heaven**; and when He comes, He will remove the sins from the sanctuary, and bring them forth and **LAY THEM UPON**

SATAN the scapegoat, who must bear the final penalty.

Sin Not Cancelled By The Blood—The First Error

Once committed to the determination to somehow defend their idea that Christ was to come in 1844, and that since He did not come to earth, He must have come somewhere else, they proceeded to pile one serious error upon another. Hence,

"Important truths concerning **THE ATONEMENT** are taught by the typical service. A substitute was accepted in the sinner's stead; **BUT THE SIN WAS NOT CANCELLED BY THE BLOOD OF THE VICTIM.** A means was thus provided by which it was transferred to the sanctuary." (1 p. 420)

The S. D. A.s quote "The life of the flesh is in the blood," in Lev. 17:11, but **THEY OMIT** "and I have given it to you upon the altar to **MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR YOUR SOULS: for IT IS THE BLOOD THAT MAKETH AN ATONEMENT FOR THE SOUL.**" It was by this atonement that the offerer's sin was covered, "passed over," forgiven, by virtue of the retroactive efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice. (Romans 3:24, 25; Hebrews 9:15)

Sins Not Yet Blotted Out—The Second Error

This grievous error suggests there were 18 centuries of investigation and uncertainty.

"**IN THE NEW COVENANT THE SINS OF THE REPENTANT ARE BY FAITH PLACED UPON CHRIST, AND TRANSFERRED, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary.**" (1pp. 421-422)

They teach that up to the time of their own set date, 1844, Christ had been for eighteen centuries in the first compartment of the sanctuary in heaven pleading His blood, "**YET THEIR SINS STILL RE-**

MAINED UPON THE BOOKS OF RECORD." (1 p. 421) And further,

"THERE MUST BE AN EXAMINATION OF THE BOOKS OF RECORD TO DETERMINE WHO, through repentance of sin, and faith in Christ, ARE ENTITLED TO THE BENEFITS OF THE ATONEMENT." (1 p. 422)

Thus they affirm that the most that Christ's precious blood effected, was to TRANSFER sins to the holy of holies in the presence of God, but DID NOT MAKE FINAL ATONEMENT FOR THEM.

God Speaks in His Holy Word:

"I HAVE BLOTTED OUT, AS A THICK CLOUD, THY TRANSGRESSIONS, AND, AS A CLOUD, THY SINS: RETURN UNTO ME, FOR I HAVE REDEEMED THEE." (Isaiah 44:22; 43:25)

Our hearts go out to those who have been ensnared by this travesty on the Gospel of the Atonement as revealed in the Word of God, and our desire and prayer is for their deliverance, that they may be brought into the liberty, and freedom in Christ.

What a travesty it is! Imagine having to wait 18 centuries before Christ began His work of **Investigative Judgment** on the sins of believers; and that they must still wait until Jesus comes before they can know that they are entitled to the benefits of the Atonement. And yet this is the teaching of Seventh-Day Adventism.

The Benefits of Christ's Atonement

God's Word does not give the remotest hint that believers have had to wait before sharing in the benefits of Christ's Atonement. Our Lord spoke of **immediate forgiveness**, "When Jesus saw their faith, He said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be

forgiven thee." (Mk. 2:5) There is the positive statement of forgiveness, "And you . . . hath he quickened together with Him, HAVING FORGIVEN YOU ALL TRESPASSES." (Col. 2:13)

Satan Must Bear the Final Penalty

There have been many false theories of the Atonement, but none more heretical and Christ-dishonoring than that of Seventh-Day Adventism, which we are now considering. They state:

"Thus those who followed the light of the prophetic word saw that, INSTEAD OF COMING TO THE EARTH at the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, CHRIST THEN ENTERED THE MOST HOLY PLACE OF THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY, to perform the CLOSING WORK OF ATONEMENT, preparatory to his coming." (p. 422)

"It was seen, also, that while the sin-offering pointed to Christ as a sacrifice, and the high priest represented Christ as a mediator, THE SCAPEGOAT TYPIFIED SATAN, the author of sin, UPON WHOM THE SINS OF THE TRULY PENITENT WILL FINALLY BE PLACED . . . WHEN CHRIST, BY VIRTUE OF HIS OWN BLOOD, REMOVES THE SINS OF HIS PEOPLE FROM THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY AT THE CLOSE OF HIS MINISTRATION, HE WILL PLACE THEM UPON SATAN, who, in the execution of the judgment, MUST BEAR THE FINAL PENALTY." (p. 422)

Christ the Only Sin-Bearer—Not Satan

It seems too terrible to write the words, but the Seventh-Day Adventists teach this, and the people must be warned. Look at these words in their naked awfulness — Satan, the Sin-Bearer; Satan, upon whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally be placed. This is just as anyone can read them in the S. D. A. standard work, **The Great Controversy**.

In contrast with this soul-destroying error, let us emphasize God's revelation concerning the True Sin-Bearer:

"HE hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors; and HE BARE THE SIN OF MANY, and made intercession for the transgressors." (Isaiah 53:12)

"So Christ was once offered TO BEAR THE SINS OF MANY." (Heb. 9:28)

"The Lord hath LAID ON HIM the iniquity of us all." (Isaiah 53:6)

"Oh, why was He there as the Bearer of sin,
If on Jesus thy guilt was not laid?
Oh, why from His side flowed
the sin-cleansing blood,
If His dying thy debt has not paid?"

We can glory in proclaiming that nineteen centuries ago the sin-question was forever settled, when our Blessed Lord, as the sinner's Substitute, gave His life on Calvary to save us.

"WHO HIS OWN SELF BARE OUR SINS
IN HIS OWN BODY ON THE TREE . . . BY
WHOSE STRIPES YE WERE HEALED."
(1 Peter 2:24)

This one Scripture sounds the death-knell to the blasphemous assertion that Satan must bear the final penalty. "Behold the Lamb of God, which TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD." (John 1:29)

The Meaning of Azazel, the Scapegoat

The argument that Satan is to be the sin-bearer, or scapegoat, introducing these extravagant views of the Atonement, turns on a very doubtful interpretation of the word Azazel, in Leviticus 16:8-10, where we read: "one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat," i.e. for Azazel. The S. D. A.

teachers assert that this word azazel means, or refers to, Satan, and thereby introduce their fundamental error into the great doctrine of the Atonement.

While there have been those who have said the word azazel may refer to Satan, the widely accepted understanding of this word is that given by Lange in his scholarly commentary, viz. **complete removal**. It indicates a **complete sending away**. He further states:

"These two points are clear: (1) the two goats together constitute one sin-offering, ver. 5; and also in ver. 10, the goat for Azazel is expressly said to be PRESENTED BEFORE THE LORD TO MAKE AN ATONEMENT WITH HIM." (2)

To clarify this point, we would ask the reader to note the following:

- 1) How could the two goats, so much alike, represent two opposites, as Christ and Satan?
- 2) A study of the Book of Leviticus shows the offerings were to be without blemish: How could an offering without blemish, the scapegoat, represent Satan?
- 3) Lev. 16:5 reads: "Two kids of goats for a sin-offering." Thus, BOTH GOATS CONSTITUTED ONE SIN-OFFERING, and BOTH as being presented before the Lord.
- 4) While one goat was slain, the other stood at the door of the tabernacle. How could Christ and Satan be typically brought together in the ONE sacrifice?
- 5) The one part of the sin-offering would be incomplete without the other. How could Christ, without Satan, be incomplete in the ONE sacrifice?

² A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, by John Peter Lange, D.D.

- 6) Note the similarity of teaching regarding the two birds in Leviticus 14:4-7, and the two goats in Leviticus 16:7-10. The one bird was slain, even as the one goat; and the living bird was dipped in the blood of the slain bird AND LET LOOSE INTO THE OPEN FIELD, even as the scapegoat was let go into the wilderness.
- 7) In both cases, they set forth and typified THE TWO ASPECTS OF THE ATONING WORK OF OUR BLESSED LORD. The one is a type of Christ "delivered for our offences;" and the other, a type of Christ "raised again for our justification." (Romans 4:25)
- 8) The living scapegoat completed the transaction of the slain goat, making visible to all beholders what had taken place in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle, as they saw the high-priest confess the sins over the head of the live goat, and this scapegoat sent completely away—"As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." (Psalm 103:12)

Assurance of Pardon to Believing Hearts

It took every part of the tabernacle, from the gate of the court to the ark of the covenant, to set forth Christ. Even so, it took the two goats, in the one offering, to set forth both aspects of Christ's atonement. It is the typical meaning of the scapegoat which gives to believing hearts the assurance of the complete putting away of sin, to be remembered no more—"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." (Hebrews 10:17) This was beautifully expressed by Dr. Alexander Maclaren:

"The expiation was made within the veil; but a visible token of its completeness was given to help feeble faith, in the blessed mys-

tery of the unseen propitiation. The picture of the goat going away, and away, and away, a lessening speck on the horizon, and never heard of more is the divine symbol of the great fact that there is full, free, everlasting forgiveness, and on God's part, utter forgetfulness." "I will remember them no more at all forever."

The Satan-Theory and the Sabbath Question

The blasphemous error of Seventh-Day Adventism that Satan is to be the final substitute for the sinner, and their teaching regarding the heavenly sanctuary and Christ ministering there in a work of investigative judgment, led to their emphasis on the Fourth Commandment.

The Saviour's Change of Ministration— Precepts of the Law

Following up their teaching regarding "the opening of the Most Holy Place in the Heavenly Sanctuary, in 1844, as Christ entered there to perform the closing work of the Atonement," they proceed to say:

"Those who by faith followed their great High Priest, as he entered upon his ministry in the most holy place, BEHELD THE ARK OF HIS TESTAMENT. As they studied the subject of the sanctuary, they had come to UNDERSTAND THE SAVIOUR'S CHANGE OF MINISTRATION, and they saw that he was now OFFICIATING BEFORE THE ARK OF GOD, pleading his blood in behalf of sinners. The ark in the tabernacle on earth contained THE TWO TABLES OF STONE, upon which were inscribed the precepts of the law of God." (p. 433)

Use with Heb. 10:17 argument

The Final Step to Sabbath-Keeping

It is not likely that many Seventh-Day Adventists know all the steps in the strange development of S. D. A. doctrine, nor how many confessed mistakes

in the interpretation of Scripture were made. However, it is well that they should know that it was their unscriptural teaching regarding the heavenly sanctuary, and Satan being the sin-bearer, which led to their emphasis on the Sanctuary, the Ark, the Law, and the Sabbath. I quote direct from their standard work once again:

**"IN THE VERY BOSOM OF THE DECA-
LOGUE IS THE FOURTH COMMAND-
MENT, as it was first proclaimed: 'Remember
the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.' . . . None
could fail to see that if the earthly sanctuary
was a figure or pattern of the heavenly, the
law deposited in the ark on earth was an exact
transcript of the law in the ark in Heaven;
and that AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE TRUTH
CONCERNING THE HEAVENLY SANCTU-
ARY INVOLVED AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT
OF THE CLAIMS OF GOD'S LAW, AND
OBLIGATION OF THE SABBATH OF THE
FOURTH COMMANDMENT . . . The work of
judgment which began in 1844, MUST CON-
TINUE UNTIL THE CASES OF ALL ARE
DECIDED . . . In order to be prepared for
judgment, IT IS NECESSARY THAT MEN
SHOULD KEEP THE LAW OF GOD." (pp.
435, 436)**

Thus we see that Seventh-Day Adventism is a system of teaching based on successive mistakes, one error in interpretation upon another, ever seeking to escape some predicament, leading to the blasphemous heresy of the insufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice, gradually reaching the emphasis on the necessity of keeping the Sabbath day in order to merit salvation, and also the designation of the observance of the Lord's Day as the certain Mark of the Beast.

As in their denial of the efficacy of Christ's death on Calvary to put away sin, the Seventh-Day

Adventists are in direct opposition to the great message of the Epistle to the Hebrews, they go further, and by their legalistic teachings regarding the Law and the Sabbath, they deny the doctrine of salvation by the free grace of God, and go in direct opposition to the Epistle to the Galatians.

**"By His own blood He entered in once into
the holy place, HAVING OBTAINED ETER-
NAL REDEMPTION . . . NOW TO APPEAR
IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD FOR US."
(Hebrews 9:12, 24)**

THE SABBATH QUESTION

WHAT DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACH

S.D.A. Arguments Answered

Most people are familiar with the way Seventh-Day Adventists enter a town or city, engage a large auditorium, and announce sensational subjects, but without making known their identity. Such questionable methods of propaganda are in exact accord with the facts narrated in our previous articles, viz. **Forging the Evidence, and Distorting Plain Facts of History.** Frequently, they propose to make clear the problems of the ages, and explain great Bible prophecies, with a wisdom superior to that of other Bible teachers. They claim to give facts and proofs to establish their theories, and yet back of the great make-believe, lies the glaring dishonesty of mutilating the writings of noted authors to supply their so-called proofs, the falsification of history, and prophecies which never came to pass. Often their advertising says nothing of their meetings being under S. D. A. auspices. In some campaigns, not until weeks have passed, and unsuspecting folk have been attracted by bold titles, do they announce some such subject as "Who Changed the Sabbath?" Then, or when it pleases them, they reveal their identity, viz. that they are Seventh-Day Adventists.

Even while this article was being written, an example of this policy is before the people of Victoria, B. C. The Seventh-Day Adventists have a new church of their own, and yet special meetings are announced in a theatre a few blocks away. If they hold meetings in their own church, the public know who they are, but if held in a theatre, they can keep their name out of the announcements, as they are doing here. These meetings in the theatre are an-

nounced as "Great Theatre Attraction," with the lecture title in large type, "WAR OR PEACE? What is Ahead?" The second meeting was announced as "Great Armistice Service," with subject in large type, "IS THERE LIFE AFTER DEATH? POSITIVE EVIDENCE OF WHAT TAKES PLACE BEYOND THE TOMB." The third, "Great Sunday Attraction," the subject, "RUSSIA'S PLANS FOR WORLD CONQUEST." The speaker is announced as "an Irish Evangelist," "who amazed thousands," etc. These large ads include everything calculated to attract the public, such as "Film-Choir-Community Singing — Amazing Predictions — Questions Answered—ALL FREE." However, in all the advertisements so far, there is not a word to suggest that these meetings are being held by the Seventh-Day Adventists. Yet such is the case. We believe any group is free to conduct special meetings, but our contention is that they should be honest, and announce who they are; then people would not be brought together under false pretenses. Any denomination which has to resort to such means, surely cannot be trustworthy.

This method may be termed **smart** or **diplomatic**, but the fact remains, it is **dishonest**. Anyone who holds the Truth need not fear to swing his banner high, and let all the world know who he is, and what he stands for.

We have already shown that the Pope did not change the Sabbath, but that the Lord's Day was observed from the beginning of the Christian era. Now we proceed to consider the Sabbath question as related to the New Testament.

A "Vision" as Support for Sabbath-Keeping

Because the Roman Church cannot prove certain

teachings from the Bible, they resort to so-called visions, miracles, forgeries, and substitute these for Scripture proof.

Similarly, Seventh-Day Adventists intrude mutilated quotations, give meanings foreign to an author's intentions, distort historical facts, and all this to build up their false system.

Because the Fourth Commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," cannot be found in the New Testament, the S.D.A.'s have sought to give it special emphasis. This was done by a so-called vision. Mrs. E. G. White, the prophetess of Seventh-Day Adventism, claimed to have been transported to heaven, and was shown the inside of the Ark of the Covenant to see the Fourth Commandment. The account of this is given as follows:

"Two angels stood, one at either end of the ark, with their wings spread over the mercy-seat and their faces turned toward it. This, her accompanying angel informed her, represented all the heavenly host looking with reverential awe towards the law of God, which had been written by the finger of God. Jesus raised the cover of the ark, and she beheld the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written. She was amazed as she saw the fourth commandment in the very centre of the ten precepts, with a soft halo of light encircling it. The angel said, 'It is the only one of the ten which defines the living God, who created the heavens and the earth, and all things that are therein. When the foundations of the earth were laid, then was also laid the foundation of the Sabbath'." (Early Writings, pp. 114, 115)

Why was such a vision necessary? Why this far-fetched story of Mrs. White being taken to heaven, of her being escorted around heaven by an angel, and of Jesus raising the cover of the Ark that she

may see the Fourth Commandment? The fact of the matter is, the Seventh-Day Adventists seem to need these strange, uncanny things to support their teaching, lacking as they do sound fact and Scriptural statement, and also because the Fourth Commandment is nowhere to be found in the New Testament.

Honest Inquiry Rejects S. D. A.

Rev. D. M. Canright, for twenty-eight years one of their most prominent and zealous ministers and writers, has left on record a masterly indictment of Seventh-Day Adventism. He also tells something of what it cost him to abandon the beliefs he had for so long tenaciously held. He says in part:

"I had been so thoroughly drilled in the Advent doctrines that I firmly believed the Bible taught them all . . . Long years of such training taught that people to let their leaders think for them; hence, they are under as complete subjection as are the Catholics." (*Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced*, pp. 40, 42)

Let the reader note particularly this statement, where, after testifying to having kept the seventh day for 28 years, he goes to say:

". . . after having persuaded more than a thousand others to keep it; after having read my Bible through, verse by verse, more than twenty times; after having scrutinized to the best of my ability every text, line and word in the whole Bible having the remotest bearing upon the Sabbath question; after having looked up all these, both in the original and in many translations; after having searched in lexicons, concordances, commentaries and dictionaries; after having read armfuls of books on both sides of the question; after having read every line in all the early church fathers upon this point . . . and after weighing all the evidence in the fear of God, and of the judgment day, I am fully settled in my own mind and con-

science that the evidence is against the keeping of the Seventh Day."

Why the Other Nine, Yet Not the Fourth?

After reading the account of Mrs. White's vision, and then studying the historical and scriptural evidence, we can readily understand why Canright was compelled by his own convictions and demands of conscience to utterly reject the teachings of Seventh-Day Adventism. As we examine Sabbath-keeping in the light of the New Testament, we shall mention some of the outstanding proofs against the erroneous conclusions of S. D. A., and we shall note some which Canright's diligent study led him to observe.

While the duty or sin covered by each of the **OTHER NINE COMMANDMENTS** is directly named many times in the New Testament, **WHY IS IT** that the **DUTY TO KEEP THE SEVENTH DAY** is not once mentioned? The **duty of men to worship the Lord God only**, as taught in the first Commandment, is found no less than **fifty times** in the N. T.; **Idolatry**, as in the second Commandment, is condemned **twelve times**; **Profanity**, the third, condemned **four times**; **Honour thy father and mother**, the fifth, is taught **six times**; **Murder**, the sixth, is condemned **six times**; **Adultery**, the seventh, is condemned **twelve times**; **Theft**, the eighth, is condemned **six times**; **False witness**, the ninth, is condemned **four times**; and **Covetousness**, the tenth, is condemned **nine times**.

Here comes a question of vital importance, Why is it that nowhere in the N. T. is it taught that the Fourth Commandment must be observed? And, further, Why is it that nowhere in the N. T. is failure to keep the Sabbath Day condemned as sin? And why is the fourth commandment itself not even once

repeated in the N. T.?

Why Did Christ Not Command it?

If, as the S. D. A. affirm, the keeping of the Seventh Day is **imperative**, Why did Christ not once command it? And why did the Apostles not command it, nor condemn its non-observance? Why this strange omission? Some seek to answer this by saying, the Jews observed the Sabbath, and needed no special instruction to do so. Both Jews and Gentiles received warning regarding sins against the other nine commandments. And did not Gentile converts need special instruction regarding the observance of the Sabbath, seeing they were unfamiliar with the Ten Commandments, especially if its non-observance was considered a great sin?

False Reasoning

It is argued that since Jesus kept the Sabbath, Christians should do likewise. Did not Jesus also keep the Passover? Then by the same reasoning, Christians should observe the Passover, which would be a denial of Christ our Passover sacrificed for us.

It is also reasoned that since the term **Sabbath** appears almost sixty times, it is an indication of New Testament emphasis suggesting its observance. This point, too, fails to carry weight, since, by the same argument, Christians should maintain **Temple** worship, seeing that the term **temple** is mentioned more than one hundred times in the New Testament, while **sacrifices** find parallel emphasis thirty-eight times, and **Passover** some twenty-eight times.

Transition Era

A study of the New Testament reveals there was a **transition era**, a gradual passing from the Law of Moses into the grace and truth by Jesus Christ; a

passing from the offering of animal sacrifices, and the observance of rituals, feast days, and sabbaths, which were but types and foreshadowings of the glorious fulfillment in Christ. **Every mention of Sabbath in the Acts**, without a single exception, is in connection with **Jewish worship** on that day. On the other hand, there is no record of a single meeting of Gentile Christians upon the seventh day. (Can-right) The noted scholar and historian, Philip Schaff, observes:

“So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, Scripturally observed the Sabbath, the annual Jewish feasts, and the whole Mosaic ritual, and celebrated in addition to these the Christian Sunday, the death and resurrection of the Lord and the holy supper. But this union was gradually weakened, and was at last entirely broken by the destruction of the temple . . . **THE JEWISH SABBATH PASSED INTO THE CHRISTIAN SUNDAY.**” “Sunday thus became, by an easy and natural transformation, the Christian Sabbath or weekly day of rest . . . It was not a legal ceremonial bondage, but rather a precious gift of grace, a privilege, a holy rest in God in the midst of the unrest of the world, a day of spiritual refreshing in communion with God . . .” (Hist. Apostolic Church, p. 118; See Hist. Christian Church, vol. i., p. 479)

If a Great Sin, Why Not Listed as Such?

The Seventh-Day Adventists stress that failure to keep the Sabbath is the **great sin**. Then why is it that in the lists of sins recorded in the New Testament, **the sin against the Sabbath is never once mentioned**. For example, in Mark 7:21-22, there are thirteen sins listed. Why did our Lord not mention breaking the Sabbath? In Romans 1:29-31, there is a list of nineteen sins; in Galatians 5:19-21, a list of seven-

teen sins; and in 2 Timothy 3:1-4, a list of eighteen sins. In all the great warning concerning sins, why was not failure to keep the Seventh Day given prominence? It was not even mentioned.

The Opportunity Jesus Did Not Take

One of the best opportunities Jesus had to preach Sabbath-keeping, was when a lawyer asked him, “Master, which is the great commandment in the law?” (Mat. 22:36) In His answer, our Lord made not the slightest reference to the Sabbath. Neither here, nor elsewhere, did our Lord teach the keeping of the Sabbath Day; nor did He warn against **not** keeping it.

“Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the **FIRST** and **GREAT** commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang **ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.**”

No Mention of Sabbath in Instructions

In the instructions or decrees from the Council in Jerusalem to the **GENTILE BELIEVERS**, **Why** was the Sabbath not even mentioned? The elders of the church had assembled to deal specifically with the keeping of the law, as we see in Acts 15:24, “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.” If ever there was a time to stress the keeping of the Sabbath-day, this was the time, and yet there is not the slightest reference to it in the instructions given from this Council. In contrast with the debated keeping of the law, Peter emphasized salvation by grace, “But we believe that through the grace of the Lord

Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." (Acts 15:11)

The Whole of the O. T. the Law

Our Lord spoke of the Law, as not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Old Testament. "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES the things concerning himself . . . that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in THE LAW OF MOSES, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." (Luke 24:27, 44) "The law and the prophets were until John." (Lk. 16:16) By "The Law of Moses" our Lord spoke of a revelation wider than the Decalogue, for did He not say, "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of Me." (John 5:46)

Not to Destroy the Law

Our Lord declared, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." (Mt. 5:17) Neither can "the law" spoken of here be limited to the Ten Commandments. Our Lord came to fill out the fulness of His Law, His Word, His Will. Thus He fulfilled the Moral Law, by His perfect obedience; the Ceremonial Law, being the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world; and He met the full penalty of the broken law, as He gave Himself a Substitute for the sinner.

Make Commandment Mean Sabbath

In the best-known S. D. A. textbook, **The Great Controversy**, by Mrs. E. G. White, dealing with the argument for "the claims of God's law, and obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment," quotations are made from the Old Testament and the New, as though referring to the same thing.

Among these, 1 John 5:3 is given, which reads: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." (see pp. 435, 436) We would, however, ask this pertinent question: Seeing that in the First Epistle of John there is no use made of the term **commandment** which could possibly imply the observance of the seventh day, WHY is the portion which definitely explains what is meant by **commandment** omitted from their textbook? Here is God's explanation in this Epistle of **what He means by commandment**: "And this is His commandment, That we should believe on the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as He gave us commandment." (1 John 3:22, 23) Why such an omission? Why this deceitful handling of the Word of God?

Scripture Misapplied

An example of misapplying Scripture to prove a point is to be found in another of the S. D. A. volumes, entitled "Bible Readings for the Home Circle," issued by the "Review and Herald Publishing Co." In dealing with the Scripture "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day," (Matthew 24:20), this question is asked, "In predicting the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the necessity of fleeing from Judea before that time, what did he enjoin upon his disciples regarding the Sabbath?" and this answer is given: "The destruction of Jerusalem was accomplished by the Romans in A.D. 70; and the Sabbath, therefore, was certainly commanded by Christ as late as that period." (see p. 57)

Here again is a **deceitful handling of Scripture**, calculated to deceive the unthinking, who are supposed to accept S. D. A. teaching without question.

This Scripture affords not the slightest support to the application they give it. Of course, they need support, but this Scripture does not give them any. Where is there any command to keep the Sabbath? The S. D. A.'s usually pay very little attention to the context. All they need is a few words, here and there, lifted out their context, and fitted into the picture of their own planning.

However, we cannot let this pass. Let us examine the context. Our Lord was speaking of the difficulties and hardships experienced in sudden flight before impending dangers, "Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains," etc. (note verses 16-21) The directions given here have nothing to do with the **observance** of the Sabbath, but with the hazard and inconvenience of flight on the Sabbath. Our Lord was thinking of the safety of those He warned, not the observance of a day, which, by the way, He nowhere commanded to be kept.

They were to pray that their flight be not in the winter, as much as that it be not on the Sabbath. But why not on the Sabbath? Because the gates of villages and cities being closed, and the shortness of a Sabbath day's journey, would constitute serious hindrances. Alford bears this out, although the S. D. A. do not quote him here:

"It will be most important that so sudden a flight should not be encumbered, by **personal** hindrances, by hindrances of **accompaniment**, see 1 Cor. 7:26; and those things which are **out of our power to arrange**, would be propitious, —weather, and freedom from legal prohibition. The words *μηδε εν σαβ.* (mede en sabbatō—not on Sabbath) are peculiar to Matthew, and show the strong Jewish tint which caused him alone to preserve such portions of our Lord's sayings. That they were not

said as any **sanction** of observance of the Jewish Sabbath is most certain: but merely as referring to the **positive impediments** which might meet them on that day, the shutting of gates of cities, etc., and their own scruples about traveling further than the ordinary Sabbath-day's journey (about a mile English); **FOR THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS ADHERED TO THE LAW AND CUSTOMARY OBSERVANCES TILL THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM."**

(The Greek Testament, by Henry Alford, B.D., in loc. cit., caps mine)

Law of Sabbath Specially for Israel

It would be well for all Seventh-Day Adventists to keep in mind that the Sabbath was specially given to Israel, never to the Gentiles. How definitely this is stated: 'And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.' (Deut. 5:15) The time when the Sabbath was given is also clearly stated:

"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 commanded them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." (Nehemiah 9:13, 14)

Sabbath God's Sign with Israel

"And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for **IT IS A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU** throughout your generations." (Ex. 31:12-13)

Under Necessity Keep Entire Law

Seventh-Day Adventism places their adherents in

an impossible position, when they teach, "THE ENTIRE CODE OF TEN COMMANDMENTS IS CLEARLY BINDING ON CHRISTIANS." (Bible Readings for the Home Circle, p. 60-Chap. on The Change of the Sabbath) It is a solemn thought, but it is true, Every man has been a law breaker. Strictly speaking, the Law of God is the entire will of God, and cannot be divided into segments, with a preference to keep a part, but not all. God's Word speaks authoritatively: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James 2:10)

Law Knows of No Relaxation

Law is either law, or it is not law. Seventh-Day Adventists either keep the Law of the Sabbath, or they break that law. The Law's Requirements demanded that the Sabbath be kept "from even unto even," or from sunset to sunset. (Lev. 23:32) How can people keep strict account of times in the Northern countries, where it is night for months together; or in traveling round the world when one loses or gains a day? The death penalty was the law's requirement of any that kindled a fire on the Sabbath. (Ex. 35:2, 3) How would folk live in frigid zones? They must neither bake, nor boil, nor gather food on the Sabbath. (Ex. 16:23-30) Sabbath breakers were to be put to death: "whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." (Ex. 31:15) Which of us would escape if under the law?

The Sabbath to be Abolished

"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." (Hosea 2:11) "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: WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME; but the body is of Christ." (Col. 2:16) When the substance is come we no longer need the shadow. If when walking we see a shadow overtaking us, our thought may be on the shadow; but when our friend catches up with us, we are no longer occupied with the shadow, but with our friend himself. So since Christ came, we are no longer occupied with the shadow of things to come, but with the glorious Person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. 1:3-13) Let God's Word make this clear: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made . . . that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe . . . Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ (or, until Christ), that we might be justified by faith." (Gal. 3:19-29)

Ministration of Death—and of the Spirit

How we would love for all Seventh-Day Adventists to study for themselves the Epistle to the Galatians; also the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Scripture now before us, viz. 2 Corinthians, the third chapter. Note the contrast between the letter that killeth, and the spirit that giveth life. What a study is here! It is a contrast between the law written in tables of stone and God's law and will written in the heart. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones was glorious . . . which was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration

of righteousness exceed in glory."

Law in itself is cold, demanding, un pitying, and makes no allowance for human weaknesses. Human hearts may well leap for joy at the Gospel announcement: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Ye are not under the law, but under grace." (John 1:17; Romans 6:14) Grace in the power of the Holy Spirit in the heart can effect truest obedience to the will of God more readily than the letter of the law written on tablets of stone, or the pages of a book. Hence, the Word of God turns us to the "glory that excelleth," and the One Who empowers for its realization, "Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." (2 Cor. 3:10, 17)

Our Lord Himself

Our Lord answers the question, "What shall we do?" When He was here, there came certain ones to Him, asking, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" Our Lord did not turn their attention to the keeping of a day, or of doing this or doing that, but rather, to Himself. "Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent." (John 6:28, 29) So we would turn every eye upon the Person of our Lord, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Romans 10:4) The Law-giver became the Law-fulfiller, "And in Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts 13:39)