

THE
SABBATH LAW OF THE HEBREWS

IS IT STILL IN FORCE

BY
G. H. WALLACE

BOSTON
ADVENT CHRISTIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY
160 WARREN STREET
1903

THE SABBATH LAW OF THE HEBREWS;
IS IT STILL IN FORCE?

BY G. H. WALLACE.

Is the Sabbath Law of the Hebrews Still in Force?

WE say *no* to the above question, and for the following reasons:

1. The Sabbath of the old dispensation was a part of a system which included more than the mere observance of a day. That system called for the observance of the seventh day of the week, the seventh year, and the Jubilee Sabbath Year at the end of each seven-times-seven years, or each fiftieth year. This system stands or falls together. God never authorized its division. No Sabbatarian that I ever met keeps that system of Sabbaths.

2. The Levitical law prescribes how the Sabbath shall be kept: Two lambs besides the usual burnt offering should be offered on the Sabbath

day (Num. 28: 9, 10). Not a spark of fire should be kindled in any habitation (Ex. 35: 3). No man should go out of his place on that day (Ex. 16: 29). The fact of observance and manner of observance stand or fall together. I have never met a person who keeps the day even of that system of Sabbaths as prescribed by the law governing Sabbath keeping.

3. The Sabbath law had a penalty attached for violation—it was capital punishment by stoning (Ex. 31: 14; 35: 2; Num. 15: 32–36). If the law is in force which makes obligatory the observance of the seventh day of the Hebrews, the penalty for violation is also in force as a necessity, and all violators should be executed according to that law as in former times.

When penalty is abolished the law is dead. I have never met a Sabbatarian who could tell me where in the Scriptures it is stated or even inferred that God had abolished that penalty, and yet kept the Sabbath law in force. I have never met a Sabbatarian who ever kept the Sabbath law as relates to the execution of the penalty which God positively commanded. See above references—that was as much Sabbath law as simply resting.

4. The reasons given for requiring Sabbath observance of that people were of local, national interest to that people only (Ex. 31: 13; Deut.

5: 15). This reason is not hinted to the New Testament church for the obvious reason that the old Sabbath law is not binding upon the Christian dispensation.

5. The absolute silence of the New Testament upon the Sabbath question, and especially where it would have been very necessary to have mentioned it amongst other New Testament essentials had its law still been in force, should, it would seem, be a matter of concern to Sabbath law agitators.

In that famous Jerusalem council, Gentile Christians, who were in no sense Jewish law keepers, received instructions from Hebrew apostles relating to the essentials of Christianity, but not even a hint was given them in relation to this point which modern *law agitators*—not law keepers, for nobody keeps that law—regard as vital to Christian fellowship.

It is a well-known fact that if it is intelligently rejected—and I positively reject it as not binding upon the Christian church—fellowship by that people is promptly withdrawn. The mark of the beast—the label for perdition—is placed upon such a person. This, too, in the face of the well-known fact, that never in the teaching of either Jesus Christ or of his apostles can anything be found to the effect that this Sabbath law was

brought across the dispensational line and incorporated in the law of grace governing the Christian church.

No one can believe that Jesus forgot it, and therefore that the disciples were silent upon the subject. I speak it reverently when I say, that it was a careless thing for St. Paul to do, if the law of the Jewish Sabbath was still in force, to write to that Gentile church at Colosse as he did when he said to them without making discrimination or modification of any kind, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or of the new moon or of the Sabbath days." "Days" being a supplied word here, and therefore without force in the text. See also Col. 2: 16 (*R. V.*).

If the agitators of the Sabbath-law are correct, St. Paul was criminally careless when he said without distinguishing or qualification, "Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5: 4). Sabbath-law agitators, please take notice with special care, that St. Paul never preached the Sabbath law as binding upon Christians, either Jew or Gentile. And he said, "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ" (Gal. 1: 7). The whole epistle shows the nature of the trouble to have been Judaistic. "But though we, or an angel from

heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1: 8).

Now if any Sabbatarian will show me chapter and verse where St. Paul commanded or taught the necessity of Christians keeping the Jewish Sabbath law, I hereby and now promise to keep the Sabbath of the Jews the rest of my natural life.

Is the Stone Inscription to be Always in Force?

The Seventh-Day Adventists in their advocacy of the Jewish law-day observance are compelled to say that it is. Mrs. Ellen G. White, their prophetess, claims this both for time and eternity (*Spiritual Gifts*, p. 82).

Great stress is laid upon Jesus teaching in Matt. 5: 17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, and the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

There is no danger of mistaking the meaning or that people as to what law they think is referred to here; they are always frank to say, the law that God wrote with his own finger upon stone.

We have never met a First-Day Advocate who claimed that Jesus Christ broke any part of the law, but we do believe that he magnified the law by keeping it, and fulfilling it; and when it had served its purpose dismissing it. This thought seems to be that of St. Paul, who was very plain upon that subject. He said:

“This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.”

Seventh-Day law agitators, please take notice: “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident, for the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith, but the man

that doeth them shall live by them”—*under a curse*. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles, through the keeping of the Law-Sabbath? No! through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

Now to be shown chapter and verse where Jesus Christ commanded the keeping of the Law Sabbath by Gentile Christians is to end all arguments upon that subject. “Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannuleth, or addeth thereto”—*i. e.*, the law is not to be broken or destroyed by men (Matt. 5:17). Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises. He saith not to seeds; as of many; but as of one, to thy seed, which is Christ. “And this I say, that the covenant [inheritance covenant, Genesis thirteenth and fifteenth chapters] that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law [stone inscription as we shall show], which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law [Sabbath law or any part of the old law] it is no more

of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression"—added to the inheritance covenant. For how long a time? "Till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

"For a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Who is the other? The covenant keeper. "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life"—*but there was none*—"verily righteousness should have been by the law," *but it was not*. "But the Scriptures hath concluded all under sin"—law keepers and all; "that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we—law-keepers—were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith."

Seventh-Day law-agitators, attention! "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Has faith come? "For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is

neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3).

We have heard of but one law being written and engraved upon stone, and that is the law that our friends and their prophetess say will never be done away. She says (*Spiritual Gifts*, p. 83): "I saw—in vision—that the Sabbath never will be done away, but that the redeemed saints and all the angelic host will observe it in honor of the great Creator to all eternity." "I was shown—by inspired vision—that the law of God—the *stone inscription always with them*—would stand fast forever, and exist in the new earth and to all eternity."

Now there is evidently some trouble either with this modern prophetess, or the ancient apostle Paul. St. Paul called what was "written and engraven upon stones" "the ministration of death" (2 Cor. 3: 7); and he called it "the ministration of condemnation" (verse 9), and declared that it had "no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth," *i. e.*, in the gospel, and further declared that this former glory is done away (verse 11). We may be pardoned, I trust, if we take sides with St. Paul against Mrs. Ellen G. White and her preachers.

Which Law Was Abolished?

Seventh-Day agitators claim eternal perpetuity of what was written upon the stone tablets, but admit that the book of the law, which was written, and put in at the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord (Deut. 31: 26), was abolished. They stand definitely committed to this claim in copious writings on the two laws, etc.

Now let us see what was abolished, and what was retained according to their claim. In Matt. 22: 37-40, Jesus replied to the lawyer's question, "Which is the great commandment in the law?" by saying, "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." Now where in the law were these two commandments upon which all the law and the prophets hang, written? Not upon the stone tablets, but in the book of the law which our Judaizing friends say was abolished. In Deut. 6: 5, the first is written, and in Lev. 19: 18, the second is found.

There was not a requirement written upon the stone that involved the necessity of loving God or

man; nothing but what a wicked man might do, or refrain from doing. Let us see:

1. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Very well, says the wicked man, I will not have, or recognize any God.

2. "Thou shalt not make unto thee," etc. Very well, replies the man, I need no image to bow down to, as I recognize no God in heaven or earth.

3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." No, says the man, as I recognize no God, I need mention the name of no God.

4. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Well, what will keep it holy, according to the stone inscription? Why, thou shalt do no work, nor allow any to be done by those under your care. Very well, says our objector, we will all lie in bed all day, and be refreshed for business to-morrow; not a word on the stone about worship, that is all in the book of the law which our friends say is abolished.

5. "Honor thy father and thy mother," etc. We have witnessed commendable instances of this among those not pretending to godliness at all.

6. "Thou shalt not kill." It is needless to say that there are many infidels who are not guilty of murder.

7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." There are plenty of godless people who do not commit that crime.

8. "Thou shalt not steal." No one will think for a moment that all persons not Christians are guilty of theft.

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness." There are lots of sinners who would scorn a lie.

10. "Thou shalt not covet." There are plenty of people who seem to have too little ambition to even covet a decent living.

And yet this code of negatives is to be perpetuated, even in the kingdom of heaven, while the book of the law containing the positive side of love to God and man, is already abolished according to Seventh-Day arguments.

Whatever was abolished was what had a yoke of bondage in it, which, said Peter, "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear" (Acts 15: 10).

Now let us look through the list of the stone table inscriptions again, and see where the yoke is; remembering that the yoke only is abolished while the rest is brought over into the New Testament and incorporated into the gospel, but not as the stone code, however.

The first commandment has no yoke in it. Jesus brought that over and incorporated it in the

governing code of the New Testament church (Matt. 22: 37).

The second has no yoke; that, too, is embraced in the above New Testament reference. So is the third; there is no yoke here.

On the stone we read, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," and in Matt. 5: 34, Jesus said: "Swear not at all." Jesus indorsed the fifth commandment and emphasized it (Matt. 19: 19).

"Thou shalt not kill." Jesus also said it (Matt. 19: 18). The seventh commandment was brought over into the gospel with very strong emphasis. The whole New Testament enforces the eighth, and says: "Let him that stole steal no more" (Eph. 4: 28).

Of the ninth we read in the New Testament: "All liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." And Jesus brought that commandment over (Matt. 19: 18).

Of the tenth it is declared that covetousness is idolatry (Col. 3: 5); and the whole Book is opposed to idolatry.

But some one says he skipped the fourth, and failed to mention the one commandment that alone keeps the God of heaven in the memory of the race. Well, we repeat the proposal, that if a Sabbatarian will come forward, with chapter and

verse from the New Testament, which commands the observance of the old Sabbath of the Jews, we shall feel in duty bound to keep that day the remainder of our life.

In his gospel Jesus did not bring the fourth commandment over, and in his fourteen epistles Paul wrote the word Sabbath once (Col. 2: 14). Let us see what he said about it: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat [margin for eating and drinking] or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath." Why this liberty? The previous verses quoted explain: They are nailed to the cross, and died with Christ, whom Paul declared to be the "end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 10: 4).

In governing this dispensation, Jesus Christ made up his own governing code, and said Peter, or rather the Holy Spirit through Peter, "It shall come to pass that whosoever will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people" (Acts 3: 23). And, said the Holy Spirit, by St. Paul, "By the deeds of the law there shall

no flesh be justified in his sight" (Rom. 3: 20). Again, Gal. 5: 4, "Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace."

What law is referred to, if not the hard, cold stone law, which found corresponding hearts of stone in the people that kept it? That covenant of stone which St. Paul said "is done away" (2 Cor. 3: 11). That code that had a yoke in its fourth article, which necessitated a cessation from industry one-seventh of the days and one-seventh of the years, and a release from business obligations each fiftieth year, as we have the Sabbath system explained in the book of Leviticus. And all this with a death penalty attached for violation (Num. 15: 35, 36). That stone code had a death penalty attached to about everything in it, *and not a hint, even, of a future life.*

No wonder that the key-word of the epistle to the Hebrews is "better." Let it be remembered that the royal law of James 2: 8, is the law of Old Testament ethics and New Testament gospel, but is no part whatever of the stone inscription.

The Old Covenant or the New Covenant: Which
Are We Under?

Our Seventh-Day friends, while not exactly ignoring the new covenant of the Christian dispensation, strenuously claim to be living under the

old covenant; *i. e.*, the one that was written upon stone. In this they take issue with the apostle Paul, for that great apostle teaches, as clearly as language can be made to express thought, that the stone covenant was done away. Listen to him: "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth." Now, Sabbatarians, attention! "If that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious" (2 Cor. 3: 7-11).

There may have been numerous covenants mentioned in the Bible, but the Book deals with just two dispensational covenants, and no more. They are known as the old covenant and the new covenant. The old covenant was inscribed upon stone. "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. 4: 13; also Deut. 9: 11-15).

In Exodus 34: 28, it is said of Moses, "He was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." This is the covenant that figures so prominently in the epistle to the Hebrews as the first covenant. St. Paul says (Heb. 9: 1), "The first covenant had also ordinances (mar., ceremonies) of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." Now please remember that the covenant and its ceremonials stand or fall together, and nowhere in the Book is it stated that the ordinances or ceremonials were abolished and the covenant left intact. It was of the covenant itself that it is stated in Heb. 8, "For if that first covenant (the stone covenant) had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind,

and write them in their hearts (not on stone) : and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they (upon whose hearts the law of the Lord is written) shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all (of these) shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

In Gal. 5 St. Paul wrote to some who were desirous of the law, about two covenants, one from Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children; the other, the new covenant, which is illustrated by the free-born son, and the Jerusalem which is above and is free, and the mother of us all—Christians upon whose hearts the laws of Jesus Christ are written—"and it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people" (Acts 3: 23).

It was in relation to these two codes of law, the old and the new, the first and the second, that Paul wrote in Rom. 7, when he compared the old to a dead husband, and the new to a living husband, and declared that the church should "be

married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God"; "for," said he, "the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband."

Now we say to all agitators of the old stone code, Come away from the corpse of the former husband; Moses has been long dead; come away and be married to another, even to Christ. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; you are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5: 4).

Please notice that these two covenants, law and gospel, stone and heart, old and new, first and second, do not hold simultaneously, but successively; the one beginning where the other leaves off. Now will some law agitator rise up and put his finger on chapter and verse of any other covenant containing the seventh-day Sabbath law, than the one that St. Paul clearly shows is dead; and which was not given until the race had got more than twenty-five hundred years down the road of time; and then it was clearly stated that it was given as a memorial of the exode from Egypt (Deut. 5: 15); and was to be observed by that people for that purpose, throughout their generations (Ex. 31: 13). Now show me chapter and

verse where Jesus Christ, or an apostle commanded the observance of the seventh-day law Sabbath of the Jews, and I will keep it the rest of my life.

Why Was the Law-Sabbath Given, and How Long
Was It to Remain in Force?

The correctness of the answer to these two questions will depend upon who makes reply. Mrs. Ellen G. White, by way of reply, says it was given for the purpose of Jehovah making himself known to his people. She also says (*Spiritual Gifts*, p. 82), "I was shown, [therefore what she says must, if so, be infallibly true,] that the law of God [the Sabbath law] would stand fast forever, and exist in the new earth to all eternity. . . . I saw that the Sabbath never will be done away, but that the redeemed saints and all the angelic host will observe it in honor of the great Creator to all eternity."

Now what is the deduction of these two statements from her standpoint? 1. If the giving of the Sabbath was the means of making God known to his people, then we have no evidence, by direct statement, that he was known to any human being for twenty-five hundred years after the race was created, for no command to keep a Sabbath before then is recorded. 2. If that Sabbath law stands fast forever, it is *immutable*; not subject to change,

and the whole system of law-Sabbath, together with the death penalty, which gave force to the law, is to be carried into the new earth, and "redeemed saints and the angelic host" come under the Sabbath law with its lamb sacrifice (Num. 28: 9, 10), and death penalty (Ex. 35: 23). This will be quite a change for the angelic host. But if that law stands fast forever, that is to be the order of things in the kingdom of heaven, in the new earth. Mrs. White says it is. She is the recognized and much-prized prophetic of Seventh-Day Adventists.

But listening to what God says in the Bible we get a very different idea of these two points. He said (Deut. 5: 15), "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 [for this reason] the Lord thy God commanded thee the Sabbath day." Would there have been any Sabbath commandment but for that reason given in this quotation?

How long was that Sabbath law to remain in force? We reply, just as long as the rest of that old Hebrew law, and not a day longer. But listen to what God himself has said: "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you." How long? "Throughout your gen-

erations" (Ex. 31: 13). Have the generations of national Israel ceased? The rent veil in the temple would answer that question, to say nothing of nineteen centuries of history.

But granted that the Sabbath was given for prophetic as well as historic purposes, to what did it point? Let us look into the 4th chapter of Hebrews, where we find that a gospel of peace and rest was preached to the Hebrews, but that the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard. This chapter clearly teaches a typical and an antitypical rest for the people of God. The temporary Sabbath rest preached its weekly sermon of the faith rest of this Christian dispensation.

With this thought in mind, read the first three verses of this 4th chapter of Hebrews: "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." This language so far makes it plain that this rest was a present privilege. "For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said." Present privilege again. "Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached [in the type] entered not in because of unbelief," not because the seventh millennium had not come, but it was a present privilege, and unbelief was all that kept them

out of the peace of Rom. 5: 1, and the rest of Heb. 5.

It is doubtless true that there are some Scriptures that apply to the present dispensational rest of faith that have been applied to the future at the expense of the present. Here may be the reason for the *absolute silence* of the New Testament law-giver in relation to a New Testament commandment, the substance of the Old Testament type and shadow of the true Sabbath rest having been reached in the gospel faith rest: "We which have believed do enter into rest," as he said. Where did he say it?

Doubtless there is to be a better antitypical rest which remaineth to the people of God; but it will not be that old Sabbath law, with its sacrifices and death penalty, but it will be the perfection of the rest of grace, entered upon now by faith. It will not be for a Sabbath day, nor a Sabbath year, as in the old law dispensation, nor a Sabbath millennial period, as taught by some; but it is to be the perfected rest of the eternal kingdom of God.

"But," says my excited law agitator, "reference is made right here in Heb. 4 to the seventh day when God ceased from his own work." Well, what of it? It reads, "He that hath entered into his rest—present privilege improved—he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from

his,"—creative works. If one is going to keep the law of Moses in a single article he has assumed a tremendous obligation. "He is debtor to do the whole law," and he must do it alone. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5: 3, 4).

In the face of such statements as this passage one must have been terribly misled to go back to the law of commandments given by Moses, which means the ignoring of the New Testament law-giver, the ignorant confession of preference for the dead body of Moses to the living personality of the Christ. "Hear ye him, Sabbatarians," and tell me where he commanded the observance of the old law-Sabbath commandment of the stone.

**Because the Sabbath Law is Past, Is the Church Without
a Sabbath Rest-Day?**

We answer, No! We have the Lord's day, in which St. John was in the Spirit when on the Isle of Patmos (Rev. 1: 10). What Lord and what day did he refer to when he said, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day"? Who was St. John's Lord? In John 13: 13, Jesus said, "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am." That part of the question then is answered. It was our Lord Jesus Christ's day. Which day in

the week was it if not that day which is made forever memorable by the occurrence of the most important event that ever took place, the resurrection of our great Life-giver from death?

The old Sabbath of the seventh-day law commemorated the emancipation of several millions of people from a national bondage. The first day of the week was chosen to emancipate from death's bondage the whole human family.

Mrs. Ellen G. White says, that if either the day of the resurrection or crucifixion is "commemorated as a day of rest it is the crucifixion." But in this we must differ in opinion. There was no joy, no breaking of prison doors or bonds in the crucifixion. It was not the event to rejoice over. But when he burst the bonds of death asunder, and manifested himself alive by many infallible proofs, it was that event and not his crucifixion that struck the joy note that has reverberated around the earth, until this gospel of joy has echoed back in nearly every formulated language under heaven.

Mrs. White is bold to say (*Spiritual Gifts*, p. 81), that "Satan presented before them the glorious resurrection of Jesus, and told them that by his rising on the first day of the week he changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week." To whom did Satan so minister on

this Sabbath question? Not to the present writer, surely. Let us look back and see if we can discover the origin of the first day rest and worship. The Sabbath-law agitation would tell us not to look too far back, in the fourth century at Constantine's day. Well, that request kills the claim that the pope changed the day, for there was no pope in the reign of the great Constantine.

But we will go back of all popes and emperors to apostles. Not even seventh-day law-keepers deny that in Matt. 28 the resurrection of Jesus Christ is accredited to the first day of the week—*Sunday*. No one can deny that Acts 20: 7 teaches that the disciples were in the habit of meeting upon the first day of the week, Sunday, to break bread—communion or Lord's Supper—and preach. Neither pope nor emperor had ordered them to do so. No one can doubt that the church collections were, according to 1 Cor. 16: 2, taken on the first day of the week—Sunday. From apostles down the disciples of Jesus Christ have met and worshipped on that first day of the week—*Sunday*.

Why have they done this? Not because Satan told them to do so, not because there is a New Testament commandment to compel the observance, but because, written upon the heart of the Christian church in characters of love by the Spirit

of God. Satan doubtless loves to remember that Jesus Christ was crucified, and many of his people love to think that far enough to follow him; but the Holy Spirit has written the sentence, "He is risen," across the tender, loving heart of every true child of God, and that fact has been commemorated by the true church from that first morning of resurrection life until this day. And every first day is a reminder, by its services, of this statement, "He is risen indeed." Church bells peal it, choirs chant it, holy men preach it, and the church rejoices because of it; and Judaizers can never efface that inscription nor prevent the joyful observance on that day of the week of the emancipation of the church from the fear of death (Heb. 2: 15) by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, for St. Paul declares that we are reconciled by his death, but saved by his life (Rom. 5: 10). For had he not been raised from the dead there would have been no resurrection of any one at the last day, and he would have died in vain (1 Cor. 15: 12-20).

No, the day of his death is not the proper day to joyfully celebrate; neither is the seventh day of the old dead law of Moses, but the day of the ever-living Law-giver of the New Testament. The Lord's day (Rev. 1: 10), is the day that is written upon the heart of the Christian church.

The claim that the pope changed the day from the seventh to the first day of the week is a most mistaken claim. It requires a very ingenious manipulation of the decrees by Roman emperors protecting—not establishing by change—the worship of the church on the first day of the week by our Judaizing friends. Take, for instance, the famous decrees of Constantine and Theodosius. They cannot be made to teach those who read that the seventh day of the Jewish law was changed for the first day worship of the Christian church. But it is clear that those decrees protected the worship of the Christian church on that day, which had been by apostolic precedent established and faithfully practiced three centuries.

Did the Pope Change the Sabbath of the Law for the Sunday of the Gospel Dispensation?

We answer, he did not; and for the following reasons:

1. The papacy was not sufficiently developed to change anything until well into the sixth century.
2. Sunday observance by Christians, as a day of rest and worship, has not only historic statement, but the endorsement of the church fathers, previous to the establishment of the papacy.
3. The first day of the week, Sunday, has been the day on which the bitterest opposers of the

papacy, from the apostles down, have met and worshipped.

For apostolic precedent we refer to Acts 20: 7, and 1 Cor. 16: 2. In these and kindred passages we certainly find that apostles met with Christian believers on the first day of the week for purposes of Christian worship.

For historic statement and endorsement we present such testimony, during the period intervening between the apostles and the papacy, as Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty-six years after St. John: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1: 10). And this acknowledged church father said, "Sunday is the day on which we hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead" (A. D. 140).

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth in Greece, A. D. 170 (and please observe he was not a Roman, but a Grecian), says of "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1: 10), "We passed this holy Lord's day in which we read your letter, from the constant reading of which we shall be able to draw admonition." The Lord's day was the same with Dionysius as to Justin Martyr, who wrote only thirty years before him.

Only ten years later Bardesanes of Edessa, Syria, A. D. 180, wrote, "On the first day of the week

we assembled ourselves together." Clement of Egypt wrote similarly in A. D. 194.

It is claimed for Tertullian that he was one of the best educated of the early church fathers, a stern disciplinarian, unalterably opposed to innovations; hence the most likely to have antagonized the observance of the first day as the Christian worship-day, had he not understood that it had apostolic sanction. He wrote about A. D. 200, "Let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed . . . teach us that for the past time righteous men kept the Sabbath." "The old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary." "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day (*i. e.*, Saturday) their Sabbath." "We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor in their sacred days." See also Col. 2: 16. "We, however,—only on the day of the Lord's resurrection—ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude, deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil."

Sunday was surely this church father's worship-day. For want of space we pass silently over such illustrious names as Origen, A. D. 225;

Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, A. D. 270; Victorinus, A. D. 300, Bishop of Petau; Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 306. We will pause for a moment with Eusebius, A. D. 324. He says of the patriarchs before the flood, "They did not therefore regard circumcision, *nor observe the Sabbath, neither do we*, . . . because such things as these do not belong to Christians." He was not a Jewish Sabbatarian, surely.

Speaking of the Judaizing element of his time, for they existed then as now, he said they are "those who cherish low and mean opinions of Christ, . . . with them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ, and a corresponding life: . . . They also observe the Sabbath, and other discipline of the Jews just like them; but, on the other hand, they celebrate *the Lord's day very much like us in commemoration of his resurrection*;" that is, some of the Judaizers were trying to keep both days. But Eusebius belonged to those who kept the day which commemorated his resurrection, and was known as the Lord's day. He further says: "It was the custom of all Christians to meet very early and every morning of the resurrection day." We ask, what did they meet every morning of the resurrection day for?

Pliny was the governor of Bithynia, Asia Minor, A. D. 106–108, and he wrote to Trojan, the emperor, concerning the Christians, "They are wont to meet together on a stated day [Eusebius has just told us which day it was] before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ. . . . When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then come together again to a meal which they ate in common without any disorder." So here in this letter, known as Pliny's defense of the Christians of his province, we have Christians coming together on the morning of the resurrection day of the week to sing and worship, and on the same day, later, doubtless in the evening, to eat a meal, undoubtedly the Lord's Supper. See Acts 20: 7, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them. . . . And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." It was evening, and they had come together on the first, or resurrection day, to break bread, or to observe the Lord's Supper.

It will be observed that all of these early fathers quoted, and many more that might be quoted, lived prior to the development of the papacy; the last one quoted did not live within two hundred years of the famous edict of Justinian, which made

Bishop John of Rome "the head of all the holy church and the rightful corrector of heretics."

What folly, then, to put forth such a claim that the pope changed the day, even if the papists claim it. But they are by no means a unit in such a claim. See extracts from Romish priests denying such a claim in *Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced*, by D. M. Canright, pp. 213, 214.

But suppose the church of Rome were unanimous in the claim, all reliable history is against the claim, and it is as ignorantly conceded as claimed. But the Roman Catholics claim that the apostles changed the day, and that they—the Roman Catholics—are their successors; hence Roman Catholics changed the Sabbath. Was not St. Peter the first pope? Others than Roman Catholics and Seventh-Day agitators read histories. We are indebted to a former champion of Seventh-Dayism for important aid in the preparation of this tract.

Mrs. White declared, "The pope has changed the day of rest from the seventh to the first day" (*Experience and Views*, p. 55). As this was shown her in vision by the Lord, those having faith in her vision accept it as from the Lord, and this necessitates interpreting the Bible to harmonize with Mrs. E. G. White, regardless of historic facts.

Salvation: By the Sabbath Law.

In a vision of Mrs. White's, on March 24, 1849, she was shown, according to report by herself, that the heading of this article is a fact. She said: "I was shown that the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, as relating to the shut door, could not be separated, and that the time for the commandments of God to shine out with all their importance, and for God's people to be tried on the Sabbath truth, was when the door was opened in the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary where the ark is, in which are contained the ten commandments. This door was not opened until the mediation of Jesus was finished in the holy place of the sanctuary in 1844. Then Jesus rose up and shut the door of the holy place, and opened the door into the most holy, and passed within the second vail where he now stands by the ark, and where the faith of Israel now reaches.

"I saw that Jesus had shut the door of the holy place and no man can open it, and that he had opened the door into the most holy place and no man can shut it (Rev. 3: 7, 8), and that since Jesus has opened the door into the most holy place which contains the ark, the commandments have been shining out to God's people, and that they are being tested on the Sabbath question. I saw

that the present test on the Sabbath could not come until the mediation of Jesus in the holy place was finished, and he had passed within the second vail" (*Experience and Views of Ellen G. White*, p. 34).

Now this would all pass as the merest folly of a visionary woman, were it not for the fact that to this day otherwise apparently sensible people endorse her vision, and a system of teaching about as foreign to the gospel as Roman Catholicism has been built up by them. Now this vision, whoever is responsible for it, is an ignorant misapprehension of the priesthood of Jesus Christ, as the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews clearly shows. The common priests ministered in the outer holy place, "But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Jesus Christ became the antitypical high priest when he had offered himself, and his own blood had been shed. Not that he went in and out once a year, but once every year this better priesthood and more effectual blood was preached to that ancient people. But Jesus, the Christian's high priest, went in once into the holy of holies, where God the Father sits on his throne, and declares himself that "when once the master of the house [our high priest] is

risen up, and hath shut to the door," calling will be in vain by any unsaved at that time.

This Mrs. White and her followers were honest enough to admit until time made it necessary to put a construction upon that vision of the shut door, as at this date it would leave about every soul of them in an unconverted condition, if that early vision of March 24, 1849, was left to its face value of statement. Then, again, the wording of this vision makes it clear that but little headway could be gained by Seventh-Dayism until she convinced her followers by this vision that Jesus Christ's mediation had ceased, and that those who are now saved must be saved by the keeping of the Sabbath law. Let the reader study carefully this vision, and he will see this clearly. This constitutes the test of the Sabbath question. Christians who suppose that Jesus Christ is still mediating in the interests of his people, in the place and on the throne occupied by him from the time he left Olivet until 1844, are, according to this prophetess, making a fatal mistake.

I will, in support of her claim, once more quote that vision of blasphemy: "I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne. They did not know that Jesus had left it" (*Experience and Views of Mrs. Ellen G. White*, pp. 46, 47). Where was this throne? According to

Heb. 9, it was in the high priest's apartment in heaven, in the most absolutely literal sense. Listen to the continued blasphemy of this woman: "Satan appeared to be by the throne trying to carry on the work of God." How did his Satanic majesty get up there? She has not yet informed her people, that we are aware. But she continues: "I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, 'Father, give us thy Spirit.'" Now, for bread will he give them a stone? Worse than that. Listen: "Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love and joy and peace. Satan's object was to keep them deceived, and to draw back and deceive God's children."

Let the reader mark these points:

1. The stone tablets are literally in heaven, where Christ was not permitted to go until 1844.
2. The devil is literally where he was until that time.
3. None but Seventh-Day Adventists know that he has risen up, and shut to the door, and that his mediation has closed, and that the devil is doing business in that place, and that God, who once loved the world (John 3: 16), has turned over to Satanic cruelty those who pray with uplifted hands, "Father, give us thy Spirit." All this is essential to the Seventh-Day Adventism.

Of course these advance positions are not taught at first, and not always promiscuously. The town is billed for straight Adventist themes. Special emphasis is given to prophecy, the coming of the Lord, and kindred truths, until the ear, especially of First-Day Adventists, is secured, and then gradually the less thoughtful are led along until they are made to feel that their only chance for salvation is in keeping the old Sabbath law of the Jews. Now just a word to First-Day Adventists. If the preachers of Mrs. Eddy, or Ann Lee, or Ellen G. White pitch a tent in your town, you make a great mistake in giving that effort the sanction of your presence, and thus lead others of less strength than your own under the influence of one of the greatest delusions of modern times.

Ye cannot serve two masters—the dead law and the living Christ (Rom. 7: 1-6). Paul never preached this strange gospel; and he said, “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” (Gal. 1: 8).

**Did the Apostles Hold Services Upon and Thereby
Endorse the Seventh-Day Sabbath?**

There is no record to that effect, while there are Scriptures to show that though they went to the synagogues on the Jewish Sabbath, they were not

holding services of their own, but merely attending the services of the Jews, with the hope and expectation of an invitation to speak; thus affording them an opportunity to preach Jesus to the people. See Acts 13 for just such a case: “They came to Antioch, . . . and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.” *It was not their meeting.* “And after the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on.”

Then followed a powerful sermon by St. Paul, showing that they could not be justified from sin by the deeds of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, who, for righteousness, had become the *end of the law, to those who believe.*

See also Acts 14: 1, “And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews—not a Christian church—and so spake, that a great multitude . . . believed.” Also in Acts 17, “when they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews:—*not Christians*,—and Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.”

Why did he do it on the Jewish sabbath days, and in the Jewish synagogue? Simply because

the people congregated on that day in that place, and Paul was after the people, and he knew where to find them. In about every instance when the apostles reached their own countrymen, it was in their synagogues and on the day that the Jews, not Christians, met for service.

We have shown both from Scripture and history, that when Christians met, it was on the first day of the week. See Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2. For the time and place it made a difference whose meeting was attended, the apostles' own meeting, or that of the Jews. Our friends, who make so strenuous a point of this, seem to have gotten badly befogged in Jewish mists.

With equal emphasis we have been many times told that Jesus kept the Sabbath law, which we readily concede. He also kept the law of circumcision, being himself circumcised, according to the law. He spent his entire life with this race, from the time of birth to his death under the law, and he not only kept the Sabbath law, but the entire law. And although he was Lord of the Sabbath day he never violated that Sabbath law, although Sabbath agitators, both ancient and modern, are obliged to claim that he did, completely changing, yes, killing it, by abrogating its penalty, and then make the empty claim that the pope changed the empty Sabbath law.

The very nails that pierced his blessed flesh nailed that whole system to the cross to die with him (Col. 2: 14), and when he died God declared the whole old system dead by rending the veil of the temple from top to bottom (Matt. 27: 51). But our friends, the Sabbatarians, tell us that it was the ceremonial law only that was nailed to the cross, and that died with him. We have shown conclusively that the covenant and its law stand or fall together. Show me the chapter and verse where the book of the law was abolished, and the stone covenant retained in force, and I will promise that the writer will keep the Jewish Sabbath day the rest of his life.

Yes, Jesus kept the law perfectly, Sabbath and all. But the Jerusalem council pronounced it a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (Acts 15: 10). Now Jesus says, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me." This is not the old law yoke, he delivered us from that by his death. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified" (Rom. 3: 20). If a man is going to keep the law of Moses, he is debtor to do the whole law. If he is going under one article of the old law let him remember he has taken a large contract, and he will have no help from Jesus Christ in keeping it. He has got all through with the old stone covenant, as such, and its regu-

lating book of the law, and has given his church the law of grace, which "is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Read carefully Rom. 13: 8-10: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet." And what a place this would have been to have named the old Sabbath law. But hear him close these essentials to a sound Christian experience by saying, "and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Now if that Sabbath law was incorporated in the New Testament code, and if the apostles themselves kept it and worshipped on that day, then they were positively at fault in their absolute silence in relation to it in their teaching.

A Strange Doctrine.

That some people in connection with the famous time movement of 1843 advocated what has since been known as the "shut door" theory there is sufficient reason to believe, and there is no good

reason to deny it. Rev. I. C. Wellcome, in his *History of the Advent Message* (p. 397) says:

This notion originated with Joseph Turner, of Maine, and there were several others in various places who simultaneously claimed to have it impressed upon them by the Holy Spirit. . . . On Oct. 22, 1844, Eld. Turner proclaimed it at a campmeeting in Woodstock, Me., while some penitent ones were being prayed for, repeating "Every one to your tents, O Israel," and declaring that Christ had left the mercy seat. . . . It was readily accepted by some, and was soon confirmed to them and others by vision of one Ellen G. Harmon—since Ellen G. White—who traveled from town to town where she was strangely exercised in body and mind . . . she would relate the wonders which she claimed had been shown her in spirit. These were subsequently called visions, among which was that she had seen Christ in heaven, that he had ceased mediating, left the mercy seat, and come out from the holy place. . . . We are aware that it has been, and yet is denied in the most positive terms that the above-named woman ever proclaimed such views; but there is a true record in heaven, we are ready to abide that—as many of us in New England know the facts when, and as they transpired. Later visions which contradict those do not prove them never to have been proclaimed, though it may militate against the reliability of either.

Rev. D. M. Canright, in his book *Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced*, says John Megquier, Saco, Me., a man noted for his integrity, writes: "We well know the course of Ellen G. White, the visionist, while in the State of Maine. About the first visions she had were at my house in Poland.

She said that God had told her in vision that the door of mercy had closed, and there was no more chance for the world (p. 143).

In his work, *The True Sabbath*, Miles Grant quotes Mrs. L. S. Burdick, a sister of Mrs. H. V. Reed, author of *Bible Triumphant*, etc., as saying: "I became acquainted with James White and Ellen Harmon, now Mrs. White, early in 1845. At the time of my first acquaintance with them they were in wild fanaticism, used to sit on the floor instead of chairs, and creep around the floor like little children. Such freaks were considered a mark of humility. They were not married, but traveling together; Ellen was having what was called visions; said God had shown her in vision that Jesus Christ arose on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, and shut the door of mercy; had left forever the mediatorial throne; the whole world was doomed and lost, and there never could be another sinner saved" (p. 72). Mrs. Burdick is still living in Hartford, Conn., and the writer of this tract has conversed with her upon this matter.

As showing what was meant at that time by the "shut door," Jesus rising up, etc., Rev. Mr. Canright, in his book referred to, quotes on page 144, "James White, the husband of Mrs. Ellen G., the visionist." He says: "*The Present Truth*, James White, editor, Oswego, N. Y., May, 1850, has an

article by the editor, 'Sanctuary, 2300 days, and the Shut Door.' Eld. White says: 'At that point of time, 1844, the midnight cry was given, the work for the world was closed up, and Jesus passed into the most holy place. . . . When we came up to that point of time, all our sympathy, burden, and prayers for sinners ceased, and the unanimous feeling and testimony was that our work for the world was finished forever.'"

On page 145 he quotes from Mrs. White's statement of a vision, March 24, 1849. These are her own words: "I was shown that the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ, relating to the 'shut-door,' could not be separated. . . . I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would spread. . . . My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their salvation is past" (*Present Truth*, p. 21, 22; published Aug., 1849). What language could be more expressive to teach that the time for the salvation for sinners—not false teachers merely, as since explained—had passed?

In a book written by Mrs. White herself, entitled *Early Writings of Mrs. White*, which I have before me (p. 46), is the following statement of a vision: "I turned to look at the company who

were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, 'Father, give us thy Spirit.' Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy and peace. Satan's object was to keep them deceived, and to draw back and deceive God's children." In what respect, if not the subject under consideration, namely, the rising up of Jesus, the vacancy of the mediatorial throne, and the substitutional operation by Satan in heaven where Christ had, since leaving Olivet, been mediating for his people.

This is from her own pen in a reprinted and revised volume, entitled *The Early Writings of Mrs. White*, which the writer owns. In spite of the fact that the revision clearly intended to explain away the doctrine of "shut-doorism," it is still there, as clearly and as strongly as language can express thought.

The foot-note, relative to that "shut-door" vision (p. 37), is a bungling effort without avail. The language of the vision (pp. 46, 47), is too plain to be explained away. This was evidently her faith at that time, and explanation or denial seems useless.

Does the End Justify the Means?

In *Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced* (Carrington, pp. 139-141), we read: "Several important passages in the first edition of her visions have been suppressed in all later ones as they contradict what is now believed. For thirty years they have chafed under this charge of suppression. They have denied it, made light of it, and, finally, the pressure was so hard that in 1882 they re-published her first visions, claiming to give them all, word for word."

They say no changes from the original work have been made. Preface of *Early Writings* (p. 4). They also say the work was printed under the author's own eye, and with her full approval (p. 4). They denounce it as a wicked slander to say that anything has been suppressed. But I have before me the original work, entitled, *A Word to the Little Flock*, published by James White, 1847; also *Present Truth*, Aug., 1849, containing her original vision. Comparing the present edition with the original, I find six different places where from five to thirty lines in a place have been cut right out, with no sign of omission. The suppressed passages are very damaging to her inspiration. I will give one short one as an illustration. It teaches what they now deny; namely, that no one could be con-

verted after 1844. The suppressed lines are in italics.

AS ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED.

"I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, *but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapt about them a religious garb which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people, but if their hearts could be seen they would appear as black as ever.* My accompanying angel bade me to look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time of their salvation is past."

AS NOW PUBLISHED.

"I saw that mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time of their salvation is past."

Despite the fact of the statement in the preface of the book (p. 4), that it was to be a word-for-word reproduction, fifty-seven words have been

expunged from the original statement of this vision alone.

To quote the editor exactly—as I have the book before me—he says: "Foot-notes, giving dates and explanations, and an appendix, giving two very interesting dreams, which were mentioned, but not related in the original work, will add to the value of this edition. Aside from these no changes from the original work have been made in the present edition, except the occasional employment of a new word, or a change in the construction of a sentence to better express the idea, and no portion of the work has been omitted. No shadow of change has been made in any idea or sentiment of the original work, and the verbal changes have been made under the author's own eye, and with her full approval."

Now from the standpoint of this statement the expunging, which has been referred to, makes it look decidedly bad for some one. The writer has noted one feature which looks as though the followers of Mrs. White work upon the policy that the end justifies the means.

In Massachusetts we asked one of the most talented workers we have met among that people, to what extent they feel confidence in Mrs. White's vision, and he replied: "As much as in the vision of Isaiah or any of the Bible prophets."

We inquired to what extent her influence governed, and was told: "To the extent of our confidence."

In Connecticut we asked similar questions of an intelligent and influential preacher, and was given to understand that she was of but little account. "We do not," said he, "pin our faith to Mrs. White's sleeve." It seems clear that the workers of the Seventh-Day view have adopted an accommodating policy in relation to the control by Mrs. White. But it is quite clear to those who have had much to do with that people that Mrs. White's visions are authoritative, and that Mrs. Ellen G. White's influence still controls amongst that people. One has but to read her writings to see that in critical matters her visions have generally been the end of all controversy.

For preserving the unity of her ministry she had a vision, of which she says: "I saw that the shepherds should consult those in whom they have reason to have confidence—those who have been in all the messages, and are firm in all the present truth, before they advocate new points of importance which they may think the Bible sustains. Then the shepherds will be perfectly united, and the union of the shepherds will be felt by the church. Such a course I saw would prevent unhappy divisions, and then there would be no dan-

ger of the precious flock being divided and the sheep scattered without a shepherd" (*Experience and Views*, p. 52).

This would, ordinarily, be considered by us as the best of advice; but it is spoiled when we remember that her shepherds are to be governed by the visions and dreams of a woman for which her followers claim the infallibility of divine revelation. For what God, by accompanying angel, or otherwise, shows to any person, is infallible.

The Inspiration of Mrs. E. G. White's Visions Claimed and Defended by Seventh-Day Adventists.

The writer has met this from their representative men, and there is no secret of the fact of their claim. On page 134 of Mr. Canright's work we read this from the man who spent the best part of his life with that people:

"Mrs. E. G. White, wife of Eld. James White, leader of the Seventh-Day Adventists, claims to be divinely inspired, as were the prophets of the Bible. This claim is accepted by the whole denomination. They defend her inspiration as earnestly as they do that of the Bible. Year after year, in their State and General Conferences, iron-clad resolutions have been unanimously adopted, endorsing her revelations in the strongest manner. Time and again I have seen these resolu-

tions adopted by a rising vote of the whole congregation, myself with them."

The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, a Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures, is a book of 144 pages, published by them in defending her inspiration. They point to her and her visions as the sign and proof that they are the only true church (Rev. 12: 17). Hence it can be seen that this is a vital subject to them. This is a fact so well known, that when a Seventh-Day Adventist preacher is confronted with Mrs. E. G. White's visions, and he tries to wave them aside in silence, he does so at the sacrifice of his reputation for either honesty or intelligence.

When the effort is made to silence the testimony of Rev. D. M. Canright, from whose book we have quoted, let it be remembered that its author spent twenty-eight of the best years of his life with that people, and was, on the day he left them, teacher of theology in their college at Battle Creek, with a class of nearly two hundred of their young people. He was associate editor of the *Gospel Sickle*, was writing the lessons for all their Sabbath Schools throughout the world, and had charge of some eighteen churches in Michigan. He was also a member of the executive committee of the International Sabbath School Association. He had just gotten out a new

pamphlet, *Critical Notes*, of which they printed an edition of 10,000 after he left them. And the half-dozen pages of the preface of his book is given up by the publishers to testimonials, and resolutions of confidence in his integrity, and it is quite likely that the truthfulness of his statements in relation to that people is the only reason why his book has not been impeached in the courts.

So far, at least, as relates to Mrs. E. G. White and her visions, and the Seventh-Day Adventists in general, he has doubtless told the truth, and they know it. And in view of the well-known facts in relation to the defense of Mrs. White's inspiration of God as a seer in holy vision, why they should permit workers in the field when it is for their convenience to deny this, is a mystery to honest people. Is it thought by them that all that is or can be known of their record for nearly sixty years is what they are pleased to say of themselves at this late date?

My personal experience with this people may have been unfortunate, possibly, but while granting that there are good, honest souls among them, as there doubtless are amongst Roman Catholics, they are as a whole entitled to about as little of confidence or sympathy as any religionists in the field.

In many ways their methods are reprehensible.

Sometimes they are positively deceptive, and are made to appear all the more so by the wholesale merchandise of their people under the pretensions of spiritually-prompted generosity, when the fact is, that that prophetess has had visions concerning their property and financial income, as well as their souls (*Experience and Views*, pp. 47, 48). The result is, that they establish sanitariums, publishing houses, cereal plants, etc., while their dupes on ten dollars per week, seem to consider it a meritorious penance to send one dollar per week to the central treasury, living on, and supporting local interests out of the remaining nine dollars. We have been told that this is purely optional. But we have reason to understand that the Seventh-Day law-keeper who fails to practise the tithing law is not much of a Sabbath law-keeper.

Nothing can be more apparent to the careful reader than the positive contradiction of Mrs. White's inspiration. But there are people still in the field who have read the early as well as the later writings of Mrs. Ellen G. White.

The Methods of Operation by Seventh-Day Agitators.

We have known them to bill the town with good, straight Adventist themes, prophetic and other matter, important to Adventists, always

representing themselves as the main Adventist body from Wm. Miller down. If there is a First-Day Adventist Church in the place, and there frequently is, if they have a pastor and he understands them, their first duty is to have it definitely understood that the pastor is not feeding the flock on the right kind of food, and that the members are wasting time and means in his support. If there is a sore spot in the church they will find it, and will do what can be done to irritate and, if possible, alienate the sore member from the body. If reading matter is circulated to counteract the error taught by them, we have known it to be borrowed up (?).

The mission of the Seventh-Day law-keeper is confessedly to Christian people; therefore we have never known them to have a direct and leading message to the unconverted. Their tactics are altogether along proselyting lines, and that, too, by the most questionable means.

In conversation, recently, with a minister, now a resident in the city of the writer's present labors, who had attended both preaching and prayer-meeting services, but whom the writer had never invited to the pulpit, we said, "We were sorry to appear to be lacking in courtesy; but knowing that your people have no fellowship for one who has investigated and turned from the Seventh-

Day Sabbath issue we did not wish to embarrass you by an invitation to a part in which you could have no heart, as you believe us under the 'mark of the beast' and labeled for perdition."

Replying, he said, in substance: "You are correct in relation to the fellowship, but had the invitation been given I should have accepted it; but I could not have prayed that God would bless his word through you. To be frank with you, we do not attend your services to worship with you, but to get hold of some of your people if possible, and lead them into the light of the Lord's Sabbath law." This is only a sample of the proselyting spirit.

Since the foregoing was written, *Safeguard and Armory*, published in Portland, Me., and edited by Rev. E. P. Woodward, has come out with one of the clearest exposures of this folly that we have read. It is a pamphlet of 110 pages, entitled *Latter Day Delusions, No. 5. "Seventh-Day Adventism."* "An exposure of the Claims, Teachings, Predictions, and Failures of Mrs. Ellen G. White, its Prophetess, with Photographic Reproductions of Her Suppressed Revelations." We recommend this book as an unanswerable exposure of one of the most fraudulent delusions of the list, as operated by the managers of Seventh-Dayism.

From pages 86 to 88 we quote the following, which may serve to help some unwary Adventists, who are keeping the Lord's Sabbath, to keep out of the hands of these law Sabbatarians:

"The course usually pursued by the Seventh-Day Adventists in presenting the particular points of their faith is one that is calculated to *deceive and mislead the people*. They plainly proclaim that they have no creed but the Bible; that they do not believe in 'driving a stake' and tying themselves to it by any set of dogmas formulated into a creed. They profess to be in favor of the largest liberty for every one to read the Bible for themselves, and urge the importance of walking out in the light of God's truth, unfettered by the opinions and teachings of men.

"They profess to take the Bible as their textbooks, and from its teachings proceed to unfold what appears to many as the truth of God. The different points of their faith, one after another, are taken up and discussed with apparent candor and frankness; yet, however, *carefully avoiding all reference to the fact of Mrs. White being a 'prophetess.'*

"So far as known, this [which follows] is the policy pursued by this people *wherever they labor*. They present certain points of their belief, and when people fully accept them, and *draw off from*

any former church connections, and commit themselves to these particular doctrines; then, and not until then, they present what they term the 'Spirit of Prophecy' in a cautious and deceptive manner, withholding the true facts as to what is claimed for her.

"When once within the pale of the church, it soon becomes manifest that this one doctrine which has been concealed and so carefully covered up is of the utmost importance; and it then becomes almost impossible to resist the pressure brought to bear upon all to accept her. . . ."

"But why, it may be asked, is this matter of 'prophecy' so carefully concealed? Why do they remain so silent on this one point, especially as they regard it of so much importance? This people are renowned for their desire for public debate. Wherever they go, they defiantly throw down the challenge of debate to all comers. The Sabbath and all kindred questions have frequently been the subject of discussions, *but who has ever known them to challenge any one in regard to their 'prophet?'* This is the last subject they would wish to debate!

"But why not debate the prophet? Tracts, books, and papers upon all subjects are freely circulated and discussed save this one. Why, then, this studied silence concerning a doctrine

which they regard of so much importance that their leading men, and even Mrs. White herself, demand that we shall accept it, *or renounce all other points of their faith.*

"Without doubt, the reason why debate upon this subject is avoided is that their arguments in support of this dogma *will not bear investigation*, and that they [very naturally] wish to avoid publicity! To debate is to attract attention; this is just the one thing they wish to avoid. . . ."

"The fact that the publications of Mrs. White are widely circulated does not signify a desire to spread a knowledge of her claim of being a 'prophetess,' for many of her books can be read without learning this fact. Her *claims* are chiefly put forward in her [seven] books called *Testimonies for the Church*, the circulation of which is confined principally to the membership of the [Seventh-Day Adventist] church." (*The Claims of Mrs. Ellen G. White*, published by W. C. Long, Stanberry, Mo., p. 2.)

The Conclusion of the Whole Matter.

If the keeping of a sabbath, the seventh day, or the first day, or both, or neither, were all that is involved in this Sabbath question, it would be a question of less importance than it now is, by reason of the following claims:

1. That Jesus Christ has left the place of mediation, occupied by him since leaving Mount Olivet, until Oct. 1844, at which time he vacated that throne of mediation. This makes a very serious affair of the issue, and one of vital importance to the Christian world; and all the more so when we are told in cool, sober earnest, that Satan, to deceive the Christian world, is carrying on this work of mediation that used to belong to the Son of God. Mrs. Ellen G. White is authority for this claim. She says (*Spiritual Gifts*, p. 123): "Like the Jews, who offered their useless sacrifices, they [Christians, G. H. W.] offered up their useless prayers to the department which Jesus has left, and Satan, pleased with the deception, assumes a religious character, and leads the minds of these professed Christians to himself, working with his power, his signs and lying wonders, to fasten them in his snare."

This would at first seem too ridiculous to even notice, but this is essential to the very life of Seventh-Day Adventism, and thousands of people accept Mrs. White as an inspired prophetess, and soon find themselves in the bondage of the law.

Of course this whole claim of abandonment of the place of mediation where Christ has, as the High Priest of our profession, officiated since leaving the earth that day from Olivet, rests upon

the inspiration of this woman, which is an awful contradiction of St. Paul's inspired statement in Heb. 9: 24, where he says of Christ, that he has entered "into heaven itself, *now* to appear in the presence of God for us." Was not God the Father in heaven itself until Oct. 22, 1844?

2. The keeping of the Sabbath-law of the Jews is a test of Christian fellowship, after they have made a sufficient effort to enlighten one upon that subject. One must accept the monstrous notion that Jesus Christ has abandoned the throne of mediation, and that salvation now must be obtained by keeping the Sabbath-law, in order to secure fellowship with that people; and this on the sole authority of Ellen G. White's visions. See her *Early Experience and Views*, pp. 34, 35. She says: "Then I was shown that the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, relating to the shut-door, could not be separated, and that the time for the commandments of God to shine out with all their importance, and for God's people to be tried on the Sabbath truth, was when the door was opened in the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary, where the ark is, in which is contained the ten commandments. This door was not opened until the mediation of Jesus was finished in the holy place of the sanctuary in 1844. . . . Since Jesus

has opened the door into the most holy place which contains the ark, the commandments have been shining out to God's people, and they have been tested on the Sabbath question. I saw that the present test on the Sabbath could not come until the mediation of Jesus in the holy place was finished." And Mrs. Ellen G. White's "I saw" governs thousands of people in this country as rigidly as the pope's encyclicals from Rome govern his dupes.

Please note, reader, the mediation of Jesus Christ must be changed before the test could come. Why? As long as that mediation lasted, according to her own testimony, people were saved, and there could be no test worked up on the Sabbath-law. So the door of his mediation must be closed, and the law of commandments must shine out, and the Sabbath-law must be kept as the only means of salvation. This makes the test. Very important, then, when understood. This makes an entirely different gospel than Paul preached, and Paul's anathema rests upon those who teach it.

Reader, turn to the Epistle of the Hebrews, and follow it with that to the Galatians, noticing, particularly, chap. 1: 6-9: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:

which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

As we said before, so say we now again: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

One has but to read the Epistle to the Galatians to see what was meant by the perversion of and "another gospel," etc.

3. These people seem to have no message for sinners, but their work, according to their own testimony, is to go into houses and churches to draw away disciples after themselves.

4. After one is properly instructed in relation to the Sabbath-law, so that they dare not go back to the simple gospel by the mediation of Christ, as people were saved before 1844, then comes the authority of the prophetess on the tithing law. One-tenth of all income must go to their mission treasury, outside and above the thank-offerings, free-will offerings, etc. Whatever of living or local religious interests, comes out of the other nine-tenths.

If this question is raised, they say, in the most affable manner: "This is purely optional." Very well; but Mrs. White will see that the believer

has the tithing option. But the beginner is blandly told, with a wave of the hand: "We do not pin our faith to the sleeve of Ellen G. White." The writer has been told this by their preachers, when he knew perfectly well that that tent could not have been pitched but with the funds from their treasury, and not a dollar would be paid to any man or woman in the field who does not pin faith to Ellen G. White. A summer's campaign without a single conversion is considered a success, if a single proselyte is made with a good business income.

We have not written this tract in an unkind spirit, but with a feeling of sorrow for the necessity we have felt laid upon us, and a feeling of pity for those who have been led away from the gospel to the old law. The next time the Seventh-Day Adventists pitch a tent in your place, do not be so fast to sustain their work by your presence, and your means; for their prosperity is dependent upon proselyting from the gospel to the law. "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding." Amen.