WRITINGS OF D M CANRIGHT

by D.M. Canright

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by D.M. Canright, compiled for study and devotional reading.

49 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00.00. Titles/Contents
2. 01.00. The Life of Ellen G. White: Her Claims Refuted
3. 01.01. Chapter 1 - Introduction
4. 01.02. Chapter 2 - The Great Denominational Test
5. 01.03. Chapter 3 - Claims Made for Her Writings
6. 01.04. Chapter 4 - Brief Sketch of Her Life
7. 01.05. Chapter 5 - Where Now is Their "Spirit of Prophecy"?
8. 01.06. Chapter 6 - Erroneous Views Concerning the Sanctuary
9. 01.07. Chapter 7 - The Shut Door, Or Probation For Sinners Ended Oct. 22, 18...
10. 01.08. Chapter 8 - Damaging Writings Suppressed
11. 01.09. Chapter 9 - Philosophy of Her Visions
12. 01.10. Chapter 10 - A Great Plagiarist
13. 01.11. Chapter 11 - Used Her Gift to Get Money
14. 01.12. Chapter 12 - Her High Claims Disproved
15. 01.13. Chapter 13 - First Visions Childish
16. 01.14. Chapter 14 - Editor Smith Rejected Her Testimonies
17. 01.15. Chapter 15 - Her Prophecies Fail
18. 01.16. Chapter 16 - Claimed to Reveal Secret Sins
19. 01.17. Chapter 17 - Influenced to Write Testimonies
20. 01.18. Chapter 18 - Broke the Sabbath Nine Years
21. 01.19. Chapter 19 - The Reform Dress
22. 01.20. Chapter 20 - Her False Vision About the Planets
23. 01.21. Chapter 21 - "Give Sunday to the Lord"
24. 01.22. Chapter 22 - Conclusion
25. 02.00. Seventh-day Adventism RENOUNCED
26. 02.000. Preface to Fourteenth Edition
27. 02.01. Chapter 1 - Doctrines and Methods of Seventh-day Adventists
28. 02.02. Chapter 2 - An Experience of Twenty-Eight Years in Adventism
29. 02.03. Chapter 3 - Adventism: A Yoke of Bondage
30. 02.04. Chapter 4 - Origin, History and Failures of Adventism
31. 02.05. Chapter 5 - My Objections to the Seventh-day Adventist System
32. 02.06. Chapter 6 - The Two-Horned Beast and the Messages
33. 02.07. Chapter 7 - The Sanctuary
34. 02.08. Chapter 8 - Mrs. White and her Revelations
35. 02.09. Chapter 9 - The Nature of the Sabbath Commandment
36. 02.10. Chapter 10 - Why Christians Keep Sunday
37. 02.11. Chapter 11 - Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?
38. 02.12. Chapter 12 - Sabbatarian Positions on the History of Sunday Refuted
39. 02.13. Chapter 13 - The Sabbath in the Old Testament

40. 02.14. Chapter 14 - The Sabbath in the New Testament
41. 02.15. Chapter 15 - The Jewish Sabbath Abolished. Colossians 2.
42. 02.16. Chapter 16 - A History of Numerous Efforts to Revive the Jewish Sabba...
43. 02.17. Chapter 17 - The Law
44. 02.18. Chapter 18 - The Decalogue Examined
45. 02.19. Chapter 19 - The Two Covenants
46. 02.20. Chapter 20 - What Law Are Christians Under
47. 02.21. Chapter 21 - Forty-Seven Prominent Texts used by Sabbatarians Examine...
48. 02.22. Chapter 22 - The Nature of Man
49. 02.23. Appendixes

00.00. Titles/Contents

Canright, D. M. - Library

Canright, D. M. - Life of Ellen G White - Her Claims Refuted

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Chapter 2 - The Great Denominational Test

Chapter 3 - Claims Made for Her Writings

Chapter 4 - Brief Sketch of Her Life

Chapter 5 - Where Now is Their "Spirit of Prophecy"?

Chapter 6 - Erroneous Views Concerning the Sanctuary

Chapter 7 - The Shut Door, Or Probation For Sinners Ended Oct. 22, 1844

Chapter 8 - Damaging Writings Suppressed

Chapter 9 - Philosophy of Her Visions

Chapter 10 - A Great Plagiarist

Chapter 11 - Used Her Gift to Get Money

Chapter 12 - Her High Claims Disproved

Chapter 13 - First Visions Childish

Chapter 14 - Editor Smith Rejected Her Testimonies

Chapter 15 - Her Prophecies Fail

Chapter 16 - Claimed to Reveal Secret Sins

Chapter 17 - Influenced to Write Testimonies

Chapter 18 - Broke the Sabbath Nine Years

Chapter 19 - The Reform Dress

Chapter 20 - Her False Vision About the Planets

Chapter 21 - "Give Sunday to the Lord"Chapter 21 - "Give Sunday to the Lord"

Chapter 22 - Conclusion

Canright, D. M. - Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced

Chapter 1 - Doctrines and Methods of Seventh-day Adventists

Chapter 2 - An Experience of Twenty-Eight Years in Adventism

Chapter 3 - Adventism: A Yoke of Bondage

Chapter 4 - Origin, History and Failures of Adventism

Chapter 5 - My Objections to the Seventh-day Adventist System

Chapter 6 - The Two-Horned Beast and the Messages

Chapter 7 - The Sanctuary

Chapter 8 - Mrs. White and her Revelations

Chapter 9 - The Nature of the Sabbath Commandment

Chapter 10 - Why Christians Keep Sunday

Chapter 11 - Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?

Chapter 12 - Sabbatarian Positions on the History of Sunday Refuted

Chapter 13 - The Sabbath in the Old Testament

Chapter 14 - The Sabbath in the New Testament

Chapter 15 - The Jewish Sabbath Abolished. Colossians 2.

Chapter 16 - A History of Numerous Efforts to Revive the Jewish Sabbath

Chapter 17 - The Law

Chapter 18 - The Decalogue Examined

Chapter 19 - The Two Covenants

Chapter 20 - What Law Are Christians Under

Chapter 21 - Forty-Seven Prominent Texts used by Sabbatarians Examined

Chapter 22 - The Nature of Man

Appendixes

Chapter 2

01.00. The Life of Ellen G. White: Her Claims Refuted

The Life of Ellen G. White: Her Claims Refuted by D.M. Canright

Preface

Mrs. E.G. White, the prophetess, leader, and chief founder of the Seventh-day Adventists Church, claimed to be divinely inspired by God the same as were the prophets of the Bible. Defining her position, she says: "In ancient times God spoke to men by the mouth of prophets and apostles. In these days he speaks to them by the testimonies of his Spirit" ("Testimonies for the Church," Vol. IV., p. 148; Vol. V., p. 661; No. 88, p. 189) that is, through her writings.

Every line she wrote, whether in articles, letters, testimonies or books, she claimed was dictated to her by the Holy Ghost, and hence must be infallible. Her people accept and defend these claims strongly. Her writings are read in their churches, taught in their schools, and preached by their ministers the same as the Holy Scriptures. Their church stands or falls with her claims. This they freely admit. She stands related to her people the same as Mohammed to the Mohammedans, Joseph Smith to the Mormons, Ann Lee to the Shakers, and Mrs. Eddy to the Christian Scientists.

Hence these high claims are a subject for fair investigation, to which her followers, who have freely criticized other claimants to divine inspiration, can not reasonably object. They have published several books bearing on her life and work, in which they have gathered together and construed everything possible in her favor. From reading these books one would never know that she ever made a mistake, plagiarized, practiced deception, or wrote alleged inspired writings which had to be suppressed. In narrating the lives of inspired men God does not thus cover up their failures and pass by their mistakes and shortcomings. The public, therefore, has a right to know the other side of the life of Mrs. White. The writer is perhaps better qualified to give the facts regarding that phase of her life than any other person living, as he united with her people almost at their beginning, now nearly sixty years ago, when they numbered only about five thousand. He has all the writings of Mrs. White in those early days. Some of the most damaging of these have been suppressed. Neither the public nor their own people, except a few officials, know of these old "revelation." His intimate association with Mrs. White gave him an opportunity to know and observe her as no one without such association could possibly have.

Why I Once Believed Mrs. White Inspired

I once accepted Mrs. White’s claim to inspiration for the same reason that most of her followers do. I first accepted the Sabbath, and then other points of the faith, until I came to believe it all.

Once among and of them, I found all stating in strong terms that Mrs. White was inspired of God. I supposed they knew, and so took their word for it; and that is what all the others do as they come in, deny it as they may.

I soon found that her revelations were so connected with the whole history and belief of her church that I could not consistently separate them any more than a person could be a Mormon and not

believe in Joseph Smith, or a Christian Scientist and not believe in Mrs. Eddy.

I believed the other doctrines so firmly that I swallowed the visions with the rest, and that it is what all do. When I began to have suspicions about the visions I found the pressure so strong that I feared to express them, or even to admit them to myself. All said such doubts were of the devil and would lead to a rejection of the truth and then to ruin. So I dared not entertain them nor investigate the matter; and this is the way it is with others.

I saw that all who expressed any doubts about the visions were immediately branded as "rebels," as "in the dark," "led by Satan," "infidels," etc.

Having no faith in any other doctrine or people, I did not know what to do nor where to go. So I tried to believe the visions and go along just as thousands of them do when really they are in doubt about them all the time. This leads them to practice deception, and pretend publicly to believe what inwardly they do not believe, or at best what they doubt. See Uriah Smith’s case in the chapter dealing with his view.

Over forty years ago, in my early ministry and while yet a firm believer in all the Seventh-day Adventist doctrines, I wrote a strong defense of Mrs. White. During all the years since, nothing so forcible has been produced by any of her defenders. This is proved by the fact that it has been copied by them in her defense, but omitting my name. Also in their writings against me they quote this as contradicting what I now say. I do not blame them; but my answer is this: "A wise man changes his mind seldom, a fool never." At the time I wrote that defense of Mrs. White, forty years ago, I had never seen a copy of her early visions contained in "A Word to the Little Flock," 1847, and in Present Truth, 1849 and 1850; nor Elder Bates’ pamphlets at the same date. They had been so effectively suppressed that I did not know they ever existed. These contain the most damaging evidence against her inspiration. All these came into my hands later. As the years went by, other evidences kept gradually accumulating, until I was compelled to change my mind.

During his early years in Parliament, Mr. Gladstone, the great statesman of England, made speeches strongly defending the side to which he belonged. Later he changed his views and joined the opposing side. Then a member of his old party arose and read one of Mr. Gladstone’s speeches strongly condemning the views he now advocated. At the close all eyes were on Mr. Gladstone. What could he say? He arose slowly and said: "That was a long while ago, and many things have happened since." That was all. The House cheered him lustily. He had effectually answered his opponent. My answer to the Adventists is the same: "That was a long while ago, and many things have happened since." The facts presented in this book give some of the reasons why I gave up faith in Mrs. White’s claim to inspiration. The facts are indisputable; the conclusions based on them must, therefore, in the very nature of the case, be inevitable. In performing this task, the writer, knowing the frailties of human nature, has used as mild language and shown as much charity as the facts in the case would permit. But, knowing the errors and deceptions which have been connected with Mrs. White and her work, he has felt it a duty which he owed to the Christian world to state the facts. The Author. My Present Standing

Since I withdrew from the Adventists, over thirty years ago, they have continued to report that I have regretted leaving them, have tried to get back again, have repudiated my book which I wrote and have confessed that I am now a lost man. There has never been a word of truth in any of

these reports. I expect them to report that I recanted on my deathbed. All this is done to hinder the influence of my books. I now reaffirm all that I have written in my books and tracts against that doctrine.

Several Adventist ministers have rendered valuable aid in preparing these pages. Once they were believers in Mrs. White's divine inspiration, but plain facts finally compelled them to renounce faith in her dreams.

D.M. Canright, Pastor Emeritus of the Berean Baptist Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Imposture shrinks from light,

And dreads the curious eye;

But sacred truths the test invite,

They bid us search and try.

O may we still maintain

A meek, inquiring mind,

Assured we shall not search in vain,

But hidden treasures find.

With understanding blessed,

Created to be free,

Our faith on man we dare not rest,

We trust alone in Thee.

--Anonymous

01.01. Chapter 1 - Introduction

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Seventh-day Adventists regard Mrs. White as a prophet, and her writings as inspired. They make long arguments from the Bible to prove that there should be "gifts" in the church, the same as do Mormons, Shakers and others for their churches. They do this to substantiate their claim for the one "gift of prophecy," which they say was possessed by Mrs. White. The Bible says: "Beware of false prophets" (Matthew 7:15). "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets" (Matthew 24:24). "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits: . . .because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1). In every generation many have arisen claiming to be prophets. All have found followers, more or less. All they had to do was to firmly believe in themselves, and make extravagant claims, and they soon had followers. Mohammed, who arose in the sixth century A.D., with his two hundred millions of followers today, is a notable example. Let us notice a few prominent ones near our own times.

Swedenborg

Emanuel Swedenborg was born in Stockholm, Sweden, 1688, and died in 1772. He was a favorite with the king and royal family. He was of the purest character, and devoutly religious. Not a stain rests on his moral character. At the age of fifty-five, according to Schaff-Herzog’s Encyclopedia, from which we condense this sketch, he began to have visions of heaven, hell, angels, and the spiritual world. He says: "I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most mercifully appeared to me, his servant, in the year 1743, when he opened my sight into the spiritual world and enabled me to converse with spirits and angels." Exactly like what Mrs. White claimed. This work he continued for thirty years, during which time her wrote about thirty inspired volumes. He made some remarkable predictions, which his followers claim were exactly fulfilled.

He founded a new church based upon his revelations. The Bible is sacredly taught, and holy living enjoined. The church has steadily increased, till it has societies in all parts of the world. They publish several periodicals, besides many books. His followers believe in him just as implicitly as do Mrs. White’s followers in her, and are very zealous in propagating their faith.

Ann Lee and the Shakers The Shakers are so well known in America that little need be said about them. Ann Lee, their leader, was born in England in 1736; died, 1784. Like Mrs. White, "She received no education." She joined a society the members of which were having remarkable religious exercises, and soon began "to have visions and make revelations," which, like Mrs. White, she called "testimonies." "Henceforth she claimed to be directed by revelations and visions" (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, article "Ann Lee"). She was accepted as leader and as "the second appearing of Christ." Like Mrs. White, she required "a peculiar kind of dress," and "opposed war and the use of pork" (Johnson’s Cyclopedia, article "Shakers"). Her followers have no intercourse with other churches, and are renowned for their purity and devotion. In proof of Mrs. White’s inspiration, Adventists cite the high moral and religious tone of her writings. They say her

revelations must either be of God or Satan. If of Satan, they would not teach such purity or holiness. The same reasoning will prove Mrs. Lee also a true prophetess, for she exceeds Mrs. White in this line, so that "Shaker" has become a synonym for honesty.

Mrs. Joanna Southcott This noted woman was born in England in 1750, of poor parents, and was wholly uneducated. She worked as a domestic servant till over forty years of age. She joined the Methodists in 1790. In 1792 she announced herself as a prophetess, and "published numerous [over sixty] pamphlets setting forth her revelations" (Johnson's Cyclopedia, article "Southcott"). She had trances the same as Mrs. White, and announced the speedy advent of Christ. (See Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott.") She carried on a lucrative trade in the sale of her books, as did Mrs. White. Strange as it may appear, many leading ministers in England believed in her, and thousands became her followers, until in a few years they numbered over one hundred thousand. "The faith of her followers," says the Encyclopedia Americana, "rose to enthusiasm."

She "regarded herself as the bride of the Lamb, and declared herself, when sixty-four years of age, pregnant with the true Messiah, the 'second Shiloh,' whom she would bear Oct. 19, 1814. . . Joanna died in her self-delusion Dec. 27, 1814; but her followers, who at one time numbered a hundred thousand, continued till 1831 to observe the Jewish Sabbath" (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia). "A post-mortem examination showed that she had been suffering from dropsy" (Johnson's Cyclopedia). "Death put an end to both her hopes and fears. With her followers, however, it was otherwise; and, although for a time confounded by her decease, which they could scarcely believe to be real, her speedy resurrection was confidently anticipated. In this persuasion they lived and died, nor is her sect yet extinct" (Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott").

Mrs. White claimed her gift to be the "testimony of Jesus" spoken of in Revelation 12:17, while Mrs. Southcott claimed to be the "woman" spoken of in Revelation 12:1-2. Mrs. Southcott wrote "A Book of Wonders," while Mrs. White wrote a book called "The Great Controversy." Mrs. White's followers claim the latter to be the most wonderful book of the age. They have sold it by the carload, Mrs. White receiving a large royalty. A recent biographer of Mrs. Southcott says of her books: "She found the business very profitable, . . . and proceeded to rake in the money by selling her prophecies." This is exactly what Mrs. White did. Mrs. Southcott claimed to be called to "seal" the hundred and forty and four thousand of Revelation 7:1-4. Mrs. White claimed to have a message to seal the same hundred and forty and four thousand with the Sabbath. She seems to have patterned very much after Mrs. Southcott in various ways. The following from Chambers' Encyclopedia (article "Southcott") is also applicable to Mrs. White and her followers: "The history of Joanna Southcott herself has not much in it that is marvelous; but the influence which she exercised over others may well be deemed so, and the infatuation of her followers is hard to be understood, particularly when it is considered that some of them were men of some intelligence and of cultivated mind. Probably the secret of her influence lay in the fact that the poor creature was in earnest about her own delusions. So few people in the world are really so that they are always liable to be enslaved by others who have convictions of any kind, however grotesque. On her death-bed Joanna said: "If I have been misled, it has been by some spirit, good or evil." Poor Joanna never suspected that the spirit which played such vagaries was her own."

Just so of Mrs. White. It is marvelous that, with all the proof of her failures, intelligent men are still led by her. But the cases of Joanna, of Ann Lee and others, help us to solve this one. All have

earnestly believed in their own inspiration, and this fact has convinced others.

Here notice the terrible tenacity of fanaticism when once started. When Joanna died we would have supposed that all sane persons would have given it up, but they adjusted it in some way, and went right on. So with the followers of Mrs. White. No matter what blunders and failures she made, they fix them up, and go right on.

Joseph Smith and the Mormons This prophet and his visions and revelations are so well known that we mention them but briefly. Smith was born in 1805, and died in 1844, the year Mrs. White began to have her revelations. He came out in a great religious awakening, as did Mrs. White in the Advent movement of 1843-4. Like Mrs. White, he was uneducated, poverty poor, and unknown. In 1823 he began to have "visions" and "revelations," and to see and talk with angels. The second advent of Christ was at hand, he said, hence the name, "Latter-day Saints." His mission was to introduce "the new dispensation." His followers are the "saints," and all other churches are "heathen," or Gentiles. Mrs. White's followers, likewise, are the saints; all other churches are "Babylon" and apostate. As for having the "gifts" in the church, the Mormons far excel the Adventists. Besides having a prophet, they have apostles' work many miracles, as they strongly assert; have the gift of tongues, and can show, they claim, many predictions strikingly fulfilled. They also have a new Bible, a new revelation, have started a new sect, and will have nothing to do with others, but proselyte from all. The Mormons began in 1831, only about fifteen years before Seventh-day Adventists did; but they now number over five hundred thousand, four times what Adventists do. They are increasing more rapidly than Adventists, who "point with pride" to their growth as proof that God is with them.

Seventh-day Adventists claim that they must be the true church because they have a prophet and are persecuted; but Mormons have a prophet and have been persecuted a thousand-fold more. Smith and others were killed; many have been whipped, tarred and feathered, rotten-egged, stoned, mobbed, run out of town and outlawed. So they must be the true church! In comparison, Seventh-day Adventists have suffered little. They have little idea what persecution is, though all along they have seemed anxious to pose as martyrs.

Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science

It is not our purpose in these few lines to discuss the character of either Mrs. Eddy or Christian Science, but simply to show how easily people are led and ruled by professed inspired prophets of God, no matter what they teach.

Mrs. Eddy was born July 16, 1821, in New Hampshire, and died Dec. 3, 1910, near Boston, being nearly ninety years old. Mrs. White was born in 1827, and died in 1915, at the age of nearly eighty-eight. Both lived during practically the same period of time. The religious systems of the two, however, are exactly the opposite. In Mrs. White's revelations the devil is a large, portly man with flesh and bones; the redeemed saints have wings, and fly like birds, live in silver houses, and in a world where gold trees with silver branches bear fruit. Everything very literal and very material. In the final destruction God tortures the wicked to the limit. Speaking of the destruction of the wicked, she says: "I saw that. . . some were many days consuming, and just as long as there was a portion of them unconsumed, all the sense of suffering remained" ("Early Writings," p. 154, ed. 1882). With Mrs. Eddy there is no such thing as matter; all is only mind, spirit, principle. There is

no personal God, no devil, no angels, no sin, no evil, no disease, no hell, no eternal punishment, no lost souls, Jesus only human, no resurrection, no second advent, no day of judgment, parts of the Bible only myths and misleading, God never answers prayer.

Yet these two prophets; with such opposite theories, find ready followers. The disciples of each believe their own prophet with equal devotion, and the writings of each as inspired and infallible. These writings are their Bibles, telling what God's Bible means.

Christian Scientists, as a class, stand high morally and socially. In these respects they excel Adventists. If teaching purity of life proved Mrs. White to be an inspired prophet of God, it proves the same thing for Mrs. Eddy. The fact is that neither of these women leaders was inspired either by God or by Satan, but by their own inherited highly wrought religious reveries molded by the dominant influences which came into their lives. It is not necessary to believe that Mrs. Eddy was dishonest. She was simply a religious enthusiast, carried away with her own mental delusions, the same as Mrs. White. Adventists point to their success as proof that Mrs. White was a true prophet. But the believers in Mrs. Eddy outnumber them ten to one, though beginning their work over twenty years later.

"Pastor" Russell Speaking of Mr. Russell shortly after his death, the New York Watchman-Examiner of Nov. 9, 1916, says:

"When Charles T. Russell, who styled himself 'Pastor' Russell, died, a remarkable man passed out of the world. We should unhesitatingly place him in a class with Alexander Dowie, and Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism. Keen-witted, eloquent and a master dialectician, he played the mountebank so successfully that he gathered multitudes of followers, in many instances deceiving even God's elect. He built around him a great organization of men and women, who responded to his leadership as the Mormons obey the commands of the prophet. A stream of gold poured into his coffers, and was used in a world-wide advertising propaganda. He was without training, and was never ordained to the ministry, and yet he spoke to unnumbered multitudes by voice and pen, and won to his erratic views many from all denominations. This success came despite the fact that his own life was a reproach to Christianity. It still seems to be true that men like to be fooled, and 'Pastor' Russell fooled multitudes.

"It is announced that his death will in nowise interfere with the propagation of his views, and the promotion of 'Millennial Dawnism.' Indeed, it is highly probable that the fanaticism that possessed many of his followers will manifest itself in a new propaganda. Already thousands of women tread the streets of our great cities distributing the literature of Russellism. People are hungry for the knowledge of the unknown and mysterious future. Mr. Russell capitalized this deep longing of the human heart, and with unparalleled dogmatism gave the most minute and exact information concerning the unborn future."

Mr. Russell set various times for the world to come to an end, the latest being in 1914. In October of that year he said the "times of the Gentiles" would be fulfilled. His followers claim that he was the greatest man that has lived since the apostles, and that his sect is the only true church. All others are Babylon. Mr. Russell lived right along at the same time with Mrs. White and Mrs. Eddy. The followers of each one accept their leader as the only infallible oracle of God. Can they all be right?

Alexander Dowie

Here in our day was another claimant to divine inspiration - the second Elijah. For years he attracted wide notoriety. It was claimed that he performed hundreds of miraculous cures. The devotion and enthusiasm of his followers were unbounded. Money flowed in freely. Like Mrs. White and Mrs. Eddy, he was dogmatic and arbitrary. His word was law. He required an austere religious life, exceeding even Mrs. White. The sect still lives on at Zion City, Chicago.

Notice what a crop of false prophets the last century has produced. It seems to be in the air of the age. Not one of those here mentioned, except Mrs. White, is regarded by Seventh-day Adventists as a true prophet. They call Swedenborg a Spiritualist. Joseph Smith they regard as an impostor, and his writings as a fabrication. Against Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science they have written extensively. Against "Pastor" Russell and his teachings they publish a work entitled "The Darkness of Millennial Dawn." None passes muster with them. All are false. The only true prophet of modern times is their own. The object of this book is to investigate the claims of Mrs. White, the prophetess of Seventh-day Adventists, and, from documentary evidence, plain facts and incontrovertible proofs, allow the reader to judge for himself whether or not she should be classed with the other false prophets of the age here noted.

01.02. Chapter 2 - The Great Denominational Test

Chapter 2 - The Great Denominational Test

"Seventh-day Adventists have no creed but the Bible." This statement is made over and over again in their publications intended for public distribution.

Likewise they say: "The Bible is its own expositor." "One text explains another." This all sounds well, but upon examination both statements are shown to be false. In the first place, Seventh-day Adventists have a creed, the same as do other denominations, and have published this ever since 1872. They call it the "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-day Adventists." It's opening words are: "Seventh-day Adventists have no creed but the Bible; but they hold to certain well-defined points of faith." And then they are once proceed to define these "points of faith." What is this but a creed? Webster defines creed as "an authoritative summary or formula of those articles of Christian faith which are considered essential."

Opening the disciplines of the various orthodox churches, such as Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians, we find each beginning its articles of faith thus: "We believe." Then follows what they believe. Adventists say that all these churches have a creed, but they themselves have no creed. But their "Fundamental Principles" begin in the same way, thus: "They believe;" and then follow their twenty-nine articles of faith, telling what they believe. Hence, for them to say they have no creed, but other churches have, is a deception. But the worst feature about this creed is that it does not contain their chief article of faith - that which they regard as the greatest essential of all. Strange as it may seem, this is omitted. Their greatest deception in this matter is not in having a formulated creed when they say they have no creed, but in failing to insert in their formulated creed the one paramount article of their faith. The third article of their published creed says they hold:

"That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were given by inspiration of God, contain a full revelation of His will to man, and are the only infallible rule of faith and practice." This again sounds well; but it is false, absolutely false. Seventh-day Adventists do not believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain the full revelation of God's will to man, neither do they take these Scriptures as their "only infallible rule of faith and practice," for they hold that the writings of their prophetess, Mrs. E.G. White, are also given by inspiration of God; that these writings contain a fuller revelation of God's will to man, and that they are infallible. And, what is more, they make faith in these writings a test of faith and fellowship in their church. All this is susceptible of the clearest proof.

Over and over Mrs. White claimed her writings to be inspired of God, and placed them on a level with the Bible. She says:

"I took the precious Bible, and surrounded it with the several Testimonies for the Church, given for the people of God. Here, said I, the cases of nearly all are met"(Testimonies, Vol. 2, p. 605; Vol. 5, p. 664).

According to 2 Timothy 3:16-17, the Bible alone is a sufficient guide to heaven, thoroughly furnishing the man of God unto all good works. But Mrs. White adds her writings to the Bible; surrounds it with them, in fact. With the two thus placed together, she says "the cases of nearly all are met." The Bible alone, therefore, must be better; for that meets the cases of all. The claim of infallibility was set up for Mrs. White's writings in 1911. In that year they declared her writings to be "the only infallible interpreter of Bible principles" (The Mark of the Beast, by G.A. Irwin, p. 1). With them, therefore, the Bible is not their only creed, it is not its own expositor, neither is it their only infallible rule of faith and practice. On the contrary, faith in Mrs. White and her writings is the great thing - the chief, but unpublished, article of faith. It is not an uncommon thing to hear their older members say, "If I gave up faith in Mrs. White, I would give up everything." This shows that everything in this church is built on her. To disbelieve in her is the greatest of heresies, and at once brands one as an apostate. Before uniting with the church one hears little or nothing about Mrs. White; but, after uniting, one hears her quoted constantly as authority upon everything - doctrine, diet, dress and discipline.

Those who at first do not accept her visions, Mrs. White says,

"must not be set aside, but long patience and brotherly love should be exercised toward then until they find their position and become established for or against."

But, "if they fight against the visions," then, she says, "the church may know that they are not right" (Testimonies, Vol. I., p. 328). This shows that in the end, according to Mrs. White's own writings, faith in her writings is made a test of faith and fellowship in this church.

Consequently, all along, not only church members, but whole churches, have been disfellowshipped for disbelief in Mrs. White's visions. To get rid of members who did not believe in her inspiration, whole churches have been summarily disbanded by church officials without their consent, and reorganized, faith in Mrs. White and her writings being made a test for entering the new organization. In October, 1913, their church in St. Louis, Mo., was disbanded in this way. The last three questions asked those who desired to unite with the reorganized church were these:

"11. Do you believe that the remnant church must have the spirit of prophecy?

"12. Do you believe in the spirit of prophecy as vested in Mrs. E.G. White?

"13. Do you believe in health reform as taught in the Bible, and the spirit of prophecy?" This is sufficient to show that "the Bible, and the Bible only," is not the creed of Seventh-day Adventists. It is the Bible and something else; it is the Bible and the writings of Mrs. White.

It is not honest, therefore, for them to publish to the world that they have "no creed but the Bible." Neither is it honest, in publishing their creed, to omit that which is their chief article of faith and great denominational test. It is only fair that the public should know of their deception in this matter.

They are not as frank and honest in this respect as are the Mormons. The Mormons have a creed, formulated by Joseph Smith in 1841, and adopted later by their general conference, which they publish as their "Articles of Faith." They do not hesitate to call this their creed. Neither do they in this creed suppress the fact that they believe in the Book of Mormon. Article VIII. Of this creed says:

"We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly, we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God."

Why should not Seventh-day Adventists be as honest, and state in their creed that they believe the writings of Mrs. White to be the word of God? There must be something radically wrong with a denomination that will thus, with fair but false words and suppressed facts, attempt to deceive the innocent and unsuspecting public, and with a spiritual "gift" which requires so much deception to protect it.

01.03. Chapter 3 - Claims Made for Her Writings

Chapter 3 - Claims Made for Her Writings

As Inspired As The Bible

Over and over, Seventh-day Adventists have given Mrs. White the highest possible endorsement. On Feb. 7, 1871, their General Conference passed the following resolution:

"That we reaffirm our abiding confidence in the Testimonies of Sister White to the church, as the teaching of the Spirit of God" (SDA Year Book for 1914, p. 253).

Again they say:

"Our position on the Testimonies is like the keystone to the arch. Take that out, and there is no logical stopping place till all the special truths of the message are gone. . . Nothing is surer than this, that the message and the visions [of Mrs. White] belong together, and stand or fall together"(Review and Herald Supplement, Aug. 14, 1883).

"The Spirit of Prophecy [Mrs. White's writings] is a fundamental part of this message. . . Since the rise of this message, this denomination has believed in the Spirit of Prophecy. We have preached it as widely as we have the Sabbath and other kindred truths, and believe it as thoroughly. . . To us it makes a vast difference whether one whom we have regarded from the rise of this message as being endowed with the prophetic gift is a prophet of God, or whether she is not" (A Statement [by the General Conference Committee], May, 1906, pp. 10, 86).

Notice that this church is built upon Mrs. White and her writings. They liken these writings to the keystone in the arch. The whole structure tumbles if that keystone is left out. Just so, the Seventh-day Adventist Church would fall if Mrs. White's writings were left out, they say, and truly too. By their own confession, that church is not built upon Jesus Christ and the Bible, but upon Mrs. White and her writings. The Protestant rule is, "The Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and practice." Seventh-day Adventists do not abide by this rule, but add to the Bible the writings of Mrs. White, and make them superior to the Bible; the keystone to their whole system, without which it would fall. Hence, according to their own statement, if left with the Bible only, without her writings, their church would fall. On what, then, is their church founded? On Mrs. White's writings, visions and dreams.

Now read this from G.A. Irwin, many years president of their General Conference. On page 1 of a tract entitled "The Mark of the Beast", he says:

"It is from the standpoint of the light that has come through the Spirit of Prophecy [Mrs. White's writings] that the question will be considered, believing as we do that the Spirit of Prophecy is the only infallible interpreter of Bible principles, since it is Christ through this agency giving the real meaning of his words."

Here we have an infallible female pope endorsed as such by that church. They claim for her exactly the same prerogative which the Catholic Church claims for the Pope; namely, that she is the only infallible interpreter of the Bible. No pope of Rome ever claimed more. The Mormons claim no more for Joseph Smith, nor Christian Scientists for Mrs. Eddy.

Now listen to the claim of inspiration and infallibility for Mrs. Eddy, as voiced in the Christian Science Sentinel, Nov. 4, 1916:

"To grasp the real import of Christian Science, to gain some sense of its infinite scope, t realize its infallibility and render unquestioning obedience thereto, one must perceive it to be a revelation from God, hence unalterable truth. To believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and of 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures' by Mrs. Eddy, is a step in the right direction. . . Furthermore, he recognizes the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science as the true and only possible Leader of Christian Scientists."

Here are two women, both living at the same time, teaching exactly opposite religious theories, both claiming to be divinely inspired, and both declared infallible and the only true guide. Which shall we believe?

Editors and ministers of the Adventist Church urge the "testimonies" of Mrs. White upon their people constantly, in their sermons and church papers. They quote her more than they do the Bible, and with the same authority. Their ministers are required to study her writings with the Bible. Any interpretation she puts on a text, or any statement she makes on a subject, settles it beyond dispute. It is what God says, and that ends it.

Thus Uriah Smith, writing in 1868, before he got his eyes open to the facts, defending her visions, says:

"We discard nothing that the visions have ever taught from beginning to end, from first o last" (The Visions of Mrs. E.G. White, p. 40).

Here is another in the Review and Herald, Oct. 5, 1914:

"As with the ancient prophets, the talking is done by the Holy Spirit through her vocal organs. The prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Then again in the same paper, Aug. 26, 1915, is this:

"Think you that he would choose an inferior mouthpiece through whom to instruct the remnant church? On the other hand, as it is the greatest crisis of all ages, we should naturally expect that the mouthpiece God would use for this period would be inferior to none in the past ages."

Language could not be stronger. Mrs. White was not inferior to any of the prophets of past ages. Hence she is equal to Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, Paul, and John the Revelator. This they teach constantly. Her Writings All Inspired by the Holy Ghost Now read what Mrs. White claims for her writings. Defining her position, she says:

"In ancient times God spoke through the mouths of prophets and apostles. In these days he speaks to them by the Testimonies of his Spirit" (Testimonies, Vol. IV., p. 148; Vol. V., p. 661).

Here she places herself on a level with all the Bible writers, both prophets and apostles. (See Hebrews 1:1-2.) Any one who rejects or opposes her writings is branded as a rebel fighting against God. Thus she says:

"If you lessen the confidence of God’s people in the testimonies he has sent them, you are rebelling against God as certainly as were Korah, Dathan and Abirum" ("Testimonies," Vol. V., p. 66).

Here she classes herself in authority with Moses. From this it will be seen that her followers have made no greater claims for her than she made for herself.

She claims that every line she writes, even in a private letter, is directly inspired by God - "the precious rays of light shining from the throne" (same book, p. 67). Of her own words she says: "It is God, and not an erring mortal, that has spoken" (Testimonies, Vol. III., p. 257). She states over and over that those who doubt or oppose her are fighting against God, sinning against the Holy Ghost. Thus: "fighting the Spirit of God. Those. . . who would break down our testimony, I saw, are not fighting against us, but against God" (p. 260).

Again she says:

"When I went to Colorado, I wrote many pages to be read at your camp meeting. . . God was speaking through clay. You might say this communication was only a letter. Yes, it was a letter, but prompted by the Spirit of God, to bring before your minds things that had been shown me. In these letters which I write, . . . I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision - the precious rays of light shining from the throne" (Testimonies, Vol. V., pp. 63-67).

Notice that she claims to be simply the mouthpiece for God. They are not her words, but God’s words, the same as the Bible - God speaking through clay. All through her writings designed especially for her own people may be found expressions of this kind. In her books prepared for the public, however, all these expressions are carefully omitted.

Mrs. White’s Bible Seventeen Times as Large as God’s Bible As given in the back part of "Life Sketches of Mrs. White," her books comprise a total of 13,351 pages. A regular Teacher’s Bible, good-sized print, contains 771 pages. It will be seen, therefore, that Mrs. White’s inspired books are seventeen times as large as our Bible. Their ministers study all these books the same as God’s Bible. An editorial in the Lake Union Herald, Dec. 22, 1915, says: "We would urge all our people to study the ’Testimonies’ daily. Our workers, especially, should read them over and over again."

Here are alleged inspired writings, seventeen times as large as the Bible, to be read over and over again! To do this the ordinary person could read little else. Few Bible students read the Bible through in less than a year.

01.04. Chapter 4 - Brief Sketch of Her Life

Chapter 4 - Brief Sketch of Her Life

Ellen G. White was born at Gorham, Me., Nov. 26, 1827. Her maiden name was Harmon. When a child her parents moved to Portland, Me. In her "Testimonies for the Church" (Vol. I., pp. 9-58), Mrs. White gives a lengthy account of her childhood, youth, conversion, and acceptance of Adventism under the preaching of William Miller. Her parents and all the family were Methodists of the most zealous kind until disfellowshipped for their strong adherence to the time-setting doctrines of Mr. Miller. When only nine years of age, becoming angry "at some trifle," as Mrs. White expresses it, a schoolgirl, running after her, threw a stone at her and broke her nose. The blow was so severe that it nearly killed her. She was disfigured for life. She lay unconscious for three weeks, and was not expected to live (p. 10). When she began to recover and saw how disfigured she was, she wanted to die. She became melancholy, and avoided all company. She says: "My nervous system was prostrated" (p. 13).

After a time she tried to attend school again, but had to discontinue, as she could not study. So her school education never went beyond learning to read and write a little (p. 13). In 1840, at the age of thirteen, she heard William Miller preach that the end of the world would come in 1843. She was terribly frightened, and thought she would be lost (p. 15). Returning home, she spent nearly all night in prayer and tears (p. 16).

She continued in this hopeless condition for months (p. 16). Then, at a Methodist camp meeting, she had a wonderful conversion (p. 18). Here she saw many fall unconscious with the "power," as was common then. Here parents were with her there, and in full sympathy with these exercises.

Again, in 1842, she heard Miller prove that Christ would come in one short year. She was terribly frightened again. She says: "Condemnation rang in my ears day and night" (p. 23). "I feared that I would lose my reason (p. 25). "Despair overwhelmed me." I frequently remained in prayer all night, groaning and trembling with inexpressible anguish" (p. 26). This indicates her mental condition. In dreams she went to heaven and met Jesus, and was relieved (p. 28). Then she attended prayer meeting and fell unconscious, and remained in this state all night (p. 31). This was often repeated. She seeks to give the impression that her exercises were all the work of the Spirit of God. But where they? No; they were simply the result of her physical and mental condition, wrought upon by the religious excitements with which she was unfortunately surrounded. Miller’s alarming predictions nearly unbalanced her hysterical mind in her feeble body.

Later she herself confesses this. She says: "Could the truth have been presented to me as I now understand it, much perplexity and sorrow would have been spared me" (p. 25). She simply had a wrong conception of God and the simplicity of the gospel. That misconception never wholly left her. The idea of a severe God and his service runs all through her writings. It shows how completely she was influenced by her associates and the spiritual atmosphere surrounding her. Instead of the Spirit of God controlling her mind all her life as she supposed, it was her own spirit

influenced by leading minds around her. The following pages will demonstrate this.

Now notice the difference in the conversion of her husband, Elder James White. The entire account of this is given by himself in just fourteen words. In "Life Sketches" (p. 15) he says: "At the age of fifteen I was baptized and united with the Christian church." That is all he says about it. His father had been a Baptist deacon, then a member of the Christian church. Neither his parents, his church, nor his associates were accustomed to such extreme religious exercises as Ellen Harmon's had been. But was not his conversion as genuine as hers? She never questioned it. From 1840 to 1844, from the age of thirteen to seventeen, this little girl, feeble, sickly, uneducated, impressible, and abnormally religious and excitable, fell under the influence of Mr. Miller's lectures predicting the end of the world in 1843, then in 1844. Toward the last she attended these exciting meetings constantly, and believed without a question all he predicted. She says: "I believed the solemn words spoken by the servant of God" (p. 22). The effect on her weak, imaginative and unbalanced young mind was terrible. She said: "It seemed to me that my doom was fixed" (p. 28). Her parents and all the family accepted Miller's theories, which caused their separation from the Methodist Church.

Miller's prediction that the end would come Oct. 22, 1844, was based on a long line of doubtful chronological figures extending back over twenty-three hundred years. They were disputed by able scholars. Now, what did that uneducated girl know about these ancient chronological dates? Absolutely nothing. She simply believed Miller's strong, positive statements without knowing whether they were reliable or not. The same was true of the great mass of those who accepted Miller's preaching. Very few, indeed, were persons with either education or ability. They were persons who could easily be moved by mere assertions and excitement. Of this there was plenty.

Ellen was so carried away with these positive assertions that for days she sat propped up in bed, working to earn a few pennies to buy Advent tracts to give away (p. 38). When able to be up, she went out warning her young friends. She says that "several entire nights were spent by me" in this way.

Then she gives an account of how different ones in exciting meetings would fall powerless to the floor (p. 47). The children were affected the same way. The Advent preachers experienced the same thing (p. 49). For weeks before the day set, business was laid aside, and exciting meetings constantly held (p. 51).

All this, Ellen, with her parents, accepted without question as the power of God, the work of the Holy Ghost witnessing to the truth of what Miller taught. But what it? No. Candid people will see that it was simply their overwrought, excited feelings; that was all. Their disappointment was great. Then followed confusion, divisions, and the wildest fanaticism - dreams, trances, visions, speaking with tongues, claims of prophetic gifts, and the like. Elder White, in Present Truth, May, 1850, says: "J.V. Himes, at the Albany Conference in the spring of 1845, said that the seventh-month movement produced mesmerism seven feet deep." Elder Himes, next to Miller, was the strongest man in that work. When it was over, that was his estimate of the spirit that moved the people. And he was right. It was inevitable that this would be the result with such a class of people expecting such an awful event on a definite day.

Miller, Himes, Litch, and all the leaders in that work, soon confessed it had been a mistake. But Elder White, Bates, Holt, Andrews and Ellen Harmon (Mrs. White) all still held on to that work as correct - as the mighty power of God. Their followers still defend it, and claim it was of God. Mrs. White, in all her visions and revelations, goes back to it over and over as the special providence of God, the power of the Holy Ghost. With her and with her people, it is like the coming out of Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the pillar of fire by night, the cloud by day, the voice of God from Sinai, the foundation of the greatest message God ever sent to men, the last test of all ages! But was this message from God? Most assuredly not. Abundant facts prove it. It was simply the work of fallible men misguided by zeal without knowledge. In fixing the exact time and setting a definite day for Christ to come, they contradicted the plainest warnings Jesus ever gave, over and over. He said: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only" (Matthew 24:36). "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts 1:7). All this was brushed aside. They did know the time and the day. Everybody who did not agree with them would be rejected of God and lost. And that spirit has followed their work more or less ever since. They met what they richly deserved for so blindly disregarding the word of God. They were bitterly disappointed, and had to endure the mocking of those whom they had condemned to destruction for not agreeing with them.

Now read the Lord's condemnation of such work. "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" (Deuteronomy 18:22). This is exactly what the Adventists did in 1843, and then again in 1844. They spoke in the name of the Lord, and it did not come to pass. So, do not fear them.

Seventh-day Adventists now condemn those who are at present trying to figure out the exact time when the Lord will come. Thus the Advent Review, March 2, 1916, says: "Satan would have us believe that we can actually figure out the proximity of the Lord's return; that by casting up figures and computing statistics we can determine how far the last gospel message has extended, and how nearly Israel is made up."

Here the Review condemns exactly what Miller did in 1844. It says this is the work of Satan. Then, was it not his work back there? In an article entitled "A False Prophet Exposed," published in their English paper, Present Truth, Feb. 4, 1915, they say:

"Now if there is one characteristic above another that marks out a false prophet, it is the unscriptural practice of setting a definite time for the return of our Lord." This was said in condemnation of "Pastor" C.T. Russell setting the time for the "end of the times of the Gentiles" to occur in 1914. But if it was wrong to set time for 1914, why was it not wrong to set it for 1844, sixty years before? If it was "unscriptural" in one case, why was it not in the other?

Although originating with this error, Seventh-day Adventists now condemn time-setting, as already stated. Referring to Christ's words in Matthew 24:36; Mark 13:33, and Acts 1:7, they say:

"In spite of these words, some have from time to time set dates for Christ's coming. Such date-setting leads often to fanaticism, and when the date passes, discouragement and utter skepticism are liable to possess the souls of the date-setters" (Review and Herald, June 7, 1917).

Time and again this has been proven absolutely true. If one sentence had been added to this statement, it would have been complete, and that would have been this: "As an illustration of one of the worst instances of time-setting, see the time set by Adventists, Oct. 22, 1844, and the awful fanaticism and ruin that followed it."

If setting a definite time proves Mr. Russell and others false prophets, why does it not prove William Miller, Joseph Bates and Mrs. White false prophets also? Seventh-day Adventists can not consistently condemn this practice in others without condemning themselves, for they, too, have been guilty of it, as we show in the chapter on "The Shut Door." In December 1844, only two months after that failure, Mrs. White began having "visions." In the first one she says: "God has shown me in holy vision," etc. She looked for the Advent people, but could not see them. She was told to look higher. There, way up above the world, she saw them on a high path going to the city. A glorious light was behind them. It was the Millerite warning of two months previous. Those who denied that work fell off the path down with "all the wicked world which God had rejected" ("Word to the Little Flock," p. 14). To deny that God was in that 1844 time-setting work, was to be lost. Thus she says: "As the churches refused to receive the first angel's message [Miller's work], they rejected the light from heaven and fell from the favor of God" ("Early Writings," p. 101).

Trying to excuse their failure in 1843, she says: "I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as the Lord wanted them; that his hand was over, and hid, a mistake in some of the figures" ("Early Writings," p. 64).

Here she has the presumption to throw upon almighty God the responsibility for the blunder and failure in 1843. Is not this charging God with folly? And this to excuse their own folly.

Again she says: "The Advent movement of 1840-44 was a glorious manifestation of the power of God." (The Great Controversy, Vol. IV., p. 429). So God is made responsible for all their time-setting failures, both in 1843 and 1844.

Here the visions of this girl were added to the Advent movement of 1844. After this she had visions almost daily, every week or so at least. The Advent people generally regarded them as simply hallucinations of her own mind, caused by her feeble condition of body and the excitements around her. Some of her best friends so regarded them. Elder White himself, in "A Word to the Little Flock" (p. 22), published in 1847, quotes one of her friends who was familiar with her exercises. This brother says:

"I can not endorse sister Ellen's visions as of divine inspiration, as you and she think them to be; yet I do not suspect the least shade of dishonesty in either of you in this matter. I may, perhaps, express to you my belief in the matter without harm - it will, doubtless, result either in your good or mine. At the same time, I admit the possibility of my being mistaken. I think that what she and you regard as visions from the Lord, are only religious reveries, in which her imagination runs without control upon themes in which she is most deeply interested. While so absorbed in these reveries, she is lost to everything around her. Reveries are of two kinds, sinful and religious. Hers is the latter. . . Religion is her theme, and her reveries are religious. In either case, the sentiments, in the main, are obtained from previous teaching, or study. I do not by any means think that her visions are from the devil."

Elder Bates says that his first impressions of her visions were that they were only "what was produced by a protracted debilitated state of her body" (same work, p. 21).

These statements exactly express the author's deliberate opinion of Mrs. White's so-called visions. After a thorough acquaintance with her for many years, I became satisfied that this was the true explanation of her supposed revelations. I have personally known other Seventh-day Adventist sisters who had visions similar to those of Mrs. White. All were most devout Christians, sincere beyond a question, but misguided and fanatical. Not being encouraged in their alleged "gifts," after awhile their visions ceased.

Since Mrs. White's death a Seventh-day Adventist sister in Los Angeles. Cal., has been having visions similar to Mrs. White's visions. She has quite a following, who accept them of God. But the conference officials denounce them as spurious. Another sister in Washington, D.C., has visions, and claims to be the successor of Mrs. White. For quite awhile Mrs. White herself doubted then genuineness of her own visions. She says: "I was sometimes tempted to doubt my own experience" (Early Writings," p. 18). Then, years later, after she had had a long experience with her own visions, she says: "In the night I have awakened my husband, saying, 'I am afraid I shall become an infidel'" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 597). Did any prophet of the Bible, any true prophet of God, ever talk like that? If she was really sure her visions were of God, there could have been no occasion for her fears that she would become an infidel. This confession shows that she was not herself certain that her visions were from God. Notice here how she turns to her stronger-minded husband to help her out of her doubts. Had it not been for his consistent encouragement, she, like others, would, in all probability, have given up her visions. That she suffered for years with a severe form of epilepsy is not generally known; but such is the case. See this subject treated in the chapter on "Philosophy of Her Visions." In 1846 she married Elder White. He strongly encouraged her in these visions. Also in that year Elder Joseph Bates endorsed them. Thus encouraged, her doubts as to their source seem to have been relieved. That she was more or less sincere in this misconception and deception seems evident from the general tenor of her life. A careful study of her writings shows that each year she became a little stronger in her claims of inspiration, till finally she made the assertion that all her utterances, even in a letter, were inspired. For a further explanation of her visions see the chapter just referred to. The foundation of Adventism was laid in 1844. The visions of Mrs. White were added to this late in the same year. Then, in 1846, the Sabbath was added. Next came the sanctuary. Then the three messages. Later, the health reform, short dress and other matters. All these were, from time to time, simply added to, and built upon, the original time-setting foundation of 1844. Hence, all Seventh-day Adventists point back to this as the great event in their history.

After their marriage, Mrs. and Mrs. White visited believers in all the New England states. These companies were small, scattered and poor. Hence, both endured many privations for a time, and induced them to keep the Sabbath, though at first they saw no importance in it. He accepted Mrs. White's visions, and she accepted his Sabbath-keeping. She soon accepted all his theories about the Sabbath; that it was the seal of God, the great test of Christianity, and that it must be kept from 6 PM to 6 PM, instead of from sunset to sunset, as they now keep it. Right after this she went to heaven, and Jesus took her into the Most Holy, lifted the lid of the ark, and showed her the tables of stone with the Sabbath shining above all the rest of the Commandments ("Early Writings," p. 26). Query: Why did not Jesus tell her she was breaking the Sabbath every week by beginning it at

the wrong time? Her first child was born in August, 1847. They occupied a part of a brother's house, and rented furniture. Elder White worked hauling stone to the railroad; then cut wood for fifty cents a day ("Testimonies for the Church," Vol. I., p. 82). By this it will be seen that he was not a man of influence among the Adventists. His wife's visions were generally discredited. In 1848 they visited different places in New England. They also went to western New York, where they met a few Adventists. In 1849, Elder White began publishing his first paper, Present Truth. Some numbers were printed in one place, and some in another, for two years. In 1850, at Paris, Me., he issued the first number of the Review and Herald. In 1852 they moved to Rochester, N.Y. Here he started a small printing office. In 1853 they came as far west as Michigan, where they found scattered brethren; then visited Wisconsin. In 1855 they moved their office to Battle Creek, Mich. This remained the headquarters of the denomination for about fifty years. Gradually large interests were built up here, a great printing plant, the large Sanitarium, the College, the Tabernacle, etc. These were the days of greatest harmony and material prosperity. These were the days when I was most prominent with them, and helped in building all these institutions. Finally Dr. Kellogg and Mrs. White parted company, and he, with the Sanitarium, was separated from the denomination. Then the headquarters were moved to Washington, D.C., in 1903.

After locating in Battle Creek in 1855, for the next twenty-five years Mrs. White traveled and labored, either with her husband or with some efficient help, in many of the states from Maine to California. Her influence with her people had now become settled and supreme. No one dared question her authority or inspiration. About every year, men or more or less prominence withdrew on account of disbelief in her "testimonies," as they now call them. But the great majority remained loyal to her. In August, 1881, her husband died. This was really a blessing to her. He had largely lost his influence with the church, and others were in the high offices. She began to be influenced more by them than by him. This worried him. He tried to get me to go with him and break their influence over her. He wrote me that we two would go on the General Conference Committee and so get them out of office, and break their growing influence over her. Here is his letter to me about two months before he died:

Battle Creek, May 24 [1881].

Bro. Canright: The Review will tell of our plans. We shall depend on you to help us. . . We hope you can join us in our labors. There will be efforts made to get you to Wisconsin, to have you go here and there. . . I hope we shall see our way out and be able to labor in union. . . Elders Butler and Haskell have had an influence over her that I hope to see broken. It has nearly ruined her. These men must not be supported by our people to do as they have done. . . It is time there was a change in the officers of the General Conference. I trust that if we are true and faithful, the Lord will be pleased that we should constitute two of that board.

(Signed) James White.

About this same time Elder White is said to have remarked to Elder Butler: "You and Haskell have warped my wife's mind, and I am going home to take the warp out of it." When we were together he went over more full the plans referred to in his letter. But August 6 he suddenly died. His words bring out clearly the fact that he knew his wife was influenced, in her visions, by others. All his life he had done that himself. As these two men were opposed to him, he feared their influence over her, if with them, as they and she had planned. So he urged me to go with him and his wife to

make a strong team, and so keep her with himself and away from them. This is the way matters stood when he died. A few days later Elder Butler told me that Elder White's death was providential to save the church from a split. This left Butler strongly in the lead for several years more. Finally he and Mrs. White fell out, and he retired to a little farm in Florida, and was silent for many years. He told her she could go her way, and he could go his. It was generally reported that he had lost confidence in the "testimonies." The fact that he quit the work for so long a time indicated it. She had given him a severe "testimony," which he did not like.

Elder White was not a literary man, not a student of books, not scholarly, not a theologian. He understood neither Hebrew, Greek nor Latin, read only the common English version of the Bible, and seldom ever consulted translations. He was a business man, had a large business ability, and was a born leader of men. His study and work were largely devoted to building up large business institutions, such as publishing houses, the Sanitarium, the college, general and state conferences, and to finance. Here he made a success. But his literary attainments were meager indeed. Compared with the great reformers like Luther, Melancthon, Wesley and others, he was a complete failure. He attended high school only twenty-nine weeks, and learned enough simply to teach a country school. Though he published and edited papers for thirty years, he produced no commentary, no critical work, no book on any doctrinal subject. He published two bound books: "Life Sketches," a simple story of his and his wife's lives, and "Life of Miller," taken almost wholly from another author. He drew his knowledge from observation and from conversing with leading men who were students. All doctrinal subjects requiring study he turned over to these men for them to dig out, after which he used them himself. Neither he nor his wife ever originated a single doctrine held by the Seventh-day Adventists. The doctrine of the second advent they received from Miller; and all the prophetic dates they accepted from him exactly as arranged them. The Sabbath they took from Bates, together with his unscriptural 6 PM time to begin and end it. Then they followed J.N. Andrews in changing to sunset time. The theory of the sanctuary in heaven they accepted from Elder O.R.L. Crosier, who afterwards repudiated it. Later they accepted from Andrews the theory of the three messages and the two-horned beast, as applied to the United States. The sleep of the dead they got from the First-day Adventists, with whom they soon fell out and had many bitter controversies. From the writer they accepted three items of vital importance to their financial success. Early in the work Elder White arranged what was called "Systematic Benevolence." Every person was asked to put down in a book a statement of all his property at its full value, and pay so much on each dollar, whether the property was producing anything or not. All were asked to pledge ahead each year what they would give each week. This is not tithing. No one can tell a year ahead what he may have, nor whether he may live that long. This plan was strongly endorsed by Mrs. White in the first volume of her "Testimonies to the Church." She says: "The plan of Systematic Benevolence is pleasing to God. . . God is leading his people in the plan of Systematic Benevolence" (pp. 190, 191). "Systematic Benevolence looks to you as needless; you overlook the fact that it originated with God, whose wisdom is unerring. This plan he ordained" (p. 545).

So, God ordained this plan! It ought to have worked, then, but it failed. This is confessed in their Lake Union Herald of Feb. 24, 1915, thus: "The money was called Systematic Benevolence, but the method did not prove satisfactory, and it was discontinued with us after two years' trial [over fifteen years], and tithing according to the income of the individual was adopted in its stead."

Yes, and I was the one who made that change. In the winter of 1875-6, Elder White requested me to visit all the churches in Michigan and straighten up their finances, which were in bad shape. I found them discouraged, and behind on their pledges, and dissatisfied with the Systematic Benevolence plan. After studying the subject, I set that plan all aside, and had the churches adopt the plan of tithing as practiced by that church ever since. All were pleased, and the finances greatly improved. I went to Battle Creek and laid the new plan before Elder White. He readily accepted it, and the change was made general.

Now, was the other plan ordained by God? Was he pleased with it? And did he direct Mrs. White to say so? No; her husband got it up, and she endorsed it. That was all. After this she just as strongly endorsed the tithing as I arranged it. Was my plan better than the Lord's? This is a fair sample of how Mrs. White endorsed what others studied out, but had no special light on, herself, as she professed to have. At the same time I found the churches neglecting the Lord's Supper, in many cases for years at a time, nor was there any regular time for business meetings. So I induced all the churches where I went, to adopt the plan of holding regular quarterly meetings, four times yearly, for all business matters. This, also, was adopted, and has been practiced by the denomination ever since.

Up till 1877, no money for any purpose, not even for Sabbath schools, was collected in their churches on the Sabbath. It was regarded as sacrilegious to take money on the Sabbath. But at Danvers, Mass., I disregarded this custom, and took the first collection on the Sabbath, Aug. 18, 1877. It worked well. I went to Battle Creek, and laid the matter before Elder White and his wife, who readily approved of it. It has been universally adopted by the denomination ever since, and has brought hundreds of thousands of dollars into their treasury. This again illustrates how Mrs. White simply followed after and endorsed what others studied out.

Thus, the Review and Herald, Sept. 7, 1916, says: "These extracts will clearly show this agency [Mrs. White] to be very helpful in confirming the believers in the conclusions they had reached from the study of the Scriptures."

Exactly. Mrs. White simply followed after and "confirmed" what others had studied out, and that was all she ever did do. In the Lake Union Herald, Nov. 1, 1916, is given another good proof of this. It tells how one brother (Wayne), ten years previous, and on for several years, worked up the plan to get missionary funds by selling what they now call "Harvest Ingathering" papers. It has proved a great success. It is now one of their established plans of raising money. After Mr. Wayne had worked this up to a success, Mrs. White came forward and endorsed it. The paper says: "Shortly after the plan was started, Sister White wrote Brother Wayne of the light God had given her concerning this plan, fully endorsing it as being in harmony with the mind of the Lord."

Here it is again, the same old story. Some one studies out a successful plan, then Mrs. White has a revelation concerning it. With her the Lord was always behind in his instructions! By far the most important part of their work is the circulation of their publications. In "Testimonies," Vol. IX., p. 65, Mrs. White says, "In the night of March 2, 1907, many things were revealed to me regarding the value of our publications," and the small effort being made to circulate them. What occasioned this revelation? On the same page she says: "The afternoon of March 2 I spent in counsel with Brother and Sister S.N. Haskell." The followed two pages telling of the burden Haskell had on this subject, and his plans to push the work. Haskell had filled her mind with his ideas and plans, and then the

night following she is restless in her sleep, and has a "revelation" strongly endorsing Haskell's plans. So it always was from first to last. This is where her revelations have been of great service to the church. Indeed, they claim that it could not have succeeded without her "testimonies." Leading men went ahead and studied out doctrines and plans, then she followed with a "divine revelation," endorsing each of these in turn. That gave each a divine sanction. They can not name a single move that has not come that way.

Take their Tract and Missionary Society. Elder Haskell first started this. Then Mrs. White took it up and endorsed it. Doctor Kellogg strongly advocated the medical missionary work. Mrs. White then followed with a strong endorsement of that. So it has been with every move made. These illustrations demonstrate the fact that she has been led by men, not by God, in her testimonies. Now the leaders turn this squarely around, and say that she has led in all the moves made, which is absolutely false. They do this to exalt her testimonies so they can use them to carry out their plans.

Never in the history, from Adam till now, had God ever chosen an uneducated man or woman as a leader in any crisis or reformation of the church. "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and deed" (Acts 7:22). Ezra "was a ready scribe in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6). He was a trusted friend of the king. Nehemiah was cup-bearer to the king, and in high authority (Nehemiah 2:1). To Paul, Agrippa said, "Much learning doth make thee mad" (Acts 26:24). The Christian church owes more to Paul than to all the other apostles combined. He was the great, educated leader of the infant church. In the great Reformation at the birth of Protestantism, all the reformers were among the great scholars of that age, men who had mighty influence with the rulers and the masses. Such were Luther, Melancthon, Erasmus, Zwingle, Knox and many others.

John Wesley, the great English reformer, the father of Methodism, was of a royal family, a graduate of Oxford, London, the highest seat of learning in the English world. He was a man of immense influence, and was a ripe scholar. His prose works comprise seven volumes, besides numerous hymns, "Notes on the New Testament," etc.

Mrs. White had none of the earmarks of a great reformer. Her books of any general interest are easily shown to have been copied largely from other authors, and polished up by her assistants. See the chapter dealing with her plagiarisms. She never had the slightest influence with out rulers or with the public generally, as all other reformers from Moses to Wesley had. She has instilled into her people a spirit so intensely sectarian, and hostile to all other churches, that, both in the homeland and mission fields, they are regarded as hindrances to Christian work. After over seventy years' trial, Mrs. White is regarded by all the Christian world as a false teacher, and this by the most intelligent, devout and earnest Christian workers of this generation. Mr. Moody, an earnest advocate of the doctrine of Christ's second coming, condemned their whole movement. There must be some good reasons for all this. The year 1846 marked the turning point in her life. August 30 of that year she married Elder James White, and 1844 Adventist. He was six years older than she, well and strong, and better educated. She was a sickly girl of only nineteen, absolutely penniless. Later years proved that Elder White was a shrewd, far-seeing business man, with a strong, dominating will, a born leader. In a work entitled "The Vision of Mrs. White" (pp. 25, 26), E.P. Woodward, or Portland, Me., gives the following estimate of the relative mental strength

of Mr. and Mrs. White:

"Behold this impressible girl, religious to an extreme, her nerves weakened and shattered by the circumstances of her childhood, just passing through her first great physiological and psychological change in her life, thrown into close contact with this dominant mind - and that at a time when the very air was surcharged with religious excitement, aggravated by bitter and hopeless disappointment."

What influence this strong, masterful mind would naturally have over that frail girl, is easy to see. In later years one needed to be in the family but a short time to see that his will was supreme, and that she constantly had to bow to it. I have often heard him speak to her sharply, while she made no defense.

Elder J.N. Andrews told me that he once sat by while Mrs. White read a mild testimony of reproof to her husband. He said, "Ellen, hand me that." She obeyed, and he took it and threw it into the fire!

Elder White, however, could readily see that it would be greatly to his advantage to have the divine endorsement for all his plans; hence, from the very first, he strongly sustained her visions; would never tolerate in others the slightest question as to their genuineness, although he himself had little respect for them when they reproved him. In the first publication he issued, "A Word to the Little Flock" (1847, p. 13), he argued for visions in the last days. Hence, from the first, Mrs. White had the influence and encouragement of her husband to believe her visions were of God. This helped her own wavering faith. In the same year (1846), Elder Bates endorsed her visions. He was a man of far more influence than Elder White or his wife. He himself was a dreamer, a visionary, trusting in dreams and visions. He says: "I asked for a dream, visions, or any way that was consistent with His will to instruct me. The next thing, as near as I can now recollect, was the following dream" ("Past and Present Experience," p. 75; 1848). Being a visionary himself, he readily endorsed the visions of Mrs. White. He was the first man of any influence to do so. The greatly encouraged Mrs. White, and increased her influence. At the same time Elder Bates pressed on Mrs. White and her husband the necessity of keeping the Sabbath. Though they at first attached no importance to it, yet they accepted it.

Mrs. White herself has given an illustration of how her testimonies were given to order as requested by officials needing them. In 1867 the first building for the Health Reform Institute (Sanitarium) was being planned and built at Battle Creek, Mich. Elder White was sick and away from home. So Elder Loughborough and others went ahead with the work. Money was needed. As usual, they went to Mrs. White and asked for a testimony to the brethren to donate the means. This was delivered as ordered. Here are a few lines from it:

"Here, I was shown, was a worthy enterprise for God’s people to engage in." "Our people should have an institution of their own." "Especially should those who have means invest in this enterprise" (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. I., pp. 492, 494).

She goes on through several pages urging the brethren to send in their means to erect that building. Over and over she says, "I was shown" this - a clear, inspired revelation from God. So means came in. I myself gave twenty-five dollars, and have the certificate now. The building was begun, and the first story up, when Elder White returned. He was angry because he had not

planned and bossed it. It had all to come down - every stone. Then he put it all up again another way at a loss of $11,000 of the Lord’s money! This put Mrs. White in a bad fix. He demanded another testimony repudiating the first one. She had to humbly obey, and did. Here is her confession:

"What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it. . . They [the officials at Battle Creek] therefore wrote to me that the influence of my testimony in regard to the institute was needed immediately to move the brethren upon the subject. Under these circumstances I yielded my judgment to that of others, and wrote what appeared in No. 11 in regard to the Health Institute. . . In this I did wrong" (Id., p. 563). This proves that Mrs. White was influenced by the officials to write a testimony, just as they wanted it, to use to get money. Then, at Elder White’s demand, she writes another testimony, confessing that the first one was wrong! Did the Lord give her that testimony? Did he do wrong? How was she "shown" what she says she "saw"? Here see the controlling influence her husband had over her. She reversed herself to suit his desire to rule in all things.

Referring to this transaction, Dr. J.H. Kellogg, in his reply to an examining committee, said: "It was an infamous thing, a crime, tearing that thing down, for no other reason than because James White was not consulted." But through her testimonies Mrs. White gave divine sanction to it all.

After the death of her husband in 1881, Mrs. White labored extensively in Europe in company with several leading men. Here she visited England, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy and the Netherlands, while their work there was yet young. Her influence in giving divine endorsements to the work helped to impart zeal to the workers. She remained there two years.

Returning to America, she labored here as usual till 1891, when she went to Australia. She remained there for nine years, visiting the different colonies, and encouraging and imparting zeal to the workers there. She also did much writing while there. Here, also, her "divine authority" was of great value in endorsing the plans and operations of the workers. In 1900, at the age of seventy-three, she returned to the United States, still full of vigor. During 1901, she made a trip through the Southern states, visiting the places where the work had been started. She attended the General Conference also that year.

About this time there was a great rebellion and rupture in the work at headquarters in Battle Creek, Much., where their largest and most important institutions were located. Dr. J.H. Kellogg, head of their Sanitarium there, was a man of influence, having many friends. Mrs. White tried to rule him as she had ruled so many others. But he was too strong for her. So she denounced him in unsparing terms. The result was that the Sanitarium, with a large number of influential men, went out of the denomination. Then Mrs. White demanded that the headquarters of the denomination should be removed from that rebellious city. In 1902 the Sanitarium and their large publishing house at Battle Creek were burned down, whether accidentally, providentially, or, well, some other way, was an open question. At first Mrs. White styled these fires mysterious, and forbade any one attempting to explain them. In a testimony dated Feb. 20, 1902, soon after the burning of the Sanitarium, she said: "Let no one attempt to say why this calamity was permitted to come. . . Let no one try to explain this mysterious providence." But later, in 1903, she called these fires "judgments," and reproved the brethren for not having tried to find out their meaning. She said: "In

the calamities that have befallen our institutions in Battle Creek, we have had an admonition form God. Let us not pass this admonition carelessly by without trying to understand its meaning." "God would not have let the fire go through our institutions in Battle Creek without a reason. Are you going to pass by the providence of God without finding out what it means? God wants us to study into this matter" ("Special Testimonies," Series B, No. 6, pp. 6, 11, 33). In 1905, their next largest publishing house, located at Mountain View, Cal., fifty-five miles south of San Francisco, was destroyed by the earthquake of that year. A new building was erected. But the next year this was also destroyed by fire. In this fire Mrs. White herself was the heaviest personal loser. Illustrations, for which she paid a New York artist thousands of dollars, to reillustrate some of her larger books, had carelessly been left out of the vault, and were completely destroyed. After this Mrs. White had little to say about these fires being "judgments" from God. The lightning had struck too close to her this time.

April 24, 1911, their publishing house at their new headquarters in Washington, D.C., had a $28,000 fire. Wherever they have gone, fires seem to have followed them.

After the rebuilding of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, the leading officials, backed by Mrs. White, tried to loosen Dr. Kellogg’s hold on it and bring it under ecclesiastical control. She said: "Our leading brethren, the men in official positions, are to examine the standing of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, to see whether the God of heaven can take control of it" ("Testimonies," Series B, No. 6, p. 33). But the leading brethren decided that God couldn’t take control of it, and so threw it overboard. Then Mrs. White predicted more judgments on the doomed city, none of which have come.

Backed by her testimonies, the officials then undertook a determined campaign to crush Dr. Kellogg. In a council meeting, Elder A.G. Daniells, president of their General Conference, said: "Dr. Kellogg has an imperious will which needs to be broken." This reveals the spirit which actuated both her and them. If they could not rule, they were ready to crush men, break their wills and call judgments down on them. But in this case their efforts failed. They simply lost Dr. Kellogg, their most capable and noted physician, and their largest and best equipped sanitarium, which Dr. Kellogg’s genius and untiring efforts had built up. For several years Mrs. White remained largely in California, visiting the work in different places, but spent much time in writing. In 1905 she attended the General Conference in Washington, D.C. After this she returned to California. Here she wrote as follows: "While at Loma Linda, Cal., Apr. 16, 1906, there passed before me a most wonderful representation" ("Life Sketches of Mrs. E.G. White," p. 407, edition 1915). She stood on an eminence with an angel by her side. She saw great buildings fall, saw awful destruction, and heard the cry of the dying. "The destroying angels of God were at work," she said. Two days later (April 18), San Francisco was visited with a great earthquake, just as she had seen! But when did she relate this great warning? Not until days after the city had fallen! On page 409, same book, she says: "It has taken me many days to write out a portion of what was revealed those two nights." Notice: she did not tell what the angel showed her till after the event had occurred. Why did not the angel tell her what city and when? Why did she not tell it the next day? Evidently that "vision of the night" was an afterthought, when it was safe to tell it. But it "went" with her followers. After the failures of the first few years, she was cautious about naming dates or places till after the events had occurred. This earthquake, so near, frightened her. So she immediately wrote: "Out of the cities, out of the cities, this is the message the Lord has been giving me" (same page). In 1909,

Mrs. White again visited Washington, where she attended the General Conference, and took an active part, though eighty-one years old. On her return to California she attended meetings in various places, speaking as usual.

During the remaining six years of her life she was too feeble to travel; so she spent the time in writing books, with the aid of her helpers. It is known that for many years the greater portion of the material for her larger and most important books was gathered, arranged and written out, not by Mrs. White herself, but by her assistants. She simply supervised it. Her biographer confesses this. He says: "She found time to supervise the revision of 'Sketches from the Life of Paul'" (p. 434, same book quoted above). Largely, therefore, these books were the production of others, "supervised" by her. Were these helpers inspired also? These books are now accepted by her followers as infallibly correct, all inspired of God!

We are informed by her near relatives that during these closing years of her life, when these important books were being prepared, she often did not know her nearest friends, nor even some of her attendants whom she saw almost daily. When she attempted to speak in her home church, she repeated herself over and over again, and had to be told when to stop. None of these weaknesses appear in the composition of her works prepared at that time, because, like most of her earlier work, they were prepared by others. Surely her "supervision" could not have amounted to much in her mental condition at this time.

Finally she met with a fatal accident, a fall in her own home, Feb. 13, 1915, which resulted in her death July 16, 1915, at the age of nearly eighty-eight.

Since her death the leaders have been exalting her and her "testimonies" more highly than before. They have been urging all their members to purchase a complete set of her works. On the last page of one of their Sabbath school quarterlies for 1915 they say: "The complete writings of Mrs. E. G. White can now be obtained for a sum that brings them within the reach of practically every household." And the modest sum asked for a set of them is, in cloth, $18.60; in leather, $26.00 - many times the price of a good morocco Bible. And what has been the general effect of her "testimonies"? They have had a tendency to create in her followers a spirit of spying, faultfinding, criticizing and judging one another. They have begotten in practically all the members, also, a narrow, bigoted, hostile spirit towards all other churches, which will not allow them to cooperate with other Christians in any evangelical work. Indeed, they use every possible means to proselyte from all. With them all other churches are "Babylon," fallen because they refused to endorse Millerism. In "Early Writings" (Supplement, p. 37), Mrs. White says: "I saw that neither young nor old should attend their meetings." Little wonder her followers are narrow, bigoted and exclusive. In the obituary number of the Review and Herald, Aug. 5, 1915, published soon after her death, Elder M.C. Wilcox said: "Her heart had large charity for those of the great Protestant denominations who could not see all that she saw." The quotation just given disproves this, and her views on the "shut door," which she held for years, ruled "the great Protestant denominations" out from God's mercy entirely. To the last she applied the term "the fall of Babylon" to them.

All her life energies were devoted to building up a sect, and promulgating narrow, sectarian views. She built high the middle wall or partition separating her followers from all other believers in Christ.

She was self-centered, and, on occasion, boastful. Her writings to her people abound in references to herself, to her ill health, and how she was often raised from beds of sickness to attend meetings. The evident object in this was to arouse sympathy, and to cause her followers to regard her as a special subject of God’s providence. As to boastful claims, the following is a sample: "I could prove greater devotion than any one living, engaged in the work" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 581). Se Proverbs 27:2). In advocating reforms, being naturally fanatical, she was inclined to take extreme views, which, although represented at the time as founded on divine revelations, she was later obliged to abandon or greatly modify. With her friends she was sociable and an agreeable companion. But she would never tolerate any question of her authority, or any expressed doubt of her inspiration. Either would instantly stir her utmost wrath.

She admits tampering with the messages she says God gave her for others, and never seems certain that she wrote them just right. At first she says: "When obliged to declare the message, I would often soften them down, and make them appear as favorable for the individual as I could. . . It was hard to relate the plain, cutting testimonies given me of God" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 73). In "Testimonies," Vol. V., p. 19, she denies having done this. She says: "I take back nothing. I soften nothing to suit their ideas, or to excuse their defects of character."

Later on, when she became more bold and severe in her work, she says that God would have "approved" had she "taken stronger ground and been much more severe" (Vol. I., p. 318). But finally, in 1901, she says: "I have written some very straight things. . . It may be that I have written too strong" ("A Response," by Dr. Charles E. Stewart, p. 54). When, then, did she ever write right? And what shall be said of a prophet that would dare to tamper with God’s messages? Upon her own showing, also, she was inclined to be cutting and severe. In his comments on her life, Elder Wilcox further said: "Mrs. White sought to teach men to look to God for guidance in perplexity, and not to her or any other human being." This is far from true. She taught her own people to look to her constantly for guidance and instruction in every move and every detail of life. This could hardly be otherwise, when she claimed divine inspiration for all her writings, and that she was God’s special "messenger" for this age.

Again, Elder Wilcox said: "Mrs. White never claimed or assumed leadership among this people." The very opposite is true. She did both. The highest officials in the denomination were subject to her. Like the Pope of Rome in medieval times, her power and influence in the church grew until she became supreme. She made and unmade conference presidents with a word of mouth or a stroke of the pen. She said who was and who was not to fill office. She said where to buy and build, and where not to. If she said, "Go ahead," no one in the whole denomination dared say otherwise, even though it meant the loss of thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. The same writer further said that her testimonies were not "clubs to mangle, nor daggers to destroy souls." This is likewise false, for many of them were called for, written, and used in this very way. As the reader peruses the succeeding chapters of this book he will many times be impressed with these dominant characteristics of her life, mingled, as they were, with unbounded zeal and an intense religious nature.

Finally, in 1911, only four years before her death, as already stated, the claim of infallibility was set up for Mrs. White and her writings. This was but the logical climax to the claims which had already been made for her, and which she herself had made.

Very appropriately the publication making this claim was written to silence heretics and apostates from the faith. No greater claim was ever made for the Pope of Rome. As the claim of Papal infallibility was made late in the history of the Catholic Church, so the similar claim for Mrs. White came late in her life; and one is no more presumptuous than the other. So far as known, she never repudiated the claim, to the day of her death. Her son, Elder W.C. White, endorsed it. But intelligent, thinking persons found that Mrs. White made mistakes; that she was often, very often, influenced by one person against another; and that she got her information from men, not God. The cases were so plain and so numerous that there could be no doubt about it. Then these persons must either acquiesce in what they doubted or disbelieved, or rebel and leave the denomination. Hence, all along the years many left, while others swallowed their doubts and remained.

We could fill pages of this book with simply the names of ministers, editors, teachers, physicians and missionaries who have left the church on account of disbelief in the inspiration of Mrs. White's writings. As to lay members, their number is legion, and rapidly increasing. Whole churches, and many of them, have left. The worst feature of it is that many who once had implicit faith in Mrs. White, and then lost it, with that lost faith in religion altogether. This is one of the sad but inevitable results of cults founded on such fanaticisms. This is why so many infidels are found in countries once so strongly Catholic. Having lost faith in the Pope, and the church which claimed to have the only means of salvation, not knowing where else to turn and place their faith and trust, they gave up all. The same tendency to infidelity is seen in Utah among doubting Mormons.

So, in this case, ex-Adventist infidels are found in large numbers wherever Seventh-day Adventists have worked. Battle Creek, so long the home of Mrs. White, is a terrible example of this.

There is now coming to be a strong influence to attract and hold thousands to the faith, by the official and financial opportunities offered, and this to persons of very ordinary ability and little training. These desirable positions blind the eyes and smother the conscience so that the obvious failures and mistakes of Mrs. White are passed over by dwelling on other things of which they feel sure. The following pages of this book point out in detail, and by proofs indisputable, some of the most glaring of these mistakes and failures which the denominational leaders have done their utmost to hide from the public and to keep from their own people.

Notwithstanding all these mistakes and failures, Seventh-day Adventists claim that Mrs. White was equal to the greatest prophet God ever sent to men. But if she was inferior to none of the prophets of past ages, why did not God give her some credentials as he did them? She never wrought a single miracle; never claimed to, dared not claim it. The prophets of old wrought many miracles. If the power of God was with her, why was there not some tangible proof of it?

According to her own testimony, she had to be healed over and over often; but she had no power to heal others. Her oldest son, Henry, a strong, healthy boy of sixteen, was suddenly taken sick. She and her husband prayed over him earnestly but he died. Her last child was taken sick, and in a short time died. Her husband caught cold, became sick, was prayed for by herself, but suddenly died at the early age of sixty-one. She prayed over others who died. She never had any more power to heal the sick than any common Christian.

01.05. Chapter 5 - Where Now is Their "Spirit of Prophecy"?

Chapter 5 - Where Now is Their "Spirit of Prophecy"?

From the beginning of their history, Seventh-day Adventists have claimed that they were the remnant church of Revelation 12:17, because they had a prophet among them; namely, Mrs. E.G. White. They have always insisted that they had the "spirit of prophecy" (Revelation 19:10). When those opposed to their views have contended that we have the "spirit of prophecy" in the writings of the prophets as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, they have denied it, and have, in the most dogmatic fashion, contended that to have the spirit of prophecy there must be a living prophet in the church. But now their prophet is dead. Where is their "spirit of prophecy" now? According to the long-used argument, they now have no spirit of prophecy, and therefore can not be the remnant church of Revelation 12:17. The death of Mrs. White killed their argument.

If they now say that they have the spirit of prophecy in her writings, they admit what they have always denied; namely, that the writings of the prophets contain the spirit of prophecy. If they have the spirit of prophecy in the writings left by their prophet, then we have always had the spirit of prophecy in the writings left by the prophets of the Bible. All who have the Bible, and believe in that, have the spirit of prophecy contained in its writings. Therefore, the claim made by Seventh-day Adventists that they are the only body of Christians who have the spirit of prophecy is proven false by their own admission. Their former theory of the spirit of prophecy would compel them to bring forth immediately another living prophet, or surrender their argument in defense of the "spirit of prophecy" as represented in Mrs. White. This would destroy their whole theory on this subject. For a period of seventy years they have claimed to be the remnant church of Revelation 12:17, because they had a living prophet in the church. But now their prophet is dead, and they have none any longer, whereby to prolong the "spirit of prophecy." They are now in the same condition as the other churches, and, according to their own argument, can not now be the remnant church. Upon the Scripture, "Where there is no vision, the people perish," their stock argument has been that, in order that the people shall be safe and surely guided, so that they shall not perish, there must be visions, and these the visions of a living prophet. Now the person is dead in whom alone they centered all true or proper visions. And now to them where are the visions without which the people perish? The author is indebted to Elder A.T. Jones, who was formerly the editor of their church paper, the Review and Herald, for the logical line or argument here presented. He rejected their narrow view on this subject, and was set aside without trial or hearing.

Up to the very last they were constantly appealing to Mrs. White for the settlement of new issues which kept arising among them. To the very close of her life, doctrinal disputes which were dividing the sympathies and allegiance of their leading men were all referred to her. As time goes on, who will now settle the new issues and questions constantly arising in their work? They will have to be settled by their uninspired, erring men, the same as in other churches. Hence they are just as liable to go wrong as are other churches.

01.06. Chapter 6 - Erroneous Views Concerning the Sanctuary

Chapter 6 - Erroneous Views Concerning the Sanctuary

As the sanctuary plays so important a part in all of Mrs. White's visions, and in the Seventh-day Adventist faith generally, I will explain it briefly, without special argument.

Moses erected a building called the tabernacle, or sanctuary. It had two rooms. The first was called the Holy Place, the second, the Most Holy Place. In the first was the table of showbread, the candlestick, and the altar of incense; in the second, the ark. The two rooms were separated by "the veil." At the door of the first room was a curtain. Outside, in the court, stood the altar of burnt-offering. In the court and in the Holy Place the priests ministered daily. No one entered the Most Holy Place except the high priest once a year, on the tenth day of the seventh month, the "day of atonement" (Leviticus 23:37). The services of this day were most important of all, and are fully described in Leviticus 16:1-34. On this day the high priest went into the Most Holy Place with the blood of a general offering for all the people, and made an atonement for all Israel. By sprinkling blood on and before the mercy seat on the ark, on the altar of incense, and on the altar of burnt-offering, he was said to "cleanse" the sanctuary from all the sins of the people.

All this was figurative and typical - an object lesson pointing to Christ.

Miller's time-setting views that Christ would come in 1844 were based on his calculations regarding the time for the "cleansing of the sanctuary." When the time passed, and Christ did not come, he, with all the leaders of the body of Adventists generally, soon acknowledged that he had been mistaken in the time. But a very few - Elder White, Ellen Harmon (Later Mrs. White), Elder Bates, and a few others - still held that the set day had been right. But they could not explain the failure.

About two years later, in 1846, one O.R.L. Crosier studied out the sanctuary subject very much as it is now held by Seventh-day Adventists. His view was accepted entirely by a few Adventists of that time, and Ellen Harmon (Mrs. White) shortly afterward had a "vision" in which she said the Lord showed her that the Crosier view was correct. She recommended its publication (see "A Word to the Little Flock," pp. 11, 12). The theory was that the earthly sanctuary was a type of one just like it up in heaven, and that this sanctuary in heaven, and that this sanctuary in heaven was the one referred to in Daniel 8:14, upon which was based the 1844 time-setting calculations; that Jesus, as our high priest, was to minister in the first room, or Holy Place, in heaven, from his ascension until Oct. 22, 1844, receiving there the confessed sins of believers, and that on Oct. 22, 1844, he finished his ministry in the Holy Place and went into the Most Holy, and there began the "cleansing of the sanctuary," which they said was also the anti-typical atonement. Notice that in this theory the atonement did not take place until over eighteen hundred years after Jesus died on the cross! In Crosier's theory it was held that the work in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary was for "forgiveness of sins" only; hence, when the work in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary closed (Oct. 22, 1844), there ended forgiveness of sins for all the world!

Probation for sinners ended there! So, after 1844, Christ’s work of atonement in the Most Holy Place was for saints only!

Mr. Crosier states that the object of this article on the sanctuary was to prove that probation ended in 1844, and Mrs. White endorsed it for that reason. See the next chapter. The Adventists new nothing of this sanctuary theory until about two years after 1844. But when Crosier’s theory was adopted, they linked up the "shut door" of the ten virgins parable, which they preached on in 1844, with what they now called the "shutting of the door" of the first room of the heavenly sanctuary when Jesus went into the second apartment.

It was not until 1849, five years after 1844, that they first invented the "open" door theory. See next chapter. But this "open door" was for saints only - the old Advent believers. This was the second step in the shut-door theory.

01.07. Chapter 7 - The Shut Door, Or Probation For Sinners Ended Oct. 22, 1844

Chapter 7 - The Shut Door, Or Probation For Sinners Ended Oct. 22, 1844

The above title indicates the theory held and dogmatically taught by all Seventh-day Adventists until the autumn of 1851. In later years they gradually modified it, and finally abandoned it altogether. Today they deny that they ever taught it at all! But we shall see. All of their leaders advocated this unscriptural theory in the clearest possible terms until the time above indicated. Mrs. White had revelation after revelation in her visions during this same period, confirming this theory. Later, they were compelled either to reject her claims to inspiration, or deny that she ever taught such a theory. The issue is plain. Here are the facts: The Seventh-day Adventist leaders of this early time were all in the great Millerite movement. In 1844 they staked all upon the assertion that the end of the world would come on Oct. 22, 1844. Of course probation would end then. To this time they applied the parable of the ten virgins recorded in Matthew 25:1-13. Just before giving this parable, Jesus had warned his disciples that his second advent would occur suddenly, when least expected. To enforce this teaching, he gave the parable. Ten virgins went out to meet the bridegroom. As he tarried longer than they expected, all fell asleep. When he did come, only five were ready to go with him to the wedding. These entered, and "the door was shut." Later the other five came and knocked, but they were too late to gain admittance. The meaning is easy to understand. When Christ comes, all who are ready will be saved. The rest will be shut out, will be lost, for probation will be ended.

All the early Adventists, with Miller at their head, explained the parable in that way. And they were correct. When their set time passed they were dazed. They still insisted that their message had been right; probation had ended. They still hoped the Lord would come, and expected him any day. They ceased exhorting sinners, ceased praying for them, and said, "The door is shut." This is the origin of the "shut door" theory. It then had with them no reference to any sanctuary, either on earth or in heaven. Such an application was attempted later. They had no "light" upon the sanctuary question till years after they had been preaching the "shut door." It was not until five years later (1849) that Seventh-day Adventists invented the theory of an "open door" from Revelation 3:7-8. This new position is stated by Mrs. White herself. She says: "The view of the ’open and shut door,’ on pages 34-37, was given in 1849. The application of Revelation 3:7-8 to the heavenly sanctuary and Christ’s ministry was entirely new to me. I have never heard the idea advanced by any one" ("Supplement" to "Experience and Views," p. 2). So she herself, with all the others, had for five years taught the "shut door" theory without any reference to an "open" door. Now they claim that they have taught both the "shut door" and the "open door" together from the first. Thus Elder Butler, referring to Revelation 3:7-8, says: "Here was a door opened and a door shut" ("Replies to Canright," p. 100). He asserts that they taught both together from the beginning in 1844. Mrs. White’s statement just quoted proves his statement to be false.

Here is a significant fact. After 1844, and on for over seven years, the term "shut door" occurs over and over in all the articles from the pens of all Seventh-day Adventists during that period - articles from Mrs. White, and Elders White, Holt, Arnold, Bates and others. It is the center of their arguments. So prominent was this that they were called "Door Shutters." As such they were denounced by Mr. Miller and the other Adventists. But after the shut-door theory was abandoned, that term gradually disappears, until now for many years past it does not occur in their articles or publications at all. This fact alone proves that they have abandoned their theory of the shut door which they at first held, and which Mrs. White so strongly endorsed.

Seventh-day Adventists at first adopted the sanctuary theory to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844, a theory which Mrs. White and all of them held at that time. Here is my proof on this point:

Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 1, 1887

"Elder D.M. Canright: I kept the seventh day nearly a year, about 1848. In 1846 I explained the idea of the sanctuary in an article in an extra number of the Day Star, Cincinnati, O. The object of that article was to support the theory that the door of mercy was shut, a theory which I, and nearly all Adventists who had adopted William Miller's views, held from 1844 to 1848. Yes, I know that Ellen G. Harmon - now Mrs. White - held that shut-door theory at that time.

Truly yours, "O.R.L. Crosier."

Now listen to Mrs. White:

Topsham, Me., Apr. 21, 1847

". . . The Lord showed me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light on the cleansing of the sanctuary, etc., and that it was his will that Bro. C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day Star (extra), Feb. 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that extra to every saint"

("A Word to the Little Flock," pp. 11, 12) Here you have the origin and object of that sanctuary theory.

All Adventists, including every branch, under the leadership of Miller, for awhile after the day passed in 1844, held that probation for sinners had ended. Miller said: "We have done our work in warning sinners and in trying to awake a formal church. God in his providence has shut the door; we can only stir up one another to be patient" (Advent Herald, Dec. 11, 1844). Then, again, in the Voice of Truth, Feb. 19,1845, he says: "I have not seen a genuine conversion since." Miller gave the keynote with which all agreed. But he, with all leading Adventists, very quickly gave up the theory, and ever after opposed it.

Elder G.I. Butler, in the Review and Herald, March 3, 1885, says: "As the time passed, there was a general feeling among the earnest believers that their work for the world was done. . . There can be no question that for months after the time passed it was the general sentiment that their work of warning the world was over. . . Their burden was gone, and they thought their work was done." Yes, that was just what they did believe, probation was ended! Even Butler is compelled to admit it.

Elder White admits the same thing to be true. He says: "In the absence of light in reference to the shut and open door of the heavenly sanctuary, the reader can hardly see how those who held fast their advent experience as illustrated by the parable of the ten virgins (Matthew 25:1-12), could fail to come to the conclusion that probation for sinners had ended" ("Life Sketches," p. 121). But they did not have the "light," either on the sanctuary or the "open door," until years after 1844. This is equivalent to a confession that they believed probation for sinners had ended, and that they believed this for several years.

Mrs. White adds her testimony to the foregoing, as follows: "After the passing of the time of expectation in 1844, Adventists still believed the Saviour's coming to be very near; they held that . . . the work of Christ as man's intercessor before God had ceased" ("Great Controversy," edition 1884, p. 268). It is clear as light, from the admissions to be found in their own writings, that for a time after 1844 Seventh-day Adventists believed probation had ended.

Elder Joseph Bates; His Great Influence Upon Elder White and His Wife

Elder Bates, New Bedford, Mass., was one of the most ardent coworkers with Miller and others in preaching the set time in 1844. He is reported to have spent $15,000 (all his fortune) in that work. He was highly regarded by the Adventists, with whom he had much influence. He was fairly well educated, a man of much force, and of very positive convictions. He met Elder White and his wife in the fall of 1846. He was then fifty-four years of age, in the prime of his life and influence.

Mrs. White was only nineteen, feeble, uneducated, unknown, save to a few, and these of no influence with Adventists. Elder White was only twenty-six, and had only a limited education. The part that he had taken in the 1844 work was so limited that he had little influence with the Adventists. He and his wife were penniless, absolutely poor. She was having "visions," which were generally regarded as the result of her poor health. After a slight acquaintance, Bates endorsed her visions as of God, and threw all of his influence into supporting them. This was a wonderful advantage to Elder White and his wife. It was the turning point in their lives. They, therefore, readily accepted all of Bates' theories - the Sabbath, beginning it at 6 P.M. on Friday, and his argument that the day of atonement would last seven years from 1844, and end in the fall of 1851. With the Whites and others he held strongly that probation for the world ended Oct. 22, 1844. The pamphlet, "A Word to the Little Flock," was published by Elder White in 1847. That he then believed that probation for sinners ended in 1844 is proved by his words on page 2, where he says: "From the ascension to the shutting of the door, October, 1844, Jesus stood with widespread arms of love and mercy; ready to receive, and plead the cause of every sinner who would come to God by him. On the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, He passed into the Holy of Holies, where he has since been a merciful 'high priest over the house of God.' . . . I think the following is a prophecy which has been fulfilling since October, 1844: 'And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor' (Isaiah 59:14-16)." Notice that after 1844 the sinner was left without an intercessor! On page 21 of the little work is the following by Elder Bates: "Since the closing up of our work for the world, October, 1844." Their work for the world ended just there because there was no longer an "intercessor." In the same little work, and between the two quotations already given, is the following from a vision by Mrs. White: "It was just as impossible for them [faithless Advent people] to get on the path again and go to the city, as all the wicked world which God had rejected" (p. 14).

Carefully note how all the foregoing quotations agree: no intercessor for sinners after October, 1844; our work closed up for the world, October, 1844; all the wicked world which God had rejected! All three are so plain that no word of explanation is needed. In 1850, Bates published a tract on the sanctuary. On page 9, he says: "The twenty-three hundred years are complete, ending in the fall of 1844. . . Here his [Christ's] work ceased ministering and mediating for the whole world forever. . . Here the door is shut." A study of this tract shows that Bates held that the day of atonement in the sanctuary in heaven began Oct. 22, 1844, and would last seven years, and, of course, end October, 1851. The last six months, the gathering of the saints would occur. He argued all this from the day of atonement as given in Leviticus 16:1-34. His argument was mere assumption, lacking proof. But it satisfied him. Elder White and his wife needed so much his influence, and besides, had so much confidence in his knowledge and ability, that they readily accepted his views and wrote in harmony with what he taught.

Here are the words of Elder Bates about that seven years:

"The seven spots of blood on the Golden Altar and before the mercy seat, I fully believe, represent the duration of the judicial proceedings on the living saints in the Most Holy, all of which time they will be in their affliction, even seven years; God by his voice will deliver them, 'for it is the blood that maketh the atonement for the soul' (Leviticus 17:11). Then the number seven will finish the day of atonement (not redemption). The last six months of this time, I understand, Jesus will be gathering in the harvest with his sickle, on the white cloud." Again: "This is also where the door is shut - at the end of the twenty-three hundred days. The times of the Gentiles are over. Hosea 5:6-7 : 'They shall go with their flocks and their herds to seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself from them. Now shall a month devour them with their portions.' How evident that this is after the door is shut and Jesus had gone, or withdrawn himself, into the Holiest." Again he says: "As soon as the day of atonement is ended, seven angels come out of the temple with the seven last plagues (Hosea 5:5-6). This is the duration of the third angel's message in Revelation 14:9-13" ("The Typical and Anti-typical Sanctuary," pp. 10-13, 15, by Joseph Bates, 1850).

Note that the times of the Gentiles were to end at the close of the twenty-three hundred days, in 1844 - their probation ended there! Then the day of atonement would begin, and last seven years. This was to be the duration of the third angel's message - seven years. This was Joseph Bates' theory. Jesus was to begin the atonement in heaven Oct. 22, 1844; it would continue seven years, and of course end in October, 1851. The last six months - May to October - would be the gathering of the saints. It is plain from Mrs. White's writings of that time that she accepted and believed fully in this theory.

Here is a "vision" given September, 1850, about one year before the seven years were to end: "Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. Time has continued a few years longer than they expected, therefore they think it may continue a few years more. . . I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished, and that time can not last but a little longer" ("Early Writings," p. 58, ed. 1907).

Jesus entered the Most Holy, it was claimed, Oct. 22, 1844. In September, 1850, he had been there six years. She at that time says she "saw" that his time to be there was nearly finished! See how exactly this agrees with the theory of Bates, published in the same year (1850)! These two

were working together. Each knew what the other believed. Both wrote alike as to the time Jesus would be in the Most Holy Place. Bates said it would end in seven years - October, 1851, or only one year after he wrote. She said that Christ's time to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished when she wrote in 1850. Thus it would have been if the theory Bates advanced had been correct. One can easily see how she was blindly led by Bates. What she saw was not what God revealed to her, but what Bates taught her.

Time has demonstrated that her "visions" was wrong. In 1850, when she wrote it, Jesus had been in the Most Holy Place, according to Advent teaching, only six years; yet she "saw" that his time to be there was nearly finished. But, instead of this being the case, nearly seventy long years have gone by, and, according to Seventh-day Adventist teaching, Jesus is still in the Most Holy Place in the sanctuary in heaven, and the day of probation for sinners has not yet ended! Any candid person will readily admit the error and the utter failure of that "vision." But here is another "vision" still worse, written June 27, 1850: "My accompanying angel said, 'Time is almost finished. Get ready, get ready, get ready.'" A little further on she says: "Some of us have had time to get the truth, and to advance step by step, and every step we have taken has given us strength to take the next. But now time is almost finished. . . and what we have been years learning, they will have to learn in a few months" ("Early Writings," pp. 64-67). In September, 1850, she limited the time to "a few months," "time almost finished," etc. Note how evidently she relied upon Bates' seven years. Had he been correct it would have been only a few months longer. It is clear that the deluded woman sincerely believed in Bates' ideas and interpretations or she never would have dared to write so dogmatically in her "vision" messages. The passing of nearly seventy years has proved her "visions" to be, not a message from God, but the hallucinations of an overwrought mind, the result of her nervous condition. No holy angel ever told her what she claims he did; for he would have told her the truth. The study clearly reveals the fact that her "visions" were simply the product of her own mind, reflecting the views of those around her.

Miss Sarah B. Harmon, older sister of Mrs. White, in a letter written from Brookfield, N.Y., to Mrs. P.D. Lawrence, July 29 and 30, 1850, said: "I believe this is the last winter we shall see before Jesus, our great High Priest, comes out. Oh, let us live for God and sacrifice for him faithfully." (1) Here is additional evidence that Seventh-day Adventists had set the time for Christ to come in 1851.

Early Adventists Teach the Shut Door

We now submit evidence from another important source of early Advent teaching; namely, Present Truth, published by Elder White in 1849 and 1850. In this publication several leading men gave their views of the "shut door" theory as held by all Seventh-day Adventists at that date. We quote first from Elder George W. Holt (Present Truth, December, 1849, p. 47). He says: "Many will point us to one who is said to be converted, for positive proof that the door is not shut, thus yielding the word of God for the feelings of an individual." Notice his point: If an individual had been really converted since October, 1844, it would have proved that the door was not shut. Hence the shut door meant that there could be no genuine conversions after 1844. This was at the close of 1849, five years after 1844, published and endorsed by Mr. and Mrs. White! How does this agree with the idea that Mrs. White, all through these five years, was laboring for the conversion of sinners, as has been claimed? Why did she not refute Holt by pointing to sinners she had herself converted

during this five years? Will Adventists explain? In the same paper (pp. 41-46, same month, Dec. 16, 1849) is an article covering six pages by Elder David Arnold, entitled "The Shut Door Explained." Surely this should make the matter plain as to what was meant by the "shut door." The burden of his whole argument is that, after 1844, Christ was a mediator for saints only, and that, as the door was then shut, there had not been, nor could there be, a genuine conversion of a sinner since that time. Here are a few lines:

"The professed conversions through the instrumentality of different sects are urged as positive proof that the door is not shut. I can not give up the clear fulfillment of prophecy in our experience, which shows the shut door in the past, for the opinions, fancies and feelings of men, based upon human sympathy and a superstitious reverence for early imbibed views. . . These professed converts will not rise to a better state than the low standard of the fallen sects; therefore, they are converted to the religion of the various sects, but not to God."

Here this writer argues exactly as does Holt, that a genuine conversion would prove the door not shut; but there had been no true conversions since 1844. That is the argument. The professed conversions were all spurious. Again we ask, Why did not Mrs. White point to her converts and refute such an argument? Why not? Because she had none. She had not labored for any. She did not believe it possible to make any. She agreed with Holt and Arnold. Remember, both articles were published in her husband's paper, edited by him.

Now let us hear Elder White upon the same question - the "shut door." In Present Truth, May, 1850, he has an article of eight columns on "The Sanctuary, Twenty-three Hundred Days, and the Shut Door." In an article of such length he should be able to make his position very plain. And, indeed, he does. He uses every argument available to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844; and that therefore there was no intercessor and no pardon for sinners after that time. He says:

"I think we shall clearly see that there can be no other place for the shut door but at the autumn of 1844. . . 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. . . The reason that the living branches felt that their work was done, was because the twenty-three hundred days were ended, and the time had come for Jesus to shut the door of the Holy and pass into the Most Holy to receive the kingdom and cleanse the sanctuary. . . At this very time when the faithful servant is giving meat to the 'household' [not to the unbelieving world], and is opposed by the evil servant, and when the Advent history marked out by the parable is fulfilled, and the shut door in the past, . . . He is still merciful to his saints and ever will be; and Jesus is still their Advocate and Priest. But the sinner, to whom Jesus had stretched out his arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offer of salvation, was left without an advocate when Jesus passed from the Holy Place and shut the door in 1844. The professed church who rejected the truth was also rejected, smitten with blindness, and now with their flocks and herds they go to seek the Lord, as still an advocate for sinners. But, says the prophet (Hosea 5:6-7): 'They shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself from them. They have dealt treacherously against the Lord, for they have begotten strange children.'"

Here it is evident that Elder White used the same argument as Holt and Arnold. Jesus is an advocate for saints, but not for sinners. The door is shut against sinners. Notice that he quotes

Hosea 5:6-7, to prove it. While they believed in the shut door, this was a text they all used over and over again. It will soon be seen that Mrs. White uses it in the same way.

Now we come to the teaching of Mrs. White herself in her "visions" and revelations on this same subject. She says that an angel came to her directly from heaven and talked with her, telling her how it all was. She writes out these "visions" for the same paper in which the articles written by Holt, Arnold and her husband all appear. She was associated with them in the same work, talked with them, heard them preach their views, read their articles, etc. When her husband brought home that little paper, Present Truth, they laid each number on the floor between them and prayed over it. In "Testimony for the Church," Vol. I., page 88, Mrs. White says: "About the same time he began to publish a small sheet entitled Present Truth. . . Always before preparing them for the post-office, we spread them before the Lord, and prayed over them."

She herself had articles in many of these little sheets, right along with the others. It is certain that she read each article, and knew, without doubt, what the others wrote and taught. She certainly agreed with these articles or she would not have prayed over them as she says she did. We will quote from only one or two of her articles to show that she taught as they all did - that there was no salvation for sinners after 1844. Opening to No. 3 (August, 1849, pp. 21, 22), we discover that she claims to have been taken up to the Holy City. In relating the "vision" given her there, she says: "There I was shown that the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, relating to the shut door, could not be separated." She "saw" all about how in 1844 Jesus left the Holy Place and entered the Most Holy, etc. Her arguments are the same as those of all the others. She saw that the power manifested by the other churches in revivals was only the power of the devil, not the power of God. Continuing, she says: "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 wrapped 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 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 was past."

It is painful to read the dodging, quibbling and untruthful assertions made by her defenders to evade the plain meaning of this passage. In a few years’ time, with its stern facts, compelled Mrs. White and her followers to abandon the "shut door" and "no salvation for sinners" doctrine. Not one of them believes in it now. This is conclusive proof that her revelations were not from God, but were the unreliable products of autosuggestion and an abnormal state of mind. No holy angel ever told her what she reports, for no such being would have told her what was not so and what the passing of time has proven untrue. Her assertion gives the lie to heavenly being. Her professed revelations were simply the product of her own mind reflecting the teaching of those around her.

Here is another of her "visions" along the same line, in the same paper, Present Truth, March, 1850, page 64. She says: "The excitements and false reformations of this day do not move us, for we know that the Master of the house rose up in 1844 and shut the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle; and now we certainly expect that they will go with their flocks to seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself (within the second veil) from them. The

Lord has shown me that the power that is with them is a mere human influence, and not the power of God."

Here she quotes Hosea 5:6-7, the same text so often used by all the others, to prove that there were no real conversions after 1844. It is idle, therefore, to say that she did not agree with the others, or to deny that she taught the shut door doctrine, the same as they. What reason does she give to explain why there were no real conversions after 1844? Note her words: Because "the Master of the house rose up in 1844 and shut the door." In a report of labor in the Advent Review, May 15, 1850, Elder White, in noticing the death of a Sister Hastings, says: "She embraced the Sabbath in 1846, and has ever believed that the work of warning the world closed in 1844." This shows that they held to the shut-door idea for years after 1844. In the Review and Herald, Aug. 19, 1851, Joseph Bates says: "We understand that he [Christ] was a Mediator for all the world, ministering in the Holy Place (Hebrews 9:26), in the Tabernacle called the Sanctuary, from the day of Pentecost (A.D. 31) until his appointed time, the end of the twenty-three hundred days, or years - the fall of 1844. At this point of time, then, the door was shut against the Sardis church [the Protestant church] and the wicked world." But to make still more certain that Mrs. White herself taught this repulsive, unscriptural and fanatical doctrine, we quote further from her; this time from her "vision" at Camden, N.Y., June 29, 1851:

"Then I saw that Jesus prayed for his enemies; but that should not cause us to pray for the wicked world, whom God has rejected. When he prayed for his enemies. There was hope for them, and they could be benefited and saved by his prayers, and also after he was a mediator in the outer apartment for the whole world; but now his spirit and sympathy were withdrawn from the world; and our sympathy must be with Jesus, and must be withdrawn from the ungodly. . . I saw that the wicked could not be benefited by our prayers now." The genuineness of this vision is acknowledged by Editor Uriah Smith and Elder J.N. Loughborough in their efforts to explain it away.

Mrs. White’s defenders try to limit this message to only one person there present. But her language is too plain for such a dodging of the issue.

Hear her once more on this subject. After Jesus left the Holy Place, she says: "I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after he arose, and they were left in perfect darkness. . . 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;’ then Satan would breathe upon them an unholy influence" ("Early Writings," pp. 55, 56; ed. 1907). Her teaching here is as clear as day - not one ray of light comes to sinners since 1844, but all are left to the devil! What is the use of Adventists denying that she taught this doctrine? She certainly did teach it. Their Denial of These Plain Facts

Now notice how Adventists squarely deny all this. Elder Butler, in "Replies to Canright," page 100, says that neither Mrs. White nor any of them ever taught that there was no salvation for sinners after 1844. Then he adds: "It is a slander to say the contrary. We also declare, with no fear of contradiction, that during this very period, when Elder C. and other opposers of the same ilk taught that she and others believed that there was no salvation for sinners, she and they were laboring for the conversion of sinners."

We here and now flatly deny every word of Elder Butler’s statement, and confidently refer all to the quotations already given from Holt, Arnold, Bates, White and Mrs. White herself, in refutation of what he asserts. The statement are plain. The reader can judge for himself who is telling the truth. Moreover, we deny that Mrs. White, or any of their ministers during these years named, ever made the slightest effort to convert even one sinner. To have done so would have contradicted all their arguments. Let them produce one line in evidence of one case where Mrs. White, or any of them, labored to convert a common sinner. No reference to such a case can be found in any of their published works of that date. On the contrary, the publications of that early time are full of unquestionable evidence that they did not labor to convert any one, for the very reason that they believed it futile.

Elder White, her husband, taught the same things she did at this period in their history. In Present Truth, page 69, dated April, 1850, he said: "Babylon, the nominal church is fallen. God’s people have come out of her. She is now the ’synagogue of Satan’ (Revelation 3:9). ’The habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird’ (Revelation 18:2)."

Yes, after 1844 all the Protestant churches were wholly left of God, turned over to Satan, who answered their prayers! They were all only the abode of devils and corruption! Yet these very churches, since that time, have produced a Spurgeon, a Livingstone, a Bishop Simpson, a Moody, and at least one-third of all the devout members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church itself! A large share of their own members were first converted in the "synagogue of Satan," and Adventists very gladly received them into their church as good Christians! Even the devil seems to be pushing the propaganda of conversion for them, through the churches that are "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird." How utterly inconsistent is the association of the young missionary students of the Seventh-day Adventist people with the student volunteers of the other Christian bodies, if they believe and remain loyal to the "visions" of Mrs. White and the teachings of her husband and other early Advent leaders. They are still privately calling upon the converts of the "devil-filled" churches to "come out" of them, and publicly professing to show a spirit of fellowship toward these churches, while in reality remaining hostile to them. These earnest Adventist young people are unaware of these early positions of their church, supported by the revelations of the woman whom they are taught to place by the side of the greatest prophets and apostles of past ages. They only need to investigate with open mind, to reject the whole scheme, and come to the simple basis of loyalty to Christ and his apostles, as the real leaders and teachers of the church. Did Christ and the Holy Spirit lead these founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church to lose for years all their burden and sympathy for sinners and cease to pray for them? Was Christ in sympathy with them when they taught that he no longer was a friend of sinners? Was he in sympathy with them when they taught that he was no longer an advocate for them, and that the whole world was rejected of God, left without the Holy Spirit, turned over to Satan, and that all churches save their own were only the synagogue of Satan, forts of the devil, in fact? Did a holy angel tell Mrs. White all that terribly false message? Such a theory seems like blasphemy. If God did not lead them then, has he led them since? Is he leading them now?

How the Shut Door Was Opened In Present Truth for April, 1850, page 72, is an account of an effort to save "the children of the remnant." This was six years after the "door was shut" in 1844. In

these six years some of their own children had grown to years of accountability, unsaved. Here was a new experience, an unlooked-for difficulty. How could they get these, their own children, in through that "shut door"? "Necessity is the mother of invention."

Here is the way they fixed it up for their children: "As they [little children] were then [1844] in a state of innocence, they were entitled to a record upon the breastplate of judgment as much as those who had sinned and received pardon; and are, therefore subjects of the present intercession of our great high priest" (Present Truth, p. 45).

This, of course, was pure assumption, without a particle of Scriptural proof; but it "did the business"! The children of "the remnant" - that is, their children - went in to Holy of Holies on the breastplate of Jesus in 1844! They were inside, and, therefore, could repent and be saved later!! This was the first slight modification of the "shut door" doctrine held by the Seventh-day Adventists.

Soon another unexpected event occurred which compelled them to open the door a little wider. In "Replies to Canright," page 102, Elder Butler gives an account of it. In 1850 a Mr. Churchill was accepted as a converted man. Butler says: "His was one of the very first cases of conversion from the world to the present truth, which occurred after 1844. As we have said, their work hitherto had been almost wholly for the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' - the old Advent believers. . . He [Churchill] had married after this [1844] a daughter of Sister Benson, a '44 Adventist. . . They were quite surprised at first that one who had been an unbeliever should manifest an interest in the Advent doctrine. . . His conversion was noised abroad quite extensively."

Study this carefully. Butler says that their work had been almost wholly for "old Advent believers." It had not been almost, but entirely, for old Adventists. They had not paid the slightest attention to any outside of old believers. Mr. Churchill's conversion "surprised" them, and it was "noised abroad extensively." His was the very first conversion from the world after 1844; that is, six years after. This is a confession that for six years after 1844 they had not converted a single sinner. Had Mrs. White and all the able ministers been laboring for years for sinners without making a single convert? She claims over and over that the power of the Holy Spirit was upon her all that time. Was this the proof of it?

Again, why were they surprised at this first conversion? Why was it so extensively commented on? The reason is plain. It was unexpected and contrary to their previous views.

Further, did they seek Churchill and labor for him? No! He came seeking admittance without being invited. As he was son-in-law to the church, as in the case of their own children the door was opened a little more, and he was let in! The, again, it was drawing near to the time (1851) when they were compelled to abandon the "shut door" theory. Evidently this Churchill conversion, and the case of their own children growing up, began to open their eyes to the folly of their "shut door" views, and caused them to hasten their modification and finally give them up entirely. The following extract is taken from the Review and Herald under date of June 11, 1861, and signed by nine of their prominent ministers:

"Our views of the work before us were then mostly vague and indefinite, some still retaining the idea adopted by the body of Advent believers in 1844, with Wm. Miller at their head, that our work for the world was finished, and that the message was confined to those of the original Advent faith.

So firmly was this believed that one of our number was nearly refused the message, the individual presenting it having doubts of the possibility of his salvation, because he was not in the ’44 move."

Until well along in 1851, their whole effort was in the interest of the old Advent believers only. All of their writings during that period are full of this teaching. In Present Truth, May, 1850, Elder White says: "This work of bringing out the jewels and purifying away error is fast increasing, and is destined to move on with increasing power until the saints are all searched out and receive the seal of the living God."

You see they conceived their work to be that of searching out "the jewels," "the saints," not sinners. Their first publication of 1847 was "To the Little Flock." Then all through everything they published from that time on until well into the year 1851, their articles are addressed to "believers," "the little flock," "the remnant," "the scattered flock," "the torn flock," "to the household of faith," "to scattered jewels," "to the saints," "to the honest in heart," etc. On page 72 of Present Truth, Mrs. White says: "The swift messengers must speed on their way to search out the scattered flock." Nowhere in all those years do we find one word about going to seek sinners or to labor for them. Hence their surprise when a sinner came to them of his own accord and sought admission. It was a wonder heralded widespread to all the church. The truth is that their early publications contain so much of their "shut door" teaching that is has been difficult to decide what to publish and what to omit. Much has necessarily been omitted to economize space.

Here is one more item of evidence that their work for years after 1844 was confined to seeking out only those who had been in the 1844 movement. It is taken from the Review and Herald, Sept. 7, 1916: "For nearly ten years the work was confined to the gathering in of those who had accepted the first angel’s message" (Miller’s work). Exactly. Their work in those first years after ’44 was not to seek sinners, but old Advent Christians, as this article confesses.

Seventh-day Adventists Hold Key to Door of Mercy

Fanaticism dies hard. After 1851 they began to open that "shut door" so that now all could get in conditionally. They must understand the sanctuary in heaven, the change Jesus made in 1844 from the Holy to the Most Holy, and follow him in there by faith. Praying to him anywhere else was only to be lost! So says Mrs. White in "Early Writings," edition 1907, page 261:

"They have no other knowledge of the move made in heaven, or the way into the Most Holy, and they can not be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there. . . They offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus has left."

Defending this view, Elder Uriah Smith, in "Objections to the Visions Answered," published in 1868, pages 24-26, says:

" A knowledge of Christ’s position and work is necessary to the enjoyment of the benefits of his mediation. . . A general idea of his work was then [previous to 1844] sufficient to enable men to approach unto God by him. . . But when he changed his position [in 1844] to the Most Holy Place. . . that knowledge of his work which had up to that point been sufficient, was no longer sufficient. . . Who can find salvation now? Those who go to the Saviour where he is and view him by faith in the Most Holy Place. . . This is the door now open for salvation. But no man can understand this change without definite knowledge of the subject of the sanctuary and the relation of type and

antitype. Now they may seek the Saviour as they have before sought him, with no other idea of his position and ministry than those which they entertained while he was in the first apartment; but will it avail them? They will not find him there. That door is shut." This theory is about as bad as the original "shut door." To find salvation now a sinner must understand the change Jesus made up in heaven in 1844. But who knows about this? Only Seventh-day Adventists. The whole world and all Christendom are totally ignorant of that change. Therefore, all these were hopelessly lost, for their prayers never reached where Jesus was!!

It is almost beyond human comprehension that sane people would teach such views; but here you have them over their own signatures. In Mrs. White's "Early Writings" they still give out to their people these statements as the inspired word of God! The author has conversed with individuals who positively affirm that they have heard Mrs. White repeatedly teach this shut door doctrine. There are even some still living who will under oath declare that they have heard her advocate it.

Signed Testimony

John Megquier, Sago, 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" ("The True Sabbath," by Miles Grant, p. 70).

Mrs. L.S. Burdick, San Francisco, Cal., was well acquainted with Mrs. White. She writes:

"I became acquainted with James White and Ellen Harmon (now Mrs. White) early in 1845. . . Ellen was having what was called visions: said that God had shown her in vision that Jesus Christ arose and on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, 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" ("The True Sabbath," p. 72).

These persons knew the facts, and have put their testimony on record.

It has been made apparent to every unprejudiced reader that both Mrs. White and her husband, James White, clearly taught that the Holy Spirit was withdrawn from the world and the "nominal" churches in 1844. All of them were left "without reprovings of conscience." Satan answered their prayers. Their prayers to God were useless. That was over seventy years ago - two generations. Since that date (1844) scores, hundreds, thousands, of the most devoted, consecrated men and women the world had ever known, have grown up, been converted, and devoted their lives and their all to the work of saving souls. Thousands of these have gone into the darkest regions of heathenism and have worn themselves out for Christ and his church. Many of these have been imprisoned, beaten or slain for the sake of Christ and his gospel. They have endured as great sufferings and accomplished as great a work as the apostles themselves did. Besides these who have given all, are thousands who have willingly contributed millions of wealth to help the missionaries forward the work of bringing the heathen from darkness to light.

One case like that of David Livingstone in Africa, or of Charles Spurgeon in England, or of D.L. Moody in America, gives lie to the above teachings of Mrs. White and her colaborers. The work of Adventists themselves in laboring for the salvation of sinners now contradicts her statement that the Spirit of God left the world in 1844. An editorial in their own paper, the Advent Review, Sept.

23, 1915, has this truthful statement: "As never before, perhaps, in the history of the world, did there exist such a spirit of reaching after God." This squarely contradicts Mrs. White's assertion that the Spirit of God was withdrawn from the world in 1844. The Results of Fanaticism In the study of this chapter we see some of the evils that result from fanaticism; how one error paves the way for another; and how loath men are to give up fanatical views. The error of time-setting in 1844 led to the misapplication of the parable of the ten virgins; the misapplication of the parable led to the theory of the "shut door," or no mercy for sinners after 1844; and this led to a misunderstanding of the sanctuary in heaven, the atonement, and Christ's mediatorial work, and the whole movement led to the unchristianizing of the whole Christian world. But time has compelled them to change their views, if not their bigotry and exclusiveness. From holding that God no longer had a merciful message of salvation for the world, Adventists have come to believe that they are the only people that have a message for the world today. From the belief that the door of mercy was closed to the world in 1844, they have passed to the belief that they are the only people who hold the key that will unlock this door. From holding erroneous views regarding the subject of the sanctuary, many of which with the lapse of time they have been forced to abandon, they have come to hold that they are the only people who understand the sanctuary question.

Because the Protestant churches did not accept the time-setting views of William Miller, Seventh-day Adventists have held and still hold that these churches are the "Babylon" of Revelation 14:8, which is fallen. Believing thus, it has been impossible for them to associate with the members of these churches as fellow Christians. From first to last their views have led them to shut some door in the face of everybody, even the most earnest Christian workers in the world.

Mrs. White's professed revelations from God place, for them, the stamp of divine approval upon all such attitudes upon their part, and her fanatical theories, all proclaimed as revelations from God, have made the fanaticism of these people most difficult to uproot.

(1) Sarah Harmon was five years older than her sister Ellen (Mrs. White). She married Stephen Belden, the father of F.E. Belden, the musician of Seventh-day Adventists. He has the letter now.

01.08. Chapter 8 - Damaging Writings Suppressed

Chapter 8 - Damaging Writings Suppressed

We have shown in the chapter on the "shut door" that Mrs. White, with all other early Seventh-day Adventists, strongly taught that, from Oct. 22, 1844, until the same time in 1851, there was no salvation for sinners. A few months before this seven years ended, Elder White and his wife became convinced that this theory had to be given up. Therefore, at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in August, 1851, Elder White, with his wife, published Experience and Views, a little pamphlet of sixty-four pages. No reference by either of them is made in this to "A Word to the Little Flock," published by James White in 1847, nor to Present Truth, published in 1849 and 1850, although all but seven introductory pages of Experience and Views is copied word for word from these two publications. Why this studied silence regarding these two publications? Because both of these old works were full of the "shut door" theory. Hence it was necessary to have these quietly dropped out of sight and forgotten as soon as possible. This is the explanation of their having been kept out of sight ever since. They will never be seen by the younger generation of Seventh-day Adventists with the consent of the leaders who now know that they once existed. A knowledge of them would absolutely destroy the faith of intelligent and honest believers in Mrs. White, in any of her claims, and this would mean the destruction of the very heart and soul of the denominational life. In 1882 the office at Battle Creek, Mich., published a small work entitled "Early Writings," by Mrs. White. In the preface the publishers say:

"A widespread interest has arisen in all her works, especially in these early views, and the call for the publication of a second edition has become imperative." "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." In the Advent Review of Dec. 26, 1882, is an article from the pen of Elder G.I. Butler, under the caption, "A Book Long Desired." In this article he calls the attention of his readers to the importance of purchasing the foregoing-mentioned book. From this article we make the following quotations:

"These were the very first of the published writings of Sister White. . . Many have greatly desired to have in their possession ALL she has written for publication. . . So strong was the interest to have these early writings reproduced that several years ago the General Conference recommended by vote that they be republished. The volume under consideration is the result of this interest. It meets a long felt want. . . There is another interesting feature connected with this matter. The enemies of this cause, who have spared no pains to break down the faith of our people in the testimonies of God’s Spirit and the interest felt in the writings of Sister White, have made all the capital possible from the fact that her early writings were not attainable. They have said many things about our ’suppressing’ these writings, as if we were ashamed of them. Some have striven to make it appear that there was something objectionable about them, that we feared would come to the light of day, and that we carefully kept them in the background. These lying insinuations have answered their purpose in deceiving some unwary souls. They now appear in their real

character, by the publication of several thousand copies of this ’suppressed’ book, which our enemies pretended we were very anxious to conceal. They have claimed to be very anxious to obtain these writings to show their supposed error. They now have the opportunity."

Immediately after Early Writings was published, Elder A.C. Long published a tract of sixteen pages entitled "Comparison of the Early Writings of Mrs. White with Later Publications." We here present a quotation from Mr. Long’s tract:

"From the above quotations we gather the following points: First, hese ’Early Writings’ of Mrs. White were published under her eye and with her full approval. Second, they contain ALL her early visions. Third, those who have claimed that certain portions of her early visions were ’suppressed’ are lairs, since they are now all republished."

We now present the evidence to show that the foregoing quotation, in which Elder Butler says that the work he speaks of contains ALL of Mrs. White’s "early writings" is absolutely untrue and deceptive. The earliest writings of Mrs. White were published by Elder White in 1847, in a small pamphlet of only twenty-four pages, entitled "A Word to the Little Flock." The work to which Elder Butler refers, as containing all of her early writings, published in 1882, claims to be an exact reprint of all her early visions. Now note carefully, that, commencing at the beginning of her first vision, as published in 1847, we read down thirty-three lines and discover that the late republished work agrees with the old on nearly word for word, only a few slight changes without altering the sense. But at the end of the thirty-third line we find that four lines have been omitted or "suppressed." These read as follows:

"It was just as impossible for them [those who gave up their faith in the 1844 movement] to get on the path again and go to the city, AS ALL THE WICKED WORLD WHICH GOD HAD REJECTED. They fell all along the path, one after another."

These lines are found on page 14 of the edition of 1847. They are not to be found in the later editions of the visions published in 1851 and in 1882. We have all three editions in our possession. Why were these few lines left out? Because at the 1847 date Mrs. White believed in the "shut door" theory, and claimed that by divine revelation God had shown her that "all the wicked world which God had rejected" was lost forever. In the autumn of 1851 and in 1882 she no longer believed that theory; hence these lines had to be omitted. Here God’s professed prophetic messenger dared to tamper with an alleged divine revelation.

Now, reading on seventy-two lines farther in this vision, we discover twenty-two more lines to have been omitted. Here are a few of them:

"In a moment we were winging our way upwards; and, entering in, here we saw good old father Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Noah, Daniel and many like them."

[Editor’s Note: To Mrs. White’s credit, the context of this vision is after the resurrection of the righteous. Therefore, the presence of Abraham and other saints does not support Mr. Canright’s contention that Ellen White believed in consciousness after death at this point in time. This is the only error our research has uncovered in this book.] At that early date Mrs. White still believed in the conscious state of the dead; so she sees all these patriarchs in heaven. Later she discarded that idea for the theory that the dead are unconscious in the sleep of death. It therefore becomes

plain why these lines were omitted. She had changed her views on the state of the dead, and therefore this "revelation" of God to her must go. A little further on two lines are omitted; still farther on eight lines are left out; and nine lines yet farther on in the vision. A vision which Mrs. White had at Camden, N.Y., June 29, 1851, is entirely missing from this volume which professes to include ALL of Mrs. White's early writings. Here is a quotations from this suppressed vision:

"Then I saw that Jesus prayed for his enemies; but that should not cause US or lead US to pray for THE WICKED WORLD, WHOM GOD HAD REJECTED. When he prayed for his enemies, there was hope for them, and they COULD BE BENEFITED AND SAVED BY HIS PRAYERS, and also after he was a mediator, in the outer apartment for the whole world; BUT NOW HIS SPIRIT AND SYMPATHY WERE WITHDRAWN FROM THE WORLD; AND OUR SYMPATHY MUST BE WITH JESUS, AND MUST BE WITHDRAWN FROM THE UNGODLY."

[Editor's Note: The White Estate claims Ellen White's itinerary shows she was not in Camden, N.Y. on June 29, 1851. They claim the authenticity of the Camden vision is doubtful. To Mr. Canright's credit, both J.N. Andrews and Uriah Smith attempted to defend the Camden vision as an authentic vision.] The reason why this vision was suppressed is plain. It taught the shut-door doctrine in the plainest terms.

Why, then, should Elder Butler accuse those who had called the attention of a deluded people to the fact that some of Mrs. White's writings and visions had been suppressed, of making "lying insinuations" against her and her colaborers? Here are the facts. They have never been, nor can they be, successfully refuted.

It is clearly manifest why all these "inspired" statements and visions were suppressed. They taught the shut-door doctrine, and said that the Adventist people were not to "pray for the wicked world which God had rejected"; that their sympathy "must be withdrawn from the ungodly." After 1844 they were to have no sympathy for the ungodly, nor must the pray for them! The most important work published by the Seventh-day Adventists during the years in which they believed and taught that probation had closed for sinners in 1844, was a paper called Present Truth. There were eleven numbers of this printed. They were issued from various places in the East, covering the period from July, 1849, to November, 1850. In the number for August, 1849, pages 21 to 24, is a long vision by Mrs. White. This vision is reproduced in "Early Writings," edition 1882, pages 34 to 37, except eight lines from page 22, relating to reformations since 1844, which are omitted. These lines are as follows:

"But from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been fully converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen, they would appear as black as ever." The reason why these lines were suppressed is plain. They teach in the strongest language possible that there were no real conversions after 1844. In 1882 they no longer believed this; so these lines had to be suppressed. On pages 31 and 32 of Present Truth is another long vision by Mrs. White. This vision is quoted on pages 37 to 39 of Early Writings. Here, again, thirty-five lines are suppressed. The omission is so lengthy we quote only a part of it simply to show why the omission was made. In this she says the messengers sent out of God "would be safe from the prevailing pestilence. But if any went that were not sent of God, they would be in danger of being cut down by the pestilence. . . What we have seen and heard of the pestilence is

but the beginning of what we shall see and hear. Soon the dead and dying will be all around us." The pestilence here referred to was local, brief, and soon checked. No such thing happened as she predicted. She simply expressed the fears common to frighten persons at the time. That is all. The vision absolutely failed, and therefore these lines had to be suppressed!

Continuing on to page 64 of Present Truth, we there find another vision which has been entirely omitted from her "Early Writings." The motive for the omission will be apparent to all. A portion of the vision runs as follows:

"The excitements and false reformations of this day do not move us, for we know that the Master of the house rose up in 1844, and shut the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle; and now we certainly expect that they will go with their flocks to seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself (within the second veil) from them. The Lord has shown me that the power that is with them is a mere human influence and not the power of God."

Mrs. White here quotes Hosea 5:6-7 to prove that there were no genuine conversions after 1844. This, all their ministers did at this time, as has been seen already. She "saw" just what all the others saw.

Again, in Present Truth, November, 1850, pages 86 and 87, there are nearly three columns in fine print, recording another of Mrs. White's visions. Almost two whole columns of this vision are omitted from "Early Writings." (See pp. 63-65.) All of the omitted passages here quoted or referred to are in the very first writings of Mrs. White.

Early Writings, published in 1882, claims to contain all the early writings of Mrs. White, with "NOT A WORD OMITTED." If this claim were true, all of the omitted passages here quoted and referred to would be included. But they are not. Why were they suppressed? The answer has already been given. What, then, shall we say of the publishers' statement? Is it not a deliberate misrepresentation of fact, made to hide some of Mrs. White's "inspired" erroneous teachings? In Early Writings, edition of 1882, we read: "Preface to the FIRST edition. James White, August, 1851." Was the first edition that of 1851? No, indeed! The FIRST edition of her early writings was issued in 1847.

Then, again, in this 1882 edition, we read: "This SECOND edition," etc. This statement is also untrue, because that was the THIRD edition of her early writings. This was done by Elder and Mrs. White, to keep out of sight the dangerous first edition of 1847. As this was all done with Mrs. White's approval, and as it was copyrighted by her, did she not know that these statements were not true? Surely she did. But Elder Butler was not aware of it. Up to 1882, the edition of 1851 was the only one of which he knew, and so, of course, he copied from that edition, word for word, just as he said. As soon, however, as the edition of 1882 was published, Elder A.C. Long issued his pamphlet, giving all the passages omitted from the edition of 1847. Butler read this. Mrs. White also knew of it. Honesty in either, or both of them, required that an apology be made, and that the omitted passages immediately be printed as addenda to be sent with the remaining copies, or at least be printed in the next edition. But what has occurred? Thirty-five years have gone by, eleven editions have been printed, thousands of copies are still being sold to the uninformed people, and yet no reference has been made to these known suppressed passages, nor has a line of any of them been inserted in later editions. Every copy sent out states what the publishers now know to

be false. All this justifies our charge that there is a streak of deception in the whole work of Seventh-day Adventists, from first to last. The Review and Herald, Aug. 17, 1916, says: "No religious body has ever come upon the stage of action but needed to carefully consider its rise and progress." The two very earliest publications of Seventh-day Adventists - namely, "A Word to the Little Flock," 1847, and Present Truth, 1849-1850 - are withheld by their leaders from their people. Why are they withheld? To suppress the false teachings of Mrs. White contained in them, which prove her writings uninspired. That is why. In the providence of God the author happens to know the inside facts regarding the publication of "Early Writings" in 1882. For years he had been closely connected with Elder White and his wife, Elders Butler, Smith and others. At that time Butler was president of the General Conference, president of the Publishing Association, etc. One day in 1880 he came into the office where Elder Smith and myself were. In high glee he said: "Those Western rebels say we have suppressed some of Sister White's earliest visions. I will stop their mouths, for I am going to republish all she ever wrote in those early visions." Elder White leaned forward, dropped his voice low, and said: "Butler, you better go a little slow." That was all. I did not understand what his warning meant, nor did Butler.

Soon Elder White died - in August, 1881. Butler then went ahead, and in 1882 issued the present edition of "Early Writings." In the preface he said not a word of her early writings had been omitted. The book, he said, contained all she had written. Then, as already stated, came Elder Long's exposure of that untrue statement, in which he gave numerous passages from "A Word to the Little Flock," which had been suppressed. This put Butler in a bad light. At that time Elder U. Smith and myself were on the most intimate terms. We both agreed in having little confidence in Mrs. White's inspiration. So it pleased Smith to have Butler pricked on that point, and have the visions put in doubt. Under date of March 22, 1883, Elder Smith, formerly a staunch defender of Mrs. White, wrote me thus:

"I was interested in your queries to Uncle George [Butler] on the omissions in 'Early Writings.' We have the Marion paper in exchange, and I noticed the article. Under the circumstances, I think it must have come down on him like an avalanche. . . I have no doubt the quotations are correct. I remember coming across the tract, 'A Word to the Little Flock,' when we were in Rochester, but I have not seen a copy since, and did not know but 'Experience and Views' [1851] contained the full text of the early visions. . . After the unjust treatment I have received [from Mrs. White] the past year, I feel no burden in that direction [that is, to defend the visions]."

Notice: Smith began work in the Review office at Rochester, N.Y., in 1855. There he saw a copy of "A Word to the Little Flock." In 1883 he had not seen one since; that is, in twenty-eight years. And this in face of the fact that he was in the Review office, their leading publishing-house, as editor-in-chief, all those years. The second edition of Mrs. White's "Early Writings" was published by Elder and Mrs. White in 1851. Smith supposed, as all others did, that this contained all she had written in 1847. But it did not.

If Elder Smith had not seen that book in twenty-eight years, what opportunity had Butler and others to see it? I was closely associated with that work for twenty-five years. I collected every book, pamphlet and tract they had ever published that could be found. I had the unbound works bound into volumes, and now have five of these, including the very earliest publications I could find. But I never saw a copy of "A Word to the Little Flock" or Present Truth, their very first publications, until

later - did not know that either existed. As shown in the chapter on "The Shut Door," Elder Bates led Elder White and his wife to believe that Jesus would end his work in the sanctuary above in seven years from Oct. 22, 1844. This period would end in 1851. Near the close of that period, it appears that Elder White and his wife saw that this theory must be abandoned. But what of their two early publications, both full of the doctrine? A study of the situation shows that they must have agreed to leave out of her writings all passages that strongly upheld that view, publish the rest of her writings under a new name, and drop their first two publications, "A Word to the Little Flock," and Present Truth, out of sight as soon as they could. A new paper was started with a new name, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald. In August, 1851, two months before the end of the seven years, Mrs. White herself revised what she had before written in "A Word to the Little Flock" in 1847, and in Present Truth in 1849-50, and left out the objectionable passages and visions already mentioned.

Here are her own words about the affair: "Here I will give the view that was first published in 1846. In this view I saw only a very few of the events of the future. More recent views have been more full. I shall, therefore, LEAVE OUT A PORTION and prevent repetition" (Experience and Views, August, 1851, p. 9). This reveals who did the "leaving out." It was Mrs. White herself. Then Elder White attended to the printing, as shown in the preface. Both of them, therefore, knew about and agreed to the suppressions. Any reference to the edition of 1847, or Present Truth, published in 1849 and 1850, is studiously avoided.

How effectually those first two publications were dropped out of sight is proven by the fact that Elder Smith had not seen the first one in twenty-eight years, and had no copy of the second as late as 1868. In that year (1868) Elder Smith wrote a book a 144 pages, in which he attempted to defend Mrs. White’s visions. It is entitled: "The Visions of Mrs. E.G. White." Referring to these old publications, he says: "Is there any law compelling us to keep on hand an edition of every vision that has ever been published? We certainly wish that we had them, and could put them on sale at this office" (p. 123). This shows that at that date they were not in the office, nor did the editor know where to get them. He says that they would gladly put them on sale if they had them. Well, for fifty years past they have had that opportunity, but have refused to publish and sell them. Elder Smith here also confesses that they had not republished all of Mrs. White’s visions, as the law did not compel them to do it!! Here Smith and Butler flatly contradict each other.

Again, on page 125, referring to the suppressed passages, he says: "As we have not proof to the contrary, we will take it for granted, as the objector claims, that these statements were published in Present Truth, August, 1849." Here, again, he confesses that the Review office had no copy of that important first volume of their first paper ever published. This is significant. How carefully editors keep on file every number of their papers. Why was that most valuable first volume allowed to become so completely lost? Yes, why?

Those old documents of 1847 to 1850 ought to be invaluable to Seventh-day Adventists, because they contain a history of the earliest days of the church, the first writings of Mrs. White and all their pioneers. How eagerly their people would buy and read them if they had the opportunity! But their eyes will never behold them if it depends upon their leaders to supply them.

Recently Elder Butler reported that at one meeting he sold about fifty full sets, of nine volumes each, of Mrs. White’s "Testimonies." They sell at about two dollars per volume, best binding -

eighteen dollars per set to each family. This shows how readily her writings are purchased by her followers. Why are they not given an opportunity to purchase and read her very first writings just as they were written and published? The reason has already been stated. The leaders know that to reproduce them would place in the hands of their people matter which would at once discredit Mrs. White's claims to inspiration. They would discover that not only had she taught error, but that she claimed divine inspiration for it. But so effectually have all these writings been suppressed, that only a few of their leading men even know of their existence. The body of their people are in absolute ignorance of them. On Aug. 12, 1915, the author wrote to Elder F.M. Wilcox, editor of the Review and Herald, their leading denominational paper, urging him to republish these old works, offering to loan him copies for the purpose. Here is his answer:

"Washington, D.C., Aug. 17, 1915.

"Mr. D.M. Canright, Grand Rapids, Mich.

"Dear Brother: I desire to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 12. Most of our brethren are away attending camp-meeting. It will be two or three weeks before they will be in. As soon as we can have a meeting of our board I will call up your letter and will write you further about the matter.

Yours sincerely, (signed) Francis M. Wilcox."

I have never heard from him since. Evidently the board decided that the wise course was to permit these old documents to rest in silence. I knew very well that they would dare do nothing else.

After waiting several months, I wrote to Elder Wilcox again, but have never received a reply. Evidently the officials decided to consign these early publications to "outer darkness," so far as Seventh-day Adventists are concerned. Their refusal to bring these early writings to the light is the best evidence that they fear them. The chapter on "The Shut Door," in this work, explains why. A Deliberate Deception

Elder J.N. Loughborough, in his book, "The Great Second Advent Movement," page 263, edition 1905, desired to give Elder Joseph Bates' testimony concerning Mrs. White's work, as given on page 21 of "A Word to the Little Flock," printed in 1847. The following illustrates the manner in which he uses the material from this early publication. He quotes:

"I believe the work [of Mrs. White] is of God, and is given to comfort and strengthen his scattered, torn and peeled people, since the closing up of our work. . . in October, 1844."

Note those three little dots? They mean that something was left out of the passage quoted. What was it? Just THREE SHORT WORDS. We will insert those words omitted from the lines quoted and indicate them [in uppercase letters]. Here they are:

"since the closing up of our work FOR THE WORLD in October, 1844." These three words reveal the fact that Bates and Elder White, who published the tract in 1847, believed that their work for the world closed up in October, 1844.

Elder Loughborough wished to use these lines and yet hide this fact regarding the belief of these early leaders. To accomplish it he omitted - suppressed - just three words, and placed three dots in their place in his quotation! He did not do this to save space in a large work of six hundred

pages. He did it to hide, conceal and suppress a doctrine which he well knew Bates and Elder and Mrs. White all believed and taught in 1847. It is a deliberate deception, too plain to be denied. It shows how willing he was to falsify in order to shield Mrs. White and the pioneers in this movement who adhered to her and proclaimed her a prophet.

Here is another case in which the same writer, Elder Loughborough, deliberately suppressed several lines from Mrs. White's first vision, published in 1847. Again, he did it to shield her, and to hide the fact that she then taught that probation for the world ended in 1844. We will give this quotation, found on page 204 in his work, and enclose [in uppercase letters] the lines he left out. Concerning those Adventists who became backsliders after 1844, Loughborough quotes Mrs. White as writing thus: They "fell off the path down into the dark and wicked world below. IT WAS JUST AS IMPOSSIBLE FOR THEM TO GET ON THE PATH AGAIN AND GO TO THE CITY AS ALL THE WICKED WORLD WHICH GOD HAD REJECTED. Soon we heard the voice of God like many waters," etc. Was it honest to suppress these lines? Most certainly not. Following in the footsteps of Elder Loughborough, Elder G.I. Butler, writing in the Review and Herald, Aug. 17, 1916, suppressed the same passage. He gave the same quotation, suppressed the same lines, and for the same purpose. Butler knew that he was deceiving, for only a few years previously he had this very matter laid before him. He well knew the entire passage as it appeared in Mrs. White's early vision. In view of all the exposures that had been made of these suppressions, how could he plead ignorance? How much reliance can be placed upon the statements of Mrs. White and these men when they undertake to defend the past history of Seventh-day Adventism? Absolutely none at all. We are personally well acquainted with both of these men just mentioned. In ordinary business matters we would consider them perfectly truthful and absolutely reliable. We would trust either of them with any amount of money simply on their word of honor. But they furnish a sad example of a not uncommon experience; namely, that sometimes men, reliable in everything else, will quibble, dodge and often squarely deny the plainest facts of their history in order to save a cause that has become dear to them. Mrs. White's numerous deceptions come under the same head. Do Baptists, Methodists, Disciples, or any other evangelical church, have to practice such methods to cover up past mistakes? Not one of them. All are proud of their past. But Seventh-day Adventists are ashamed of theirs, and well they may be. In attempting to defend Mrs. White's visions as divine revelations, and in permitting her and her writings to occupy so prominent a place in their work, they have simply invited difficulties from which it is impossible for them to extricate themselves without exposing her mistakes and the falsity of her claims. In order to cover up her mistakes, they stultify themselves and harden their own consciences. They become practical Jesuits.

Still At It In the General Conference vault in the office at their headquarters at Washington, D.C., are many thousands of pages of Mrs. White's unpublished writing. These are carefully guarded from their own people. It is claimed, however, that every line of these writings was inspired by the Holy Ghost to guide that people now. Yet they are withheld from them by the officials. Why do they do this? What right have they to withhold all these writings if they are God's inspired words?

Recently some of their workers in their printing-office were given access to this vault. They discovered these hidden writings, copied hundreds of pages of them. When the officials learned of this, they demanded that the copies that had been made be given up, with the threat that these brethren would lose their jobs if they refused. Three of them yielded; but two - Claude E. Holmes

and Frank Hayes - refused to do so. Holmes, an expert linotypist, was promptly dismissed from the office, and Hayes, an electrical engineer, is threatened with the same thing if he does not yield. This illustrates how the officials still manipulate and suppress Mrs. White’s "inspired" writings to suit their purpose. And still they make faith in the inspiration of these writings a test of fellowship in the church!

Lastly, what prophet of God ever suppressed his own inspired writings? This one test alone is sufficient to disprove Mrs. White’s claims to divine inspiration.

01.09. Chapter 9 - Philosophy of Her Visions

Chapter 9 - Philosophy of Her Visions

The proof is abundant that Mrs. White's visions were merely the result of her early misfortune, nervous disease, and a complication of hysteria, epilepsy, catalepsy and ecstasy. That she may have honestly believed in them herself does not alter the fact. The writer personally knew four other women, all Seventh-day Adventists, who likewise had visions. All were sincere Christians, and fully believed in their own visions. But all were sickly, nervous and hysterical. Not being encouraged in them, but opposed by their ministers, they finally gave them up. In every age such cases have been numerous. A few of them, like Mrs. Southcott, Mrs. Ann Lee and Mrs. White, have become noted for awhile. An editorial in the Advent Review, Aug. 19, 1915, says: "In our personal experience we recall at least a dozen during the past two or three decades who have claimed they had the prophetic gift. Two or three of these have drifted into the wildest fantasies. Others frankly acknowledged later in their experience that they had been mistaken, and settled down to a quiet experience. Others are, perhaps, still nursing their fancy." By this it will be seen that there have been among Seventh-day Adventists right along numerous persons who fancied they had the gift of prophecy. The editor correctly attributes all these to their fancy. These had no Elder White to encourage and back them up. So their visions finally ceased, as Mrs. White's in all probability would have done under similar circumstances.

Medical books and cyclopedias, under the words "hysteria," "epilepsy," "catalepsy" and "ecstasy," in describing these affections, give a complete description of Mrs. White's cases, as stated by herself, her husband and others. This may be seen from a brief study of these diseases.

1. The sex - a female. "The vast preponderance of hysteria in the female sex has give rise to its name" (Raynold's "System of Medicine," article "Hysteria"). So say all the authorities. This fits Mrs. White's case.

2. The age. "Hysteria is infinitely more common among females, beginning usually from fifteen to eighteen or twenty years of age" ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," by Roberts, p. 399). "In the female sex, hysteria usually commences at or about the same time of puberty; i.e., between twelve and eighteen years of age" (Raynold's "System of Medicine," article "Hysteria"). This again exactly fits the case of Mrs. White. She had her first vision at the age of seventeen. (see "Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 62.) "Notwithstanding this mode of life, their health does not materially deteriorate" (Johnson's Cyclopedia, article, "Hysteria"). So with Mrs. White. She gradually improved in health and her visions gradually ceased. At first she had visions almost daily, but they grew less frequent as she grew older and healthier, till after about forty-five years of age, from which time she did not average one in five years, and even these were short and light, till she ceased entirely to have them. Now read this: "Hysteria generally attacks women from the age of puberty to the decline of the peculiar functions of her sex" (Johnson's Cyclopedia, article, "Hysteria"). Mrs. White's case again, exactly.

3. The cause. Hysteria, epilepsy, catalepsy and ecstasy are all nervous diseases, which sometimes coexist or alternate or blend together so it is difficult to distinguish them. The causes noted are: "1. Mental disturbance, especially emotional; for example, a sudden fright, prolonged grief or anxiety. 2. Physical influences affecting the brain, as a blow or a fall on the head" ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," Roberts, p. 393). "In ten of my cases the disease was due to reflex causes, which consisted in six cases of injuries to the head" ("Fundamental Nervous Disease," Putzel, p. 66). This fits Mrs. White's case again, exactly. At the age of nine she received a terrible blow on the face, which broke her nose, and nearly killed her. She was unconscious for three weeks. (See her life in "Testimonies," Vol. I., pp. 9, 10.) This shock to her nervous system was doubtless the chief cause of all the visions she had afterwards.

4. Generally weakly and sickly. "Most hysterical persons are out of health" " ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," by Roberts, p. 404). "Fainting fits and palpitations of the heart appear very frequently, and are sometimes so severe that persons affected with them seem to be dying" (Encyclopedia Americana, article, "Hysteria"). Now read the life of Mrs. White, and she tells it over and over, times without number, about fainting frequently, pain at the heart, and about being so sick that she expected to die. And it is remarkable that most of her visions were immediately preceded by one of these fainting death spells. This shows plainly that they were the result of nervous weakness. She says: "My feelings were unusually sensitive" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 12). Now read this: "Women. . . whose nervous system is extremely sensitive are the most subject to hysterical affections" (Encyclopedia Americana, article, "Hysteria"). An exact fit.

Mrs. White's Physical Condition as Written By Herself When nine years old a girl hit her in the face with a stone which broke her nose, and nearly killed her "(Testimonies for the Church," Vol. I., p. 9). "I lay in a stupor for three weeks" (p. 10). "I was reduced almost to a skeleton" (p. 11). "My health seemed to be hopelessly impaired" (p. 12). "My nervous system was prostrated" (p. 13). Here was the origin of her hysteria of after years. In this condition she "listened to the starling announcement that Christ was coming in 1843" (p. 14). "These words kept ringing in my ears: 'The great day of the Lord is at hand'" (p. 15). "I frequently attended the meetings and believed that Jesus was soon to come" (p. 22). Of her impression of hell she says: "My imagination would be so wrought upon that the perspiration would start" (p. 24). "I feared that I would lose my reason" (p. 25). At one time she did become insane for two weeks, as she herself says ("Spiritual Gifts," Vol. II., p. 51). She continues: "My health was very poor" (Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 55). It was thought hat she could live but a few days. Then it was she had her first vision, in reality an epileptic fit (p. 58). "I was but seventeen years of age, small and frail" (p. 62). "My strength was taken away," and angels talked with her (p. 64). "My friends thought I could not live. . . Immediately taken off in vision" (p. 67). Notice that her visions occurred when she was very sick! This tells the story; they were the result of her physical weakness. If it was the power of the Holy Ghost, why didn't God send it when she was well? Why not?

"I often fainted like one dead." The next day she was well and "rode thirty-eight miles" (p. 80). This is characteristic of hysterical persons, as all know who have seen them. They are nearly dying one hour and all well the next. Mrs. White went through that experience a thousand times. She was just dying, was prayed for, was healed by God, and all well in a few minutes. In a few days she went right over it again. But if God healed her, why didn't she stay healed? This used to bother me. When Jesus healed a man, did he have to go back and be healed again every few days?

She goes on: "I fainted under the burden. Some feared I was dying. . . I was soon lost to earthly thing" - had a vision (p. 86). Again: "I fainted. Prayer was offered for me, and I was blessed and taken off in vision" (p. 88). There is the same old story. It is simply her hysterical imagination, nothing more. Next page: "I fainted. . . taken off in vision." So she goes on all through her book. Says the Encyclopedia Americana, article "Hysteria": "Fainting fits and palpitation of the heart appear very frequently, and are sometimes so severe that persons afflicted with them seem to be dying." Mrs. White exactly. On page after page the same story is repeated by herself. In the account of her last vision (Jan. 3, 1875), she was very sick till it ended in a vision ("Testimonies," Vol. III., p. 570). Dreadfully sick, almost dead, then a vision - this is the story, times without number, from her own pen. That tells the story. Her visions were the result of her physical weakness.

5. Visions in public. "As a rule, a fit of hysteria occurs when other persons are present, and never comes on during sleep" ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," by Roberts, p. 401). Most of Mrs. White's visions occurred in public, and generally while she was very sick, or when praying or speaking earnestly. This was the case with her first vision ("Spiritual Gifts," Vol. I., p. 30). So, again, on pages 37, 48, 51, 62, 83, and many more, she had her visions in the presence of many. I do not know that she ever had a vision while alone, or, if so, only once or twice.

6. Inclination to exaggerate and deceive. All medical books state that hysterical persons are given to exaggeration and deception. The inclination is irresistible. Nothing can break them of it. Gurnsey's "Obstetrics," article, "Hysteria," says: "Such persons entertain their hearers with marvelous tales of the greatness and exploits of their past lives. . . These accounts are uttered with an air of sincerity well calculated to deceive the honest listener, and such unbridled license of the imagination and total obliviousness in regard to the truth, which are vulgarly attributed to an entire want of principle and the most inordinate vanity, are in reality due to that morbid condition of the female organism which is designated by the comprehensive term 'hysteria.'"

Mrs. White was always telling what great things she had done. The deception which she so often practiced is here accounted for on principles which do not impeach the moral character, and we are glad to accept the explanation.

7. Does not breathe. "Stoppage of respiration usually complete." "Generally appears to hold his breath" (Roberts' "Theory and Practice of Medicine," p. 393, 394). Elder White, describing Mrs. White's condition in vision, says: "She does not breathe" ("Life Incidents," p. 272). They always refer to this fact with great confidence as proof of the supernatural in her visions; but it will be seen that it is common in these diseases.

8. Importance of self. "There is a prevailing belief in the importance of self, and the patient thinks that she differs from every other human being" (Raynold's "System of Medicine," article "Hysteria"). This was Mrs. White precisely. Hear her laud herself: "It is God, and not an erring mortal, who has spoken." "God has laid upon my husband and myself a special work." "God has appointed us to a more trying work than he has others" ("Testimonies," Vol. III., pp. 257, 258, 260). I could prove greater devotion than any one living engaged in the work" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 581). I knew her for nearly thirty years, but I never knew her to make confession of a single sin in all that time, not one. Seventh-day Adventists ridicule the Pope's claim to infallibility, but they themselves bow to the authority of a woman who made higher claims to infallibility than ever pope

or prophet did.

Space will not allow us to fill out every particular of her experience by quotations from medical works compared with her own statements; but those already given are sufficient to show the nature and philosophy of her attacks. They were the result of nervous disease, precisely the same as has often been seen in the case of thousands of other nervous, feeble and sickly women.

9. Testimony of Physicians. Dr. Fairfield was brought up a Seventh-day Adventist; was for years a physician in their Sanitarium at Battle Creek. He had the best opportunity to observe Mrs. White. He writes:

"Battle Creek, Mich., Dec. 28, 1887.

"Dear Sir: You are undoubtedly right in ascribing Mrs. E.G. White's so-called visions to disease. It has been my opportunity to observe her case a good deal, covering quite a period of years, which, with a full knowledge of her history from the beginning, gave me no chance to doubt her ('divine') attacks to be simply hysterical trances. Age itself has almost cured her.

W.J. Fairfield, M.D."

Dr. Wm. Russell, long a Seventh-day Adventist, and a chief physician in the Sanitarium, wrote July 12, 1869, that he had made up his mind some time in the past, "that Mrs. White's visions were the result of a diseased organization or condition of the brain or nervous system." "When giving, to a conference at Pilot Grove, Ia., 1865, an account of her visit at Dr. Jackson's health institute, she stated that the doctor, upon a medical examination, pronounced her a subject of hysteria" ("Mrs. White's Claims Examined," p. 76). This is the testimony of physicians who have personally examined Mrs. White. At the Sanitarium at Battle Creek, Mich., Mrs. White was often treated when ill. The physicians there became familiar with her case. Several of those most prominent there renounced their faith in her visions. This is significant. Dr. J.H. Kellogg, for many years the head of that institution, has a world-wide reputation as a physician and a scientist. He was brought up to reverence Mrs. White and her revelations. Through long years he had every opportunity to study her case. Against his best interests he was compelled to lose faith in her visions. He is no longer a believer in her visions. These physicians, so closely connected with her, learned that the visions were simply the result of her weak physical condition.

Mrs. White joined the Millerites in their great excitement of 1843-44. In their meetings she often fainted from excitement. In the enthusiasm and fanaticism of the time many had various "gifts," visions, trances, etc. She drank deeply of their spirit. The grief and disappointment of the passing of the set time were too much for her feeble condition. Says Dr. Roberts: "The exciting cause of the first hysterical fit is generally some powerful and sudden emotional disturbance." "Sometimes the attack is preceded by disappointment, fear, violent, exciting, or even religious emotions" ("Library of Universal Knowledge," article, "Catalepsy"). Just her case in the great excitement and disappointment of 1844. In his "Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists," page 94, Elder J.N. Loughborough gives a description of Mrs. White while having a "vision." Compare it carefully with the condition of patients affected by the diseases already described, many cases of which have been treated by eminent physicians. The two are almost identical, as will be seen.

Mrs. White's Condition While in Vision

"For about four or five seconds she seems to drop down like a person in a swoon, or one having lost his strength; she then seems to be instantly filled with superhuman strength, sometimes rising at once to her feet and walking about the room. There are frequent movements of the hands and arms, pointing to the right or left as her head turns. All these movements are made in a most graceful manner. In whatever position the hand or arm may be placed, it is impossible for any one to move it. Her eyes are always open, but she does not wink; her head is raised and she is looking upwards, not with a vacant stare, but with a pleasant expression, only differing from the normal in that she appears to be looking intently at some distant object. She does not breathe, yet her pulse beats regularly." In his "Medical Advisor," pages 647-650, Dr. H.V. Pierce gives the cause of, and hereditary tendencies to, epilepsy. He says: "Many of the cases treated by us have been brought on as the results of an injury to the head. The majority of these forms of disease can be exactly localized in a small area of the brain and may usually be traced to a blow or fall on the head." Of the fit itself, Dr. Pierce says: "It begins suddenly, with little or no warning, commonly with a cry or scream. In the severe form of the disease, the respiration is arrested."

Dr. John Huber, in an article on this subject in the Washington Post, June 18, 1916, says that epilepsy is called "the falling sickness" because the patient usually falls over when the paroxysm comes on. He says: "The epileptic fit is a kind of brain storm. . . The sufferer utters a loud scream at the beginning of the convulsion."

These descriptions, written with no reference to Mrs. White, fit her case exactly. Both of these authorities, it will be noticed, say that the epileptic fit generally begins with a loud cry or scream. This was also characteristic of Mrs. White's "visions." Introducing his description of her condition while in visions, Elder Loughborough, in his work already quoted, same page, says: "In passing into visions she gives three enraptured shouts of 'Glory!' the second, and especially the third, fainter, but more thrilling than the first."

Now read what experienced physicians have written in medical books on trances, ecstasy and catalepsy.

Dr. George B. Wood's "Practice of Medicine," page 721 of Vol. II., in treating of mental disorders, and explaining the cause and phenomena of trances, says:

"Ecstasy is an affection in which, with a loss of consciousness of existing circumstances, and insensibility to impression from without, there is an apparent exaltation of the intellectual or emotional functions, as if the individual were raised into a different nature, or different sphere of existence. The patient appears wrapped up in some engrossing thought or feeling, with an expression upon his countenance as of lofty contemplations or ineffable delight. . . Upon recovering from the spell, the patient generally remembers his thoughts and feelings more or less accurately, and sometimes tells of wonderful visions that he has seen, of visits to the regions of the blessed, of ravishing harmony and splendor, of inexpressible enjoyment of the senses or affections." A person perfectly familiar with Mrs. White could not have described her visions more accurately.

Another high medical authority (G. Durant, M.D., Ph.D., member of the American Medical Association, Fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine, etc., etc., recipient of several medals, etc.), on describing ecstasy and catalepsy, says:

"It often happens that the two diseases alternate or coexist. In ecstasy the limbs are motionless, but not rigid. The eyes are open, the pupils fixed, the livid lips parted in smiles, and the arms extended to embrace the beloved vision. The body is erect and raised to its utmost height, or else is extended at full length in recumbent posture. A peculiarly radiant smile illuminates the countenance, and the whole aspect and attitude is that of intense mental exaltation. Sometimes the patient is silent, the mind being apparently absorbed in meditation, or in the contemplation of some beatific vision. Sometimes there is mystical speaking or prophesying, or singing, or the lips maybe moved without any sound escaping. . . Usually there is complete insensibility to external impressions. Ecstasy is often associated with religious monomania. It was formerly quite common among the inmates of convents, and is now not unfrequently met with at camp meetings and other gatherings of a similar nature. Many truly devout people are ecstatics." This was Mrs. White's case very clearly. Hundreds of similar ones have occurred in every age and are constantly occurring now. The sad part of it is that so many honest souls are deluded into receiving all this as a divine revelation. When we remember that Mrs. White's followers, especially during the first ten or fifteen years, were all very common people, wholly unacquainted with such exercises, which appeared to them to be miraculous, it is not so strange that they should accept it as the power of God. She herself was young, uneducated and inexperienced. She could only explain her unusual experiences as miraculous, as the work of the Holy Ghost. So, after doubting awhile, she accepted the view of them. Probably Elder White, at first at least, believed in her visions for the same reason.

All the accounts of her visions which we have were written by her devout believers. We know that they would give only the most favorable aspect of them, omitting anything unfavorable. But, taking their own statements, her symptoms are exactly the same as those described by the physicians as above, where similar visions were merely the results of disease of the nervous system, generally brought on by a blow to the head, as in the case of Mrs. White. Her failures in so many ways, as noted in other chapters of this book, leave no reasonable doubt that the woman was simply deceived herself as to the real nature and cause of her visions.

Mrs. White's visions ceased about the time of the change of life common to women. While she still had visions, she claimed that much that she "saw" went entirely from her mind at the time. Months, even years later, when she met a brother or a church that needed a "testimony," the part relating to these all came vividly to her mind, she said. She would then write out this portion of the forgotten "vision." This worked very well till years after her visions ceased. Finally this could not be stretched further. Then her revelations had to come in a different way; by a voice, by dreams, by "impressions," by some one on "authority" speaking, and the like. The following expressions, taken from the last volume of her "Testimonies for the Church," Vol. IX., published in 1909, are examples of this. Page 13: "I was instructed." Page 82: "Instruction has been given me." Page 65: "In the night of March 2, 1907, many things were revealed to me." The room, she said, was very light. Page 66: "Then a voice spoke to me." Page 95: "The angel stood by my side." But she had no vision as formerly. Page 98: "Instruction has been given me." Page 101: "In the night season I was awakened from a deep sleep and given a view." Page 137: "In the night season matters have been presented to me." Page 195: "At one time I seemed to be in a council meeting." The expression, "I have been instructed," occurs over and over in these later alleged revelations, just as the expression, "I saw," does in her earlier writings. But all this is entirely different from her

vision period. Then the Holy Ghost fell on her, her strength was taken away, and she fell to the floor. Then she was carried to heaven, talked with Jesus, visited the planets, and the like. No such things occurred in her later days. Why this change? The physicians have answered that.

01.10. Chapter 10 - A Great Plagiarist

Chapter 10 - A Great Plagiarist

About 1904, Dr. J.H. Kellogg and his Sanitarium associates, it was learned, were not accepting as from God all of Mrs. White's writings. They found numerous contradictions in them, and believed that many of them were inspired by the officials, and were calling attention to some of these things.

Mrs. White thereupon wrote them a "testimony," asking that they write out their difficulties regarding her writings, and send them to her. In this communication, dated March 30, 1905, she not only promised to clear up these difficulties, but said that God would help her to do this. She said:

"Recently in the visions of the night I stood in a large company of people. . . I was directed by the Lord to request them, and any others who have perplexities and grievous things in their minds regarding the testimonies that I have borne, to specify what their objections and criticisms are. The Lord will help me to answer these objections, and make plain that which seems to be intricate. . . Let it all be written out, and submitted to those who desire to remove the perplexities. . . They should certainly do this, if they are loyal to the directions God has given."

Dr. Charles E. Stewart, one of the Battle Creek Sanitarium physicians, took her at her word, and wrote out a large number of "perplexities" which he and others had found in her writings, and sent them to her.

What did Mrs. White do? Instead of fulfilling her promise and attempting an explanation, she had another "vision," in which she was instructed by "a messenger from heaven" not to do so. Here are her words, written under date of June 3, 1906:

"I had a vision, in which I was speaking before a large company, where many questions were asked concerning my work and writings. I was directed by a messenger from heaven not to take the burden of picking up and answering all the sayings and doubts that are being put in many minds."

Notice: First, "in the visions of the night," she was "directed by the Lord" to request those men who had "perplexities and grievous things in their minds" concerning her writings, to "specify what their objections and criticisms are." "Let it all be written out," she said. Then she not only promised to answer these objections and criticisms, but said, "The Lord will help me to answer these objections, and make plain that which seems to be intricate." Then, after the brethren had done exactly what she told them to do, she had another "vision," in which she was "directed by a messenger from heaven" not to do the very thing she promised to do, and said the Lord would help her to do! In doing this she involved herself, and, through claiming divine revelation for what she had written in both communications, involved God, in a most glaring contradiction and cowardly backdown. As usual, she placed upon God the responsibility for her failure. He had not come to her rescue and helped her as she had said he would, so, through another "vision," she

makes him responsible for her breaking her promise. The simple solution of it all is, she could not clear up these difficulties, nor answer these objections. They were too much for her. Seeking to get these men to commit themselves openly in writing, she had made a promise which she could not fulfill. In the net she had spread for others her own foot was taken. (Psalms 9:15) One of the perplexities mentioned by Dr. Stewart in his communication was: The Charge of Plagiarism The rights of authorship are recognized and protected by copyright laws the world over. Any infringement of these rights, even where credit is given, is punishable by severe penalties, and frequently by confiscation of the works involved.

Plagiarism, or literary piracy, is the worst form of this offense. It is the appropriating of the writings of another as one's own, without quotes or credit. It is indulged in by uneducated, pedantic and unscrupulous persons, who desire to appear what they are not, or to make money from the products of other minds.

Mrs. White's works abound in offenses of this kind. Few Seventh-day Adventists know this. Many of the striking passages in her writings, which her followers have thought evidences of her inspiration and supernatural powers, have been fond, upon investigation, to have been copied verbatim, or with but slight verbal changes, from the writings of others. A careful examination has revealed eighteen close parallels between her writings and the Book of Jasher, a book twice mentioned in the Bible, but not a part of the Bible; yet she never once in all her writings refers to the Book of Jasher. The Standard Dictionary gives the following definition of plagiarism: "The act of plagiarizing or appropriating the ideas, writings or inventions or another without due acknowledgment; especially, the stealing of passages, either word for word or in substance, from the writings of another, and publishing them as one's own; literary or artistic theft."

One of the damaging facts against the claim of divine revelation in the writings of Mrs. White is that she copied extensively from other authors without giving credit. In the text of her books where she has done this she gives no hint of it in any way. She did not put the passages referred to in quotation marks, nor in any other way indicate that she had made use of the literary productions of others. The proof of this is abundant in several of her works. In 1883 she published a work, of 334 pages, entitled "Sketches from the Life of Paul." In the preface the publishers declared it to be written by "special help from the Spirit of God." In 1855, twenty-eight years prior to this, the "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul" had been published by Conybeare and Howson, two English authors. I have both books. A comparison of them reveals the fact that Mrs. White copied a large part of her book directly from this previously published work. Yet she nowhere makes the least reference to that work, nor does she give credit by the use of quotation marks or otherwise for the material which she thus so extensively copied. Very few Adventists are aware of this fact; hence they innocently read her book as material given to her by revelation of the Holy Spirit in harmony with the misleading statement made in the preface by the publishers.In 1907, Dr. Stewart published a pamphlet of eighty-nine pages, in which he arranged in parallel columns quotations from Mrs. White's book and the book by Conybeare and Howson just mentioned. These show beyond dispute that she copied her matter directly from the older book. The material for Dr. Stewart's book was gathered and prepared in response to the request of Mrs. White, in 1905, already referred to. But she never attempted to answer the difficulties he presented. Copies of his book have been in the hands of their leaders now for years; yet not a word of explanation has been attempted.Dr. Stewart says: "In order to make clear what I mean with reference to the

similarity in the two books, I will arrange some of the matter in parallel columns:

"Sketches from the Life of Paul" By Mrs. E.G. White, 1883

"Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul" By Conybeare and Howson, 1855, 3rd ed.

"The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in the rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps from the valley below" (p. 93)

"The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in the rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps immediately from the Agora" (p. 308).

"Had his oration been a direct attack upon their gods, and the great men of the city who where before him, he would have been in danger of meeting the fate of Socrates" (p. 97)

"Had he begun by attacking the national gods in the midst of their sanctuaries, and with the Areopagites on the seats near him, he would have been in almost as great danger as Socrates before him" (p. 310)

"An extensive and profitable business had grown up at Ephesus from the manufacture and sale of these shrines and images" (p. 142)

"From the expressions used by Luke, it is evident that an extensive and lucrative trade grew up at Ephesus from the manufacture and sale of these shrines" (p. 432)

"Only their reverence for the temple saved the apostle from being torn in pieces on the spot. With violent blows and shouts of vindictive triumph, they dragged him from the sacred enclosure" (p. 216)

"It was only their reverence for the Holy Place which preserved him from being torn to pieces on the spot. They hurried him out of the sacred enclosure and assailed him with violent blows" (p. 547)

"In the excitement the flung off their garments as they had done years before at the martyrdom of Stephen and threw dust into the air with frantic violence. This fresh outbreak threw the Roman captain into great perplexity. He had not understood Paul’s Hebrew address, and concluded from the general excitement that his prisoner must be guilty of some great crime. The loud demands of the people that Paul be delivered into their hands made the commander tremble. He ordered him to be immediately taken into the barracks and examined by scourging, that he might be forced to confess his guilt" (p. 220)

"In their rage and impatience they tossed off their outer garments (as on that other occasion when the garments were laid at the feet of Saul himself) and threw dust into the air with frantic violence. This commotion threw Lysias into new perplexity. He had not been able to understand the apostle’s Hebrew speech and when he saw its results he concluded that his prisoner must be guilty of some enormous crime. He ordered him therefore to be taken immediately from the stairs into the barracks and to be examined by a torture in order to elicit a confession of his guilt" (p. 557)

"Among the disciples who ministered to Paul at Rome was one Onesimus, a fugitive from the city of Colosse. He belonged to a Christian named Philemon, a member of the Colossian church. But

he had robbed his master and fled to Rome" (p. 284)

"But all of the disciples now ministering to Paul at Rome, none has for us a greater interest than the fugitive Asiatic slave Onesimus. He belonged to a Christian named Philemon, a member of the Colossian church. But he had robbed his master and at last found his way to Rome" (p. 610)

So plainly and fully was Mrs. White's book copied from the older book, that the publishers of Conybeare and Howson's work threatened prosecution if her work was not suppressed. Hence it was withdrawn from sale, and for many years has not been listed among her books. Did any prophet of old have to suppress one of his books because he had stolen so much of the matter in it from some other writer? The writers of the Bible frequently quote one from the other, but with due credit. (See Daniel 9:1-2; Matthew 24:15; Acts 2:25-28; Romans 9:1-33.)But, as Dr. Stewart observes, this is not an isolated case. Continuing, he made the following comparisons between her book, "Great Controversy," and Wylie's "History of the Waldenses" and D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," thus:

"Great Controversy" By Mrs. E.G. White

"The bull invited all Catholics to take up the cross against heretics. In order to stimulate them in this cruel work, it absolved them from all ecclesiastical pains and penalties; it released all who joined the crusade from any oaths they might have taken; it legalized their title to any property which they might have illegally acquired, and promised remission of all their sins to such as should kill any heretic. It annulled all contracts made in favor of the Vaudois, ordered their domestics to abandon them, forbade all persons to give them any aid whatever, and empowered all persons to take possession of their property" (p. 83)

"History of the Waldenses" By Rev. J.A. Wylie

"The bull invited all Catholics to take up the cross against heretics, and to stimulate them in this pious work, it absolved them from all ecclesiastical pains and penalties, general and particular; it released all who joined the crusade from any oaths they might have taken; it legitimatized their title to any property they might have illegally acquired, and promised remission of all their sins to such as should kill any heretic. It annulled all contracts made in favor of the Vaudois, ordered their domestics to abandon them, forbade all persons to give them any aid whatever, and empowered all persons to take possession of their property" (p. 28)

"Great Controversy" By Mrs. E.G. White

"In the gloom of his dungeon, John Huss had foreseen the triumph of true faith. Returning in his dreams to the humble parish where he had preached the gospel, he saw the pope and his bishops effacing the pictures of Christ which he had painted on the walls of his chapel. The sight caused him great distress; but the next day he was filled with joy as he beheld many artists busily engaged in replacing the figures in great numbers and brighter colors. When their work was completed, the painters exclaimed to the immense crowds surrounding them, 'Now let the popes and bishops come! They shall never efface them more!' Said the reformer as he related his dream, 'I am certain that the image of Christ will never be effaced. They have wished to destroy it, but it shall be painted in all hearts by much better preachers than myself'" (pp. 91, 92)

D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation"

"One night the holy martyr saw, in imagination, from the depths of his dungeon, the pictures of Christ that he had painted on the walls of his oratory, effaced by the popes and his bishops."The vision distressed him; but on the next day he saw many painters occupied in restoring these figures in greater numbers and in brighter colors. As soon as their task was ended, the painters, who were surrounded by an immense crowd, exclaimed, 'Now let the popes and bishops come! They shall never efface them more!' . . . 'I am no dreamer,' replied Huss, 'but I maintain this for certain: That the image of Christ will never be effaced. They have wished to destroy it, but it shall be painted afresh in all hearts by much better preachers than myself'" (p. 3)

Here are other examples of Mrs. White's plagiarisms:

Unpublished Testimony of Mrs. White, Aug 5, 1896:

"The laws governing the physical nature are as truly divine in their origin and character as the law of the ten commandments.""Testimony," Vol. II."It is just as much a sin to violate the law of our being as to break on of the ten commandments" (p. 70).

Cole's "Philosophy of Health," Published 1853, 26th ed.

"The laws which govern our constitutions are divine; and to their violation there is affixed a penalty, which must sooner or later be met. And it is as truly a sin to violate one of these laws as it is to violate one of the ten commandments" (p. 8).

Mrs. White's "Great Controversy" ed. 1888 "The cross of Christ will be the science and the song of the redeemed through all eternity" (p. 651).

Robert Pollok's "Course of Time" written in 1829 "Redemption is the science and the song of all eternity" (p. 55)

These quotations from her different books show that Mrs. White practiced this literary stealing right along all through her life. Ten times as much could readily be given. The Great Controversy is her most popular book with her people. Every line is accepted as original with her; all inspired by the Holy Spirit. Carefully studying it, we found that it was largely taken from Andrews' History of the Sabbath, Wylie's History of the Waldenses, D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Smith's Sanctuary, Elder White's Life of Wm. Miller, itself a copied book, and other works. The quotations already given are sufficient to show that Mrs. White's inspiration was from very human sources, although she sent her works forth as inspired by the Holy Spirit. The facts here cited are all in print, and can not successfully be denied. From these facts the reader can judge for himself as to how much reliance can be placed on her claim that all her writings were inspired and dictated by the Holy Spirit. In his communication to her Dr. Stewart said:

"I am informed by a trustworthy person who has had an opportunity to know, that you, in the preparation of your various works, consulted freely other authors; and that it was sometimes very difficult to arrange the matter for your books in such a way as to prevent the reader from detecting that many of the ideas had been taken from other authors."

Remember that Mrs. White never answered Dr. Stewart's communication, which she herself invited through her professed revelation from God on March 30, 1905. And since she did not in several years find it either possible or convenient to answer what she had not only promised to

answer, but what she said God would help her to answer, it is evident that it is impossible for these objections to be answered. Mrs. White can not answer them now, for she is dead; and after a lapse of more than eleven years [Editor: 93 years now] none of her followers has attempted to answer them.

One Advent sister who had been with Mrs. White for ten years told the author personally that she had seen her copying from a book in her lap. When visitors came in she would cover the book with her apron until they had gone, then proceed with her copying. Her works show that the sister told the truth. Such work is considered dishonorable in any one. It is defined as "literary theft." Webster says:

"Plagiarist: A thief in literature; one who purloins another’s writings and offers them to the public as his own." This is exactly what Mrs. White did, as already shown. But she did more than steal her material from other authors; she sent it forth to the world as a divine revelation given to her by the Holy Spirit from God himself.

Occasionally a college student is detected in the appropriation from some author of an essay which he submits to his teacher as his own production. When discovered, he is promptly expelled or suspended for misconduct. As may be seen from the preface or introduction to almost any standard or reputable work, honorable authors take pleasure in acknowledging the assistance they have received from the productions or labors of others. Mrs. White, it seems, suppressed this fact as far as possible in the preparation and publication of her works. The only plausible excuse that can be offered for this is that she had a diseased brain, and was a monomaniac on the subject of her visions, revelations and religious ideas, and thought her "gift" gave her a right to do that which would be reprehensible in others. This accounts for her numerous plagiarisms and contradictions, which never seemed to trouble her. Had we the space, we could give dates, places, and names of persons involved, when we, with others, told her all about certain circumstances having to do with some other persons; shortly, she would have a "testimony" for them respecting what we had told her; but, instead of telling the source of her information, she delivered it as a direct revelation from God. She knew that we were aware of the source of her information; but that did not seem to disconcert her at all.

All of those near to her well understood how to use her influence through testimonies, and many of them did it. Especially did her husband, Elder White, secure in this way "divine sanction" for all his plans. It helped him in a remarkable way, as it did also her two sons and other leaders later. Therefore, neither he nor they would allow Mrs. White’s "revelations" to be questioned in any way. To do so was the greatest of all heresies, and meant summary excommunication from the church, without hearing or trial.In 1909, at the last General Conference of her people that Mrs. White ever attended, a glaring illustration of her plagiarism was discovered. A certain minister was asked to read one morning before a large audience, a selection from a collection of her unpublished testimonies. As he read it he recognized it as his own production. Without quotes or credit of any kind, Mrs. White had taken it bodily from a communication which he had sent her some years before, and appropriated it as her own. This man, who from childhood had been taught to believe in her inspiration, was dumbfounded, and began to investigate her claims for himself. To his surprise, he soon found them groundless.

Miss Marian Davis, the literary worker who had the most to do of any one in the preparation of Mrs. White’s books, was one day heard moaning in her room. Going in, another worker inquired the cause of her trouble. Miss Davis replied:

"I wish I could die! I wish I could die!"

"Why, what is the matter?" asked the other.

"Oh" Miss Davis said, "this terrible plagiarism!"

It is said that before her death Miss Davis was greatly troubled over the connection she had had with Mrs. White’s plagiarism, for she knew how extensively it had been carried on. In 1911, only four years before Mrs. White’s death, three thousand dollars was spent on the revision of her book, "Great Controversy," chiefly to relieve it of some of its most glaring plagiarisms. The revision began to be demanded by some of her own people who had become aware of the facts.This charge against her, therefore, must stand. She was a copyist rather than an original or inspired writer. While professing to be the special mouthpiece for God, she was guilty of practicing this literary fraud practically all her life. This nullifies her claim to inspiration. God does not inspire his prophets to steal.While Mrs. White took so freely from the writings of others without giving credit, and thus took credit to herself which did not belong to her, she was very particular about receiving credit herself. Jan. 30, 1905, Dr. David Paulson, of Chicago, wrote her, asking permission to make extracts from her writings for his monthly magazine, The Life-boat. Feb. 15, 1905, her son, W.C. White, replied as follows:

"Mother instructs me to say to you that you may be free to select from her writings short articles for The Life-boat. Or you may make extracts from these MSS. and from similar writings, in your articles, in each case giving the proper credit."

Why did not Mrs. White do as she wished to be done by, and "in each case," where she made use of the writings of others, give "the proper credit"? From what has been presented, the answer is plain. She was so anxious to make books, so possessed with the idea of her own self-importance, and so desirous of appearing something she was not, that she ignored the rights of others, purloined from their writings, and became a pronounced literary kleptomaniac.

01.11. Chapter 11 - Used Her Gift to Get Money

Chapter 11 - Used Her Gift to Get Money

There is no example in the Bible where a prophet took advantage of his inspiration to enrich himself. The prophets of the Bible generally worked hard, had little and died poor. Mrs. White and her husband began poor. She says: "We entered upon our work penniless" (Testimonies, Vol. I., p. 75). But as soon as they became leaders, they commercialized their work, and managed to supply themselves well. They soon had abundance, and used means for themselves lavishly. They would always have the best of everything, and plenty of it. Everywhere they went they required to be waited upon in the most slavish manner. At an early campmeeting in Michigan they sent their son Edson out in camp crying: "Who has a chicken for mother? Mother wants a chicken." Mrs. White dressed richly, and generally had a number of attendants to wait on her. When Elder White died, it is said he left some $15,000 or $20,000. He took advantage of his position to benefit himself and family financially, and she aided him by her revelations. She received a larger salary than was paid most of the ministers of the denomination; received pay for all her articles furnished to the leading papers of the denomination (while others generally contributed theirs gratuitously); besides receiving a large and increasing income from the royalties on all her books. For several years before she dies, because of the "peculiar position" she occupied in the church, she was paid a higher royalty than was paid other authors in the denomination.

Take an example of how she used her revelations to make money: In 1868, Elder White had on hand several thousand dollars' worth of old books which were dead property, as they were not selling, and were going out of date. He hit on a plan to raise a "book fund" for the free distribution of books and tracts. This fund he used to buy out his and his wife's old books. When the money did not come fast enough, she had a revelation about it thus:

"Why do not our brethren send in their pledges on the book and tract fund more liberally? And why do not our ministers take hold of this work in earnest? . . . We shall not hold our peace upon this subject. Our people will come up to the work. The means will come. And we would say to those who are poor and want books, send in your orders. . . We will send you a package containing four volumes of 'Spiritual Gifts,' 'How to Live,' 'Appeal to Youth,' 'Appeal to Mothers,' 'Sabbath Readings,' and two large charts, with key of explanation, . . . and charge the fund four dollars"

(Testimonies, Vol. I., p. 689).

Every one of these books was their own. The money came, and they pocketed it all. I was there, and know.

Mrs. White had about twenty inspired books. To sell these, every possible effort has been made through every channel. She was constantly urging their sale by all her inspired authority. Hear her:

"The volume of 'Spirit of Prophecy' and also the 'Testimonies' should be introduced into every Sabbath-keeping family. . . Let them be worn out in being read by all the neighbors. . . Prevail

upon them to buy copies. . . Light so precious, coming from the throne of God, is hid under a bushel. God will make his people responsible for this neglect"

(Testimonies, Vol. IV., pp. 390, 391).

See how she lauds her own books! So, of course, her books were pushed and sold in large numbers, and as a result she received large financial returns. Her royalties from only one of their publishing houses (the one located in Washington, D.C.), in 1911, amounted to over $8,000, or more than the net profits of the house itself that year. From one book alone she received over $4,000 royalty, and from all of her books over $100,000. [Editor's Note: In 1998 dollars, that amounts to many millions of dollars.] In his book "Past, Present and Future," page 367, edition 1909, her son, Edson White, accuses Mrs. Eddy of "simony" because she took advantage of her system to make money. The charge lays equally against Mrs. White. If one practiced simony, so did the other.

Mrs. White herself, however, was not a good business manager. She advised the brethren to undertake several business projects which proved great financial failures. June 8, 1905, she wrote Elder W.J. Fitzgerald, president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, to "go right forward" in the purchase of a certain building in Philadelphia for a sanitarium; "raise every penny possible." He did so. The institution proved a failure, was finally closed, and the building sold at a loss of over $60,000 to the denomination.

About the same time she gave similar instruction regarding the purchase of another building for a sanitarium at Nashville, Tenn. This was likewise a failure, and entailed a loss of $30,000. A little later, through her advice, the denomination was plunged into over $400,000 debt at Loma Linda, Cal., although in 1901 she had told her followers to "shun the incurring of debt as you would shun disease," and that "we should shun debt as we would shun leprosy" ("Testimonies," Vol. VI., pp. 211, 217). Her conflicting instruction threw the leaders into great perplexity. Not long after her husband's death she became financially embarrassed, notwithstanding her large income. For many years she kept such a retinue of servants that her family expenses were heavy. When she died she is said to have been heavily in debt, although owning a large home and a ranch in California, worth probably $20,000 [Editor: That ranch would probably be worth half a million today], besides the plates and copyrights to her numerous books, worth many thousands more. To save her credit, the General Conference assumed her obligations.

Mrs. White gave very explicit instruction about the duty of publishing houses paying royalty to authors (see Testimonies, Vol. V., pp. 563-566). Contrary to her plain instructions, however, the denominational leaders are planning to discontinue, as far as possible, the paying of royalty altogether. The example she set in this matter seems to have turned them against it, and led them to disregard both her plain instructions and the rights of authors.

01.12. Chapter 12 - Her High Claims Disproved

Chapter 12 - Her High Claims Disproved

No prophet of God ever made stronger claims than did Mrs. White. In Spiritual Gifts, Vol. II., page 293, she says: "I am just as dependent upon the Spirit of the Lord in relating or writing a vision as in having a vision." Here she claims that the very words in which her visions are recorded are of divine inspiration. But I know that the words in her books and written "testimonies" are not inspired; for:

1. She often changed what she had written, and wrote it very differently. I have seen her scratch out a line, a sentence, and even a whole page, and write it over differently. If Go gave her the words, why did she scratch them out and alter them? Does God change his mind that way?

2. I have seen her sit with pen in hand and read her manuscript to her husband, while he suggested changes, which she made. She would scratch out her own words and put in his. Was he inspired too? She denied this. In "Testimonies," Vol. I., page 612, she says: "I have never regarded his judgment as infallible, nor his words inspired." And yet in preparing her writings she would take his words in preference to her own.

3. As she was ignorant of grammar, she employed accomplished writers to take her manuscript and correct it, improve its wording, polish it up, and put it in popular style, so her books would sell better. Thousands of words, phrases and sentences, not her own, were thus put in by these other persons, some of whom were not even Christians. Were their words inspired too?

4. One of her employees worked for over eight years preparing her largest book. After completing it, she said: "I got a little here, and a little there, and a little somewhere else, and wove it all together." The manager of one of their largest publishing houses, who was intimately acquainted with her work, said that he did not suppose that Mrs. White ever prepared a whole chapter for one of her popular subscription books. They were all the work of others.

5. In gathering matter for her books Mrs. White often copied her subject matter, without credit or sign of quotation, from other authors, none of whom claimed divine inspiration for their writings. See the chapter on her plagiarisms. Were these authors inspired?

6. Many of the things which she says "I saw," "I was shown," "I have been shown," are now known to be false. These expressions abound in her writings for the church. In the one small book, "Early Writings," they occur 409 times. But God does not show his prophets things which are not true. Therefore God did not show her what she claims he did.

7. The denominational leaders often treated her writings as they would any ordinary literary production, and not as the inspired word of God. Here is the testimony of one who knows:

"This is to certify that I was proof-reader in the Review and Herald office here for six years, beginning in 1898. Many times when testimonies from Mrs. White were received, passages were

cut out and left out as it suited those in authority in the office. (Signed) W.R. Vester." On Oct. 7, 1907, at Battle Creek, Mich., a church committee called on Dr. J.H. Kellogg to inquire into his religious views, especially his attitude toward the testimonies of Mrs. White. The interview lasted eight hours, from 8:30A.M. till 4:30P.M., was stenographically reported, and covered 164 typewritten pages. The doctor allowed that Mrs. White meant to be a Christian woman, but held that her testimonies were not reliable. He gave many instances where she contradicted well known facts - contradicted what she herself had written, and denied what she had said. He gave many instances where officials had simply used her to get testimonies to suit their projects. He gave instances where these officials had cut out of her testimonies parts they did not like, put other pieces together to change the meaning, and then, with her name signed, used them to further their schemes, and "down" men they wished to silence. On page 48 of this report the doctor says: "These men have frequently cut out large chunks of things that Sister White had written, that put things in a light that was not the most favorable to them, or did not suit their campaigns that way; they felt at liberty to cut them out so as to change the effect and the tenor of the whole thing, sending it out over Sister White's name. I know that, and I think you know it too." The committee could not contradict him. This shows how little respect the officials have for the testimonies. On page 51 the doctor says: "I do not believe in Mrs. White's infallibility, and never did. I told her eight years ago, to her face, that some of the things she had sent me as testimonies were not the truth, that they were not in harmony with facts; and she herself found it out." She finally confessed to him, he said, that she had been mistaken. On page 96 he says again: "I know that fraud is being perpetrated right along, and I have no sympathy with that at all. I know that people go to Sister White with some plan or scheme they want to carry through under her endorsement of it, and stand up and say, 'The Lord has spoken!'" In fact, that is the way a large share of her "testimonies" were given; that is, through the influence of some one over her, to write what he wanted written. On page 62, G.W. Amadon, for many years head printer in the Review office, and a member of the committee who examined Dr. Kellogg, said:: "You know, in the days of the Elder [Elder James White], how her writings were handled, just as well as I do." Dr. Kellogg replied: "Of course I do." That is, Elder White manipulated them to suit himself. Later, others did the same thing. On page 130 the doctor says Mrs. White said to him: "Dr. Kellogg, I sometimes doubt my own experience." That was in 1881. This shows that all along, at times, she was not sure that her visions were of God. On the same page the doctor says that Elder White came to him one day and said: "Dr. Kellogg, it is wonderful; my wife sometimes has the most remarkable experiences; the Lord comes near her and she has the most remarkable experiences; and then again the very devil comes in and takes possession of her."

These statements throw some remarkable sidelights on the life of Mrs. White, and give additional proof that she was not inspired.

8. She herself suppressed some of her own writings, for which, at the time of their first publication, she claimed divine inspiration. See the chapter on "Damaging Writings Suppressed."

9. Lastly, in the revision of some of her books she directly contradicts what she had previously written. Thus, in all editions of her book, "Great Controversy," page 383, from 1888 up to 1911, of the fall of Babylon referred to in Revelation 14:8, she said: "It can not refer to the Romish Church." She applied it altogether to the Protestant churches. But in the revised edition of 1911 this statement was changed to read: It can not refer to the Romish Church alone." Before this it could

not refer to the Roman Church at all; but now she says it does apply to that church, and to that church particularly, but not to it alone. It includes others. Here is a direct contradiction if ever there was one. What, then, becomes of her claim to divine inspiration for her writings, and to the still more presumptuous claim of her followers that her writings are "the only infallible interpreter" of the Bible? Does God change his mind and contradict himself in that way? The foregoing chapters have clearly shown the real source of her inspiration.

01.13. Chapter 13 - First Visions Childish

Chapter 13 - First Visions Childish

The ideas, and the way of expressing them, in her first visions are often crude, childish and extravagant, differing in this, materially, from her writings in later years. At the time of her first visions she was only seventeen, unread, and filled with the fanatical ideas of the Millerites of that date. These visions were in keeping with her surroundings and her childish mind at that time. In her first vision she says she saw "a tree with a trunk on either side of the river, both of pure, transparent gold" (Early Writings, edition 1907, p. 17). Again: "I saw two long rods on which hung silver wires, and on the wires most glorious grapes." Think of a fruit tree of gold, and of silver wires bearing grapes! A worthy idea for a childish mind.

Once again: "All the angels hold a golden card, which they must present at the gate of the holy city, to get in and out" (p. 39).

Every saint of all the untold millions saved has a crown of gold. She says: "Jesus with his own right hand placed them on our heads" (p. 16). For Jesus himself to do all this for all the myriads of the redeemed, would require hundreds of years. Then she sees "a table of pure silver; it was many miles in length, yet out eyes could extend over it" (p. 19). The saints all have silver houses; in each house is a shelf of gold. The saints take off their golden crowns, lay them on the shelf, and go out to work in the ground (p. 18).

She sees little children "use their little wings and fly to the top of the mountains" (p. 19). Again: "The saints used their wings and mounted to the top of the wall" (p. 53). Where is the Scripture for such teaching?

She claimed to have had a minute view of Satan; saw his frame, shape of his head, his eyes, etc. She says: "His frame was large, but the flesh hung loosely about his hands and face. As I beheld him, his chin was resting upon his left hand" (p. 152).

Notice her extreme, materialistic views of everything like a simple-minded, imaginative child, just what she really was at that time. In her later writings, when she became more intelligent and better read, these crude ideas largely disappear. Her ideas of the fall of Satan, the fall of man and the loss of Eden, look as if she got them from Milton’s "Paradise Lost," surely not from the Bible.

Look at her views regarding the destruction of the wicked. She says some were consumed "quickly." "Some were many days consuming, and just as long as there was a portion of them unconsumed, all the sense of suffering remained" (p. 294; old edition, p. 154). So if a thigh bone was the last to burn after the brain and all the nerves were gone, that bone could think and feel and understand, and suffer, without head or brain! This is worthy of Dante’s Inferno, or the old medieval idea of torture in literal fire. God would have to work a miracle in each individual case to torture men that way.

While Dr. Kellogg was in her high favor, Mrs. White used the most extravagant terms in his praise. Here is one instance: Dr. Kellogg "took up the most difficult cases, where, if the knife had slipped one hair’s-breadth, it would have cost a life. God stood by his side and an angel’s hand was upon his hand, guiding it through operations" (General Conference Bulletin, 1901, p. 203).

If an angel could do this for Dr. Kellogg, other angels could do the same for any devout surgeon, or even for a person who never studied surgery at all. This illustrates the ungoverned bridle upon her fertile imagination in all her writings. In 1901 she called Dr. Kellogg "God’s appointed physician." A little later (July 23, 1904) she denounced him as a tool of the devil, and said he had been "taught by the master of sophistries" ("Special Testimonies," Series B, p. 43). A Historical Blunder About the Two Herods In her early years, especially, Mrs. White was entirely ignorant of history. Hence she made many mistakes which are very apparent. Here is one about the two Herods: One Herod took part in the trial of Christ; years later another Herod put James to death. Mrs. White did not know this, but supposed it was the same Herod in both cases. So this is her inspired comment: "Herod’s heart grew still harder; and when he heard that Christ was risen, he was not much troubled. He took the life of James," etc. (Early Writings, second part, p. 54). A note by the publisher, at the bottom of this page, makes this confession: "It was Herod Antipas who took part in the trial of Christ, and Herod Agrippa who put James to death." And they try to fix matters up for her by saying: "It was the same Herodian spirit, only in another personality." Did not the Lord know the difference between the two Herods? Surely! Did he inspire Mrs. White to write this false statement? No. The simple fact is, she wrote this out of her own mind as she supposed it was. It affords clear proof that she was not inspired.

01.14. Chapter 14 - Editor Smith Rejected Her Testimonies

Chapter 14 - Editor Smith Rejected Her Testimonies

Uriah Smith was editor of the Review and Herald, their church paper, for over fifty years. All these years he was intimately associated with Mrs. White, and had every possible opportunity to judge of her claims to divine inspiration. Like most of us, he began with the fullest confidence in her claims. In 1868 he wrote a lengthy defense of her visions, in a pamphlet of 144 pages. As the years went by he began to question her inspiration. First, he denied that the "testimony of Jesus" of Revelation 12:17 meant to prophesy and be a prophet, as Mrs. White assumed. His position on this was well known. Later he argued that we must discriminate between a direct "vision" and simply letter, or testimonies, she wrote. From Healdsburg, Cal., March 28, 1882, Mrs. White wrote Elder Smith a scathing letter, condemning him, and requiring him to read what she had written him to the church at Battle Creek. This he refused to do. He said it was only a letter giving her personal opinion, and was not inspired. It cut him deeply.

June 20, 1882, she wrote a letter to the church saying she had written Smith, and that he had withheld the testimony. Both of these communications he was compelled to have printed in "Testimonies for the Church," No. 31, pages 41-80, the first under the heading, "Important Testimony," and the second under the caption, "The Testimonies Slighted." Then these were circulated through all the churches everywhere. This was humiliating to Smith; but he had to swallow it or rebel. For years it was a question which he would do. In the first letter Mrs. White said: "You despise and reject the testimonies" (p. 45). Here Mrs. White, in an inspired revelation, testifies that Smith had rejected the testimonies. So it must stand as a fact, which he never denied. In the second she said: "If you lessen the confidence of God’s people in the testimonies he has sent them, you are rebelling against God as certainly as were Korah, Dathan and Abiram. . . God was speaking through clay" (pp. 62, 63).

Believing, with others, that Smith was about to rebel, she said: "In the mighty sifting soon to take place. . . many a star that we have admired for its brilliancy, will then go out in darkness" (pp. 76, 77). But the prediction failed. The "mighty sifting soon to take place" did not occur, nor has it occurred during the thirty-five years since the prediction was made, and Smith, though doubting, remained in the church. In the second letter, Mrs. White said: "You might say that this communication was only a letter. Yes, it was a letter, but prompted by the Spirit of God" (p. 63). Smith yielded, but was not convinced. It only increased his doubts. He talked them freely to me.

One day on the steps of the Battle Creek Tabernacle I said to him: "You have written a defense of the visions; but it is not satisfactory to yourself." He simply laughed. I laid one finger across another and said: "You know they contradict themselves just like that." Again he laughed and said nothing.

Apr. 6, 1883, Elder Smith wrote me thus: "If the visions should drop out entirely, it would not affect my faith in our Biblical theories at all. . . I did not learn any of these things from the visions. . . The

idea has been studiously instilled into the minds of the people that to question the visions in the least is to become at once a hopeless apostate and rebel."

July 31, 1883, he wrote me again: "Sister White herself has shut my mouth. In the special testimony to the Battle Creek Church she has published me as having rejected, not only that testimony, but all the testimonies. Now, if I say I haven't rejected them, I thereby show that I have, for I contradict this one. But if I say I have, that will not do them any good."

Poor fellow, he was indeed in a dilemma. Under date of Aug. 7, 1883, he wrote me once again: "I now have to discriminate between 'testimony' and 'vision.' I think I know myself as well as Sister White knows me."

March 22, 1883, he again wrote me: "It seems to me that the testimonies have practically come into that shape that it is not any use to try to defend the enormous claims that are now put forth for them. At least, after the unjust treatment I have received the past year, I feel no burden in that direction."

Oct. 2, 1883, he wrote me that he allowed it to be understood that he had not rejected the testimonies, lest others by his example should be led to give up, not only the testimonies, but all the rest of the message as well. With this plausible excuse he silenced his conscience, allowed his influence to favor what he did not himself believe, and kept his office. From this it will be seen that he was compelled to live a double life, as many other high officials in that church all along have done and are now doing. Publicly, Smith accepted the testimonies; privately, he did not believe them. When I left the Adventists, I stated that Elder Smith, like myself, doubted the testimonies. The officials then pressed him to state in the Review his position regarding them. This put him in a tight place. After much pressure, he wrote a short article headed "Personal." Every line of this shows that he tried to say something without really saying anything. His brethren were not satisfied. I was told he said, "You will take that or nothing." Here are a few lines from his statement:

"Just how near I ever did come to giving them up, I am willing any one should know who wishes to know if it can be determined. Perhaps I have not come so near as some suppose; perhaps not so near as I have supposed myself. . . Under what has seemed, for the time, strong provocations to withdraw from the work, I have canvassed the question how far this could reasonably be done, or how much of this work could consistently be surrendered. . . A little reflection is sufficient to show that the message, and that which has accompanied it, can not be separated. Well, then, says one, the absurdity of this part [the visions] of the work is sufficient to overthrow the other. To which I reply, No, for the strength of the other parts is sufficient to hold a person from giving up this. And this has been the position I have occupied" ("Replies to Canright," p. 108).

Here Smith owns that Mrs. White's visions are absurd, and that, standing by themselves, he would have given them up. It was his faith in the other parts of the message which held him from repudiating them. And this is what he told me personally. In the testimonies themselves he saw no evidence of divine inspiration, but he did see enough against them to reject them as absurd. No man ever had a better chance to know this than he. For the last thirty years of his life he reluctantly outwardly accepted the testimonies, because he had to or be ousted from office. He was a fair illustration of the spiritual bondage in which many of their more intelligent ministers and officials

are held now. I myself wore that galling yoke for years, and know what it means. Once, Elder W.C. Gage, another prominent Adventist minister, said to me: "I hate and despise myself for pretending to believe what I do not believe;" that is, the testimonies. Yet, like Elder Smith, he swallowed his doubts, smothered his conscience, and stayed there till his death, as many more are doing now.

01.15. Chapter 15 - Her Prophecies Fail

Chapter 15 - Her Prophecies Fail

Mrs. White and her followers claim that she had the "spirit of prophecy" from December, 1844, to the end of her life, August, 1915 - seventy-one years. During these long years she wrote over twenty volumes. All this time she claimed that the future was being revealed to her, and predicted what would happen. Here her claims can be examined and tested.

God’s prophets foretold definite things to occur; named persons and cities, and told what would happen to each, and when. Joseph foretold the seven years of plenty and seven years of famine (Genesis 41:1-57); Samuel told Saul that the kingdom would be taken from him and given to another (1 Samuel 15:28); Isaiah named Cyrus two hundred years before he was before (Isaiah 44:28); Jeremiah foretold the fall of Babylon (Jeremiah 51:1-64); Daniel prophesied regarding the rise and fall of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (Daniel 2:1-49; Daniel 7:1-28); Jesus warned of the destruction of Jerusalem (Matthew 24:1-51); Agabus foretold what would happen to Paul at Jerusalem (Acts 21:10-11). Scores of such cases could be given. But where are the fulfilled predictions of Mrs. White during her seventy-one years of prophesying? What definite events did she foretell to occur at definite times and to definite cites? Where are these prophecies? Nowhere in all her numerous volumes. At first she did venture to foretell a few things definitely, but they all failed. After she invariably put everything in general terms, not venturing to name definitely any persons or cities or places or time. She predicted numerous floods, storms, earthquakes, wars, etc., all in general terms. Anyone could do that safely, without any prophetic gift. If she really had the spirit of prophecy, that should have been the outstanding feature of her books. Instead of this, her "Testimonies" and other books are devoted almost wholly to personal matters, expositions of the Bible, and to practical subjects regarding Christian conduct and duty, the same as any intelligent religious teacher could write.

Once in her early work she did venture to predict the curse of God upon a definite person, Moses Hull. In 1862 he was about to give up his faith in Adventism. Mrs. White wrote him thus: "If you proceed in the way you have started, misery and woe are before you. God’s hand will arrest you in a manner that will not suit you. His wrath will not slumber" ("Testimonies for the Church," Vol. I., pp. 430, 431). Mr. Hull lived on many long years to a ripe old age, and nothing of the kind predicted happened. After this she threatened many, but always in general terms.

Predictions About the Civil War The Civil War of 1861-65 placed Seventh-day Adventists in a trying position. They could not engage in war and keep the Sabbath. The draft threatened them. Now, what? I was one of them, twenty years old - the right age to go to war. So I remember it all distinctly.

Something had to be done. We hoped Mrs. White would have a revelation. And she did have - several of them, covering thirty pages of printed matter in Volume I. Of "Testimonies for the Church." At the time, we read these revelations with great anxiety, hoping for light ahead. We were

disappointed. They simply told just what everybody already knew, reflecting the sentiments of those opposed to the Government and the war.

It was a forced attempt to say something when she had nothing to tell. Read in the light of today, it is seen to be mere guess work, mostly wrong. She says, "It was necessary that something be said" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 356). It was all directed to us, a little handful of about ten thousand, half women, none of any influence in the Government or in the war. Bible prophets went directly to the king and told him how to conduct the war, and what the end would be. Our prophet had no such message. She says: "Jan. 4, 1862, I was shown some things in regard to our nation" (p. 253). It is all a bitter denunciation of Lincoln's administration and his management of the war. Every move had been wrong, and only defeat was prophesied. But the verdict of history is that Lincoln was one of the wisest and most successful men who ever led a nation through a crisis. The whole world honors him. With the most tremendous odds against him on the start, he conducted the war to a glorious victory, preserved the union, freed the slaves, and benefited even the South. During the dark hours of that awful struggle, how he needed the encouragement of a prophet of God, if there was one, as Mrs. White claimed to be. But her whole message was one of opposition, faultfinding, condemnation, and a prophecy of defeat and final failure - exactly that of the opponents of Lincoln and his management of the war. Listen to her:

"The rebellion was handled so carefully, so slowly, that many. . . joined the Southern Confederacy who would not, had prompt and thorough measures been carried out by our Government at an early period. . . How little has been gained! Thousands have been induced to enlist with the understanding that this war was to exterminate slavery; but now that they are fixed, they find that they have been deceived; that the object of this war is not to abolish slavery, but to preserve it as it is." "The war is not to do away with slavery, but merely to preserve the Union" (pp. 254, 258). This was only a few months after the war began. Like her, some unwise hot-heads urged Lincoln to immediately declare slavery abolished. General Fremont had to be removed from his command because he began that very thing in the West. It was premature. The general sentiment of the nation was not ready for it. Lincoln only waited and watched for the proper time. Then it was a success. Now all see the wisdom of his course.

Mrs. White goes on: "They [the soldiers] inquire, 'If we succeed in quelling the rebellion, what has been gained?' They can only answer discouragingly, 'Nothing'" (p. 255). Fine language to encourage Mr. Lincoln, the soldiers and the North in the dark hour of their need!

She continues: "The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion" (same page). A plain, false prophecy. No such thing happened, as all now know.

Again: "The prospects before our nation are discouraging" (same page). Yes, as far as humans could see. But she claimed to have divine revelations of the future. Had her claim been true, she would have seen the victory at the end, disproving her words.

Hear her again in the same gloomy tone: "As this war was shown to me, it looked like the most singular and uncertain that has ever occurred. . . It seems impossible to have the war conducted successfully" (p. 256). Yes, to her it was uncertain, impossible to succeed. But was that all God knew about? All he could tell her? Remember, she is writing by God's inspiration; writing the words

he tells her! Everything she writes, whether in a private letter or newspaper article, she says, is inspired. Thus: "God was speaking through clay. . . In these letters which I write, in the testimonies I bear, I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. I do not write one article in the paper, expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision - the precious rays of light shining from the throne" ("Testimonies," Vol. V., p. 67). There you have it, Simon-pure - every word she writes is a ray of light from the throne of God! So, to God it was an uncertain war, impossible to succeed! So the Lord must have been greatly surprised when it did really succeed!

Mr. Lincoln, in his need, asked the prayers of all Christians, and appointed days of fasting and prayer. Of these Mrs. White said: "I saw that these national fasts were an insult to Jehovah. . . A national fast is proclaimed! Oh, what an insult to Jehovah!" ("Testimonies," Vol. I., p. 257). That was the way she sympathized with Mr. Lincoln and the nation in the hour of need. A day before the awful battle of Gettysburg, on which the destiny of the nation would turn, Mr. Lincoln spent the night in agonizing prayer to almighty God. So his biographer testifies. But neither Mrs. White nor any of her followers offered a single prayer for him or the nation. I was with her - and with them - and know. During the entire twenty-eight years I was an Adventist I never offered one prayer for the President, for Congress, for a Governor, or any one in authority. I never heard Mrs. White, Elder White, or any one of them, do it. I have often attended their large meetings since then, but never heard a prayer offered for any Government official. Yet one of the plainest commands of the gospel is that we should pray for kings, rulers and all in authority (1 Timothy 2:1-2). Since Mrs. White died, Adventists have begun to pray for Government officials.

Again Mrs. White said: "This nation will yet be humbled into the dust. . . When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war" (p. 259). For awhile this is what seemed probable, and what was feared; but it never came. Here, again, her prophecy was a complete failure. Our nation was not humbled into the dust. England did not declare war. All along it is clear that Mrs. White simply saw things just as circumstances at the time seemed to indicate, and wrote as those around her talked. If it had been true, as she claimed, that she was not writing any of this out of her own mind, but was simply recording what God told her, would he have told her that way? Did not the Lord know that England would not declare war? Surely. If her predictions were not reliable then, they are not now. If she was not God’s prophet then, she never was at any time.

Here is another blunder: "Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided, it must fall" (p. 260). No such thing happened. It was not divided, nor did it fall. Did not the Lord know better than that? Yes. But she did not.

Mrs. White interpreted the Civil War as a sign of the end of the world, just as Adventists have been interpreting the European war. She says: "The scenes of earth’s history are fast closing" (p. 260). Under the heading, "The Rebellion," she says: "The one all-important inquiry which should now engross the mind of every one is, Am I prepared for the day of God? Time will last a little longer" (p. 363).

Since then a generation has gone. Mrs. White, Elder White, and nearly all who then preached and heard that warning, are laid away. They needed no such warning, for they did not live to see that day, as she then predicted. Failure, failure, failure is marked by ineradicable letters against all her

predictions.

Notice now how she forbade her followers taking any part in sustaining the Government in the struggle to save the Union and free the slaves. "I was shown [that is, the Lord showed her] that God's people, who are his peculiar treasure, can not engage in this perplexing war, for it is opposed to every principle of their faith" (p. 361). Hence not a single Seventh-day Adventist took any part in the effort to save the Union and free the slaves - not so much as to go as nurses. Had all the people done that way, the nation would have been divided, and slavery would be with us now.

During those dark days of the Civil War, Mrs. White privately warned our married people not to have any more children. Time was so short, and the seven last plagues were so soon to fall, that children born then would be liable to perish. But children born since then are now grandparents! The horrors of the great Civil War, she, in her vivid imagination, interpreted as proof that the end of the world was right at hand, as already stated. In the same manner she interpreted the great war and revolution in Europe in 1848. It will be remembered that in that year there was quite a general war in Europe, in which several nations were engaged. In January, 1849, Elder Bates published a pamphlet entitled "Seal of the Living God." He interpreted that was as the beginning of Daniel's time of trouble (Daniel 12:1), and as fulfilling Revelation 11:18 : "The nations were angry, and they wrath is come." On page 48 of his pamphlet he says: "The time of trouble, such as never was (Daniel 12:1), has begun." In proof of this he names several of the powers at war, thus: "Prussia, Hanover, Sardinia, Sicily, Naples, Venice, Lombardy, Tuscany, Rome, Austria," etc. On page 15 he says: "And now the trouble has begun, what is our duty?" On pages 24 and 26 he relates how, while he and others were discussing this question, Mrs. White had a vision in which she saw the same thing! She said: "The time of trouble has commenced, it is begun. The trouble will never end until the earth is rid of the wicked."

Elder Bates then says: "The above was copied word for word as she spoke in vision, therefore it is unadulterated."

Notice here, again, how she is influenced by Bates to see in vision just what he was arguing in her presence. Both were wrong.

Aug. 3, 1861, Mrs. White had a vision in which she was shown the Civil War, then just fairly begun. She says:

"I was shown the inhabitants of earth in the utmost confusion. War, bloodshed, privation, want, famine and pestilence were abroad in the land" (Testimonies, Vol. I., p. 268) This was exactly what all faultfinders at that date predicted - famine and pestilence. But nothing of this kind happened. There was no famine, no pestilence. Her predictions utterly failed. Where, then, did she get that "vision"? not from God, surely, but from the ideas of those around her, the same as she got all her "visions." The event proved this.

01.16. Chapter 16 - Claimed to Reveal Secret Sins

Chapter 16 - Claimed to Reveal Secret Sins

As usual with characters of this kind, extravagant and even superstitious views concerning Mrs. White have quite generally been held by the denomination recognizing her as its prophet and spiritual head. This was encouraged both by her own claims and by the teachings of her devout followers. She claimed to be God’s special messenger; to have been given the work of revealing and reproving "secret sins"; and to have been taken in vision from house to house and heard conversations which she was bade not to relate. Many of her followers looked upon her as endowed with supernatural powers, and went to her for counsel and advice as one would go to God himself.

Elder A.G. Daniells, president of their General Conference since 1901, in a statement made Feb. 12, 1914, said: "In my earlier ministry, when I was a young man, I thought Mrs. White knew everything about me; that she could read my thoughts." He had since learned better, and characterized his former views as "superstitious."

About the same time, Elder F.M. Wilcox, editor of the Review and Herald, their leading denominational paper, told how he felt when, while yet a boy, he first saw Mrs. White and heard her speak. He said: "I thought she could look right through me; that she knew everything I had ever done." He likewise characterized this as "superstitious."

Mr. Charles T. Shaffer, for a number of years elder of the first Seventh-day Adventists Church at Washington, D.C., in a statement dated Nov. 10, 1915, said: "I always considered Mrs. White as the prophet of the Lord, and that all things were as open before her eyes and that she saw them as clearly as I can see a house through a glass window." He later learned that this was no so. She got her information from others.

One of Mrs. White’s claims was that God had empowered her to know the thoughts and secrets of people without their knowledge, and then to reprove or expose them to save the church from hidden corruption. Hear her: "God has been pleased to open to me the secrets of the inner life and the hidden sins of his people. The unpleasant duty has been laid upon me to reprove wrongs and reveal hidden sins" ("Testimonies," Vol. III., p. 314).

Then she tells how she saw them is their homes, listened to their conversations, was in their councils, and heard all they privately discussed, just the same as God himself sees and hears and knows all this. Nothing could be hidden from her ("Testimonies," Vol. V., p. 68). Thus Elder Uriah Smith, in "Objections to the Visions Answered," edition 1868, page 6, says: "They have exposed hidden iniquity, brought to light concealed wrongs, and laid bare the evil motives of the false-hearted."

There is an abundance of evidence to disprove this claim. Numerous plain facts in her life refute it. Later, Elder Smith himself doubted this claim of Mrs. White’s. Under date of March 22, 1883, he

wrote me about his unbelief in her testimonies. I quote a few lines: "The cases of C------ and S----- are stunners to me." No wonder these cases were stunners to Smith, as they were to all of us. I knew both of these ministers well. But their sins were not revealed to Mrs. White, although she was closely associated with both of them.

Look at another case - that of Elder Nathan Fuller. Elder Fuller was a man of commanding appearance, large abilities, and was highly esteemed by the Advent people. There was a large church at Niles Hills, Pa. He lived near there, and for years had the oversight of this church. About 1869 or 1870 Elder White and his wife visited this church and stayed at the home of Mr. Fuller. Elder White publicly praised Fuller as a godly man of much ability. Only a few days later, by the confession of a conscience-stricken sister in that church, it came out that for years Fuller had been practicing adultery with five or six of the women in the church. All of them confessed, and Fuller had to own it himself. The community came near mobbing him. The whole denomination felt the shock and shame of it. But it hit Mrs. White the worst of all. She had been right there for days in Fuller's home, in meetings with him, had met all these women, yet knew nothing of all this rottenness. A little later I went there and held meetings for two weeks, met all these people, and learned the whole shameful story. This case exposed the falsity of Mrs. White's claim that God revealed to her the "hidden sins" of his people. What could she say? As usual, after it was all common knowledge, she had a testimony telling all about it. it is printed in "Testimonies for the Church," Vol. II., pp. 449-454. She says: "The case of N. Fuller has caused me much grief and anguish of spirit." Yes, well it might, as it so forcibly exposed her own failure. To excuse herself, she says: "I believe that God designed that this case of hypocrisy and villainy should be brought to light in the manner it has been." That is, God hid it from her and let the women expose it! If ever there was a case where her alleged "gift" of revealing "hidden sins" was needed, it was here - a widespread, awful, hidden iniquity, extending over years, and involving a whole church. She had often met Fuller in general meetings, had been in his home, and had also met all these women. Yet she knew nothing about it at all. No wonder Smith was stunned. The second case Smith mentioned was that of a minister far more prominent than Fuller. I was holding meetings in a church where this minister had shortly before also held meetings. The elder of the church and his wife told me how he had tried to seduce her, the wife, and had tried the same with a young sister, their adopted daughter.. Inquiry revealed the fact that for a long time he had been at the same thing right along in other places. I submitted these facts to the Conference, and he was deposed from the ministry. Mrs. White had been with him in meetings for weeks, and had been in the same church; yet she knew nothing about any of this. She was in total ignorance of it until after it all came out.

Later another case, a very bad one, came to light. A minister who had been one of their most trusted and valuable men, came to Battle Creek one week before the General Conference was to meet there. He was to preach in the Tabernacle on Sabbath afternoon. His wife had long suspected his infidelity. So, searching through his trunk one day, she found hidden a bunch of letters from a woman which revealed their illicit intercourse. She informed the officials, and he was not allowed in the pulpit. At the conference I heard him confess his shame before several hundred in the Tabernacle. Then, as usual, after it was out, Mrs. White had a testimony about it, entitled "The Sin of Licentiousness." I have that testimony now.

These cases show that her claim that God had commissioned her to reveal the "hidden sins" in the church are groundless. In all I believe she wrote me fine personal testimonies during my ministry. I carefully scanned each one to see if there was any reference to anything in my life which none but God knew. There was never a word of such a thing in one of them,. Any one well acquainted with me as she was could have told all she told. Besides, she made several mistakes, supposing things to have happened which had not.

Things like the foregoing narrated events, covering many cases, finally destroyed my confidence in her claims to divine revelations.

Several years before Mrs. White’s death so many cases of immorality were discovered in one of their leading publishing houses that the institution was coming into disrepute in the community where it was located. Upon investigation, nearly a score of employees, among them some of the most faithful church-goers and tithe-payers, had to be dismissed for misconduct. Yet Mrs. White, their prophet, knew nothing about all this deplorable condition of things.

These cases, and many more which might be cited, are sufficient to show that her claim that God had commissioned her to reveal the "hidden sins" in the church was groundless. She had no such gift. As a revealer of secret sins she was a complete failure. In this, as in many other things, she mistook her calling, and assumed responsibility which did not belong to her.

Like the prophets of the Delphic Oracle in ancient Greece, she quietly and industriously gathered information from many sources about many things concerning which she was supposed to know little or nothing. Upon this she based many of her testimonies, which were represented as direct revelations from God. But, as with the Delphic prophets, in proportion as the true source of her information came to light, her "gift" fell into disrepute.

01.17. Chapter 17 - Influenced to Write Testimonies

Chapter 17 - Influenced to Write Testimonies

That Mrs. White was influenced to write her testimonies to individuals by what others told her is easily proved. She denied this, and sought to make her followers believe that she received her information direct from heaven - that "the angel of God" had spoken to her and revealed their cases to her. (See "Testimonies," Vol. III., pp. 314, 315; Vol. V., pp. 65, 683). But the facts to the contrary are too plain. Note the following illustrative examples:

Rebuked the Wrong Man

About the year 1882, two Adventists ministers, E.P. Daniels and E.R. Jones, were laboring together in Michigan. In giving a health talk one of them had made some remarks quite offensive to esthetic tastes. Not long afterward Elder Daniels received a testimony from Mrs. White, rebuking him for the offense, which she said took place at Parma, Mich. But, as the event turned out, she rebuked the wrong man, and the incident did not occur at Parma, but at another place.

Instead of Mrs. White acknowledging her mistake, Elder Daniels, the man wrongly accused, was induced to make the following statement:

"Through a misunderstanding, I happened to be the person rebuked, in the place of the one for whom the rebuke was intended, and who justly merited it. Were all the facts known, it would leave no room for even the slightest disrespect for the motives that influenced her, as she has, as she supposed, the best of reasons for believing that her informant had told her the truth. And, indeed, he had, but he made a mistake in the name of the person. All that he had said was true of another, though the incident did not occur at Parma" (Review and Herald Supplement, Aug. 14, 1883, p. 10). At best this is "a lame apology for an inspired blunder." It demonstrates beyond question that in this instance at least Mrs. White was influenced to write the testimony in question by some one reporting to her; that her "informant" was not "an angel from heaven" speaking to her, as she had claimed, but an erring mortal; and that, between them, this "informant" and Mrs. White got things badly mixed up, both as to person and place. When God rebukes a man he does not rebuke the wrong man. When he sent the prophet Nathan to David with the message, "Thou are the man," he hit the right man.

Continuing his explanation, Elder Daniels said: "Mrs. White told me plainly that this report came from a gentleman whose acquaintance they had formed when traveling in the West." This again proves the falsity of her claim that she was not influenced to write testimonies by reports carried to her by various individuals. This testimony was written by Mrs. White while she was in Colorado. Had Elder Daniels, the one to whom it was addressed, been the guilty party, he probably would never have questioned its origin; and the church elders would have reasoned as they so often had reasoned in regard to other of her testimonies: "How could Sister White know so far away what Elder Daniels was doing at Parma, Mich., if the Lord had not shown it to her in vision?" But the mistake revealed its origin. The best that could be done from Mrs. White then was to shift all the

blame unto the man who gave her the report. In basing her communication as she did on the testimony of one man, she disregarded a plain principle laid down in the Bible: "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses" (1 Timothy 5:19). But this she did almost constantly in her testimony work. Her ear was ever open to hear reports. The writer was well acquainted with Elder Daniels. The mistake Mrs. White made in this case shook his faith in her testimonies, so much so that he came nearly leaving the work then. The writer had a long conference with him, trying to relieve his doubts; but they always stuck to him, and opened his eyes to other mistakes of Mrs. White. Finally, after years of struggle, he withdrew from the denomination, and opposes it now, the same as hundreds of other Adventist ministers, officials and honest laymen have done; and their numbers are bring added to constantly.

"What Called it Out"

Take another case. For a number of years certain irresponsible and independent workers in the South made a practice of going among church members in some of the Northern states and collecting tithes and donations for their work. Elder George F. Watson, president of the Colorado Conference, objected to this being done in his conference. Before long he received a testimony from Mrs. White, dated Jan. 22, 1906, defending this irregularity, and admonishing him to silence. In it she said:

"It has been presented to me for years that my tithe was to be appropriated by myself. . . I have myself appropriated my tithe to the needy cases brought to my notice. . . It is a matter that should not be commented upon; for it will necessitate my making known these matters, which I do not desire to do. . . And if any person shall say to me, 'Sister White, will you appropriate my tithe where you know it is most needed?' I shall say, 'Yes,' and I will and have done so. I commend those sisters who have placed their tithe where it is most needed. . . For years there have been now and then persons who have lost confidence in the appropriation of the tithe who have placed their tithe in my hands. . . I have taken the money, given a receipt for it, and told them where it was to be appropriated. I write this to you so that you shall keep cool and not become stirred up and give publicity to this matter, lest more shall follow their example." This communication from Mrs. White flatly contradicted what she had written ten years before. In the Review and Herald of Nov. 10, 1896, she had said:

"Let none feel at liberty to retain their tithe to use according to their own judgment. They are not. . . to apply it as they see fit, even in what they may regard as the Lord's work. . . The minister. . . should not feel that he can retain and apply it according to his own judgment because he is a minister. It is not his. . . Let him not give his influence to any plans for the diverting from their legitimate use the tithes and offerings dedicated to God. Let them be placed in his treasury." In 1909 this and other matter of similar import were gathered together and published in Volume IX of the "Testimonies." At a General Conference committee council meeting held behind closed doors in Washington, D.C., Oct. 27, 1913, after reading these two contradictory statements, Elder Watson, holding up one in each hand, said he could not believe that both were written by the same person. He said he had charged J.E. White, Mrs. White's oldest son, with being the author of the 1906 communication; had told him he believed it was "a product of his own evil brain." For nearly eight long years he said he had been left in the dark as to whether it was a genuine testimony or not, and asserted that hundreds of thousands of dollars had been diverted from the regular

channels by the use that had been made of it.

Finally, in that same meeting, Elder W.C. White, in response to what Elder Watson had said, made the following statement regarding it:

"The letter was written by my mother, and was duplicated, and a copy was sent Brother Watson, and another copy, very unwisely I believe, and I am sorry to say, to my brother. What called it out was a letter from my brother to my mother. I am very sorry that the letter was written."

Notice some important facts:

1. Here we have two "inspired" testimonies from Mrs. White squarely contradicting each other.

2. She was influenced by one of her sons to write one of these, as the other son confesses. This disproves her claim that she was not thus influenced to write testimonies.

3. Notice also her duplicity. In her printed testimonies for the church she forbids others to use their tithes as they thought best. All must be strictly paid into the treasury. But she herself used not only her own tithes, but those entrusted to her by others, just as she pleased, placing none in the treasury as she required others to do. Privately she encouraged confiding ones to send their tithes to her, contrary to her published testimonies. When this was found out she admonished Watson to keep the fact concealed, lest she should be compelled to make an explanation, and others should be influenced to follow her example and the example of those whose course she commended! What shall we say of such manifest duplicity in a professed prophet of God?

4. If it was proper for one of her sons to be "sorry" for a testimony which she had been inspired to write by a letter she had received from the other son, why would it not be perfectly proper for the whole church to be sorry for many other things she was influenced to write in the same way?

All along Mrs. White was influenced in this way by her sons and by leading men in the denomination to write testimonies to individuals and churches. Both she and they tried to conceal the fact that her testimonies originated in this way. In later years, some, like Elder A.G. Daniells, president of their General Conference since 1901, when desiring a testimony from her against some one, would write to her son, W.C. White, and he would read their communications to his mother. Then, when asked if they had written to Mrs. White about the individuals concerned, they would deny it, which was technically true, but false altogether in fact and effect, for they had written to her through her son. To such unworthy subterfuges both she and they resorted to shield her in her work and defend her testimonies. No gift, profession or observance prevented either her or them from practicing deception. As early as 1867 Mrs. White herself admitted that she was influenced to write a testimony by letters received from the brethren. See latter part of the chapter, "Brief Sketch of Her Life," pages 77, 78. Of what use, then, was it for her to deny the fact in later years?

Led by Dr. Kellogg to Deny the Resurrection of the Body

All Adventists hold strongly to the material resurrection of the body which goes into the grave. In 1878, Dr. Kellogg advocated the theory that the dead body would never be raised, but that all that was left of a person at death was a record of his life kept in heaven. At the resurrection an entirely new body of new matter would be formed like the old one, and made to think that he was the same

person as the old one! Dr. Kellogg influenced Elder James White to advocate this new view. Kellogg presented his new theory before the General Conference, Oct. 8, 1878, and later published it in a book called "Soul Resurrection." It met with strong opposition; but Elder White used all his influence for it. He invited Elder J.N. Andrews and myself to a private conference with himself and wife, hoping to win us to his side. But he failed to answer our objections. Then he asked his wife is she had any "light" on the subject. She promptly declared that the Lord had showed her that not a particle of the old body would ever be raised, but that a new body of new material would be formed. I asked her how about Christ's body which was raised. She said he dropped it all when he ascended. As the Lord had settled it, we dared say no more, though not convinced. Then she went before the conference and made the same positive statements as to what the Lord had "shown" her. A young minister asked her how she reconciled her present statement with what she had written previously about angel's "watching the precious dust of Wm. Miller." Of course she could not answer. Instead, she denounced the minister as a little upstart, and set him down summarily. The rest of us kept still.

Here we see how she was influenced by Dr. Kellogg and her husband to confirm what they wished. It illustrates how easily she was influenced, how readily she adopted any new or wild theory advocated by her associates, and how prompt she was to put upon it the stamp and sanction of divine inspiration and approval. But this speculative theory about the resurrection did not take with the body of her people, so it was soon dropped. Notwithstanding Mrs. White's strong statements to the contrary, her church still believes and teaches the old doctrine of the resurrection of the material body which goes into the grave. This is only one of the many things which Mrs. White once taught as of divine revelation from God which her church no longer believes. For many years in her published testimonies criticizing, reproving and accusing individuals, the names of the individuals were published; but this finally became so objectionable that in 1883, when her testimonies were revised, these names were omitted, and the persons referred to were indicated by letters of the alphabet. One of her testimonies incriminating a certain individual provoked a $50,000 suit for damages. The suit was settled out of court. But if it was proper for her to publish these names thus at first, why did she not continue to do so? The omission of these names in this way is an open confession on the face of it that she was not inspired by God to put them in in the first place. Her "inspiration" to write these numerous and voluminous epistles came from another source, as has already been shown.

While she lived, every one in the denomination was liable to an attack, a cutting reprimand, or to dismissal from office from her if he chanced to be reported or complained of by some one to her. No one was safe from her ever ready and caustic pen. One denunciation from her meant a stigma on one's character and standing in the denomination for life. She was at the same time both the dread and the idolized oracle of the denomination.

01.18. Chapter 18 - Broke the Sabbath Nine Years

Chapter 18 - Broke the Sabbath Nine Years

Jews and Seventh-day Baptists keep the Sabbath as the Bible teaches, from sunset to sunset (Leviticus 23:32; Mark 1:32). Elder Bates led Mrs. White and her husband to accept the Sabbath in 1846. He had been a sea captain, and by nautical time began the day at 6P.M. So he began the Sabbath that way. By him Mrs. White was led to keep it the same way until 1855 - nine years. In a pamphlet published at New Bedford, Mass., 1850, entitled "The Sabbath Controversy," pages 80-82, Elder Bates wrote an article headed "The Beginning of the Sabbath." He says: "Here, also, we can not be too particular; God claims every moment of his day." Then he argues for the 6P.M. time, and says: "Therefore by the same rule (and no other) we regulate the weeks, and must of necessity begin the Scripture day at 6P.M." In another pamphlet, entitled "The Sealing Message," published in 1849, at the same place, he says: "Friday evening, 6P.M., the Sabbath commences; all other figuring is lost time" (p. 38). So Mrs. White blindly followed Bates in this unscriptural practice for nine years. This was not satisfactory to all, and a discussion arose over it. Some argued for sunrise time and some for sunset time. A division was feared. But Bates' influence was in the lead, and held them to 6P.M. In 1868, Elder U. Smith published a pamphlet entitled "The Visions - Objections Answered," 144 pages. On page 90 he quotes Elder White thus: "Mrs. White has in two visions been shown something in reference to the time of the commencement of the Sabbath. The first was as early as 1847, at Topsham, Maine. In that vision she was shown that to commence the Sabbath at sunrise was wrong."

If the Lord gave her this visions, how natural and easy it would have been for him to tell her that sunset was the right time. Why simply tell her sunrise was wrong, and leave the whole church in error eight years more as to what time was right? The answer is easy. Bates was still in the lead, and opposed sunrise time, and she "saw" through his glasses; that was all. In Early Writings, by Mrs. White, edition 1882, pages 25-28, is an account of this same vision at Topsham, Maine, 1847. She says: "I saw an angel flying swiftly to me. He quickly carried me from earth to the holy city." There she was taken by Jesus into the Holy of Holies and shown the ark. Jesus opened the ark and showed her the Ten Commandments. She says: "The fourth, the Sabbath Commandment, shone above them all. . . I saw that the holy Sabbath is, and will be, the separating wall between the true Israel of God and unbelievers." Then right along, page after page, she has vision after vision very frequently. She goes to heaven often, talks familiarly with Jesus and angels. She is told over and over about the Sabbath, how holy it is, and that it is the seal of God, and that people "are being tested on the Sabbath question" (p. 35). Why was she not told in some of these visits that she was beginning the Sabbath wrong, keeping part of two days? But not a hint of it was given her.

How did she finally find out? This way: A division among them was arising over this question. So Elder J. N. Andrews, the best scholar they then had, was requested to study the subject and present his conclusion to the conference held at Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 16, 1855. This he did, and decided that sunset was the Scriptural time to begin the Sabbath. The conference voted to

accept his view, and then the whole denomination changed from 6P.M. to sunset, after nine years of error on this vital question. This is all told fully by Smith in "The Visions - Objections Answered," pages 88-93. Then, four days after Andrews and the conference had settled it, Mrs. White had a vision in which and angel told her that sunset was the right time!!! Smith says: "After the conference, November 20, the vision was given, establishing those undecided on the sunset time" (p. 93). This put Mrs. White in a bad fix. So in that vision she complained to the angel and asked for an explanation. She says: "I inquired why it had been thus, that at this late day we must change the time of commencing the Sabbath. Said the angel, 'Ye shall understand, but not yet, not yet'" ("Test.," Vol. I., p. 116). That was over sixty years ago; Mrs. White is dead; but the promised explanation has never been given. So I will give it now: In her visions she saw just what Bates taught her. When Andrews had the lead, then she changed her views and saw just what he and the conference taught. That is the whole of it, and the like of that is the source of all her revelations.

Notice the importance of this blunder. For nine years they all began the Sabbath at 6P.M. Friday. In June the sun at 6P.M. would be two hours high when they began the Sabbath. They kept two hours of Friday, two hours on which they now work. At 6P.M., with the sun two hours high on Saturday, they all went to work - plowing, washing, etc. They worked on two hours of the Sabbath, holy time as they now believe. In December it went the other way; they worked two hours on Friday after the Sabbath began, and kept two hours Saturday evening after the Sabbath ended! So they actually broke the Sabbath every week for nine years. All this with Jesus and angels frequently talking with Mrs. White about the sacredness of the holy Sabbath! Did she not mistake Bates and Andrews for angels?

01.19. Chapter 19 - The Reform Dress

Chapter 19 - The Reform Dress

A Short Dress With Pants

One of the most manifest mistakes Mrs. White made was about what she called the "Reform Dress." Shortly before the Civil War of 1861-65 a few women wore and advocated a reform dress cut short - about half-way to the knees.1 With this they wore a sort of loose pants on the limbs below the dress. Some Advent sisters favored it as convenient and healthful; but Mrs. White condemned it, with good reason, as follows:

"God would not have his people adopt the so-called reform dress. It is immodest apparel, wholly unfitted for the modest, humble followers of Christ. . . Those who feel called out to join the movement in favor of woman's rights and the so-called dress reform, might as well sever all connection with the third angel's message. . . Let them adopt this costume, and their influence is dead. . . They [the sisters] would destroy their influence and that of their husbands. They would become a byword and a derision. . . God would not have us take a course to lessen or destroy our influence with the world" (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. I., pp. 421, 422).

Notice that she gives God as her authority here. "God would not have his people adopt the so-called reform dress." That was God's mind at that date. Again she says:

"If women would wear their dresses so as to clear the filth of the streets an inch or two, their dresses would be modest and they could be kept clean much more easily, and would wear longer. Such a dress would be in accordance with our faith" (p. 424).

Notice the length of the dress - "to clear the filth of the streets an inch or two."

Remember this. Once more she says:

"Christians should not take pains to make themselves a gazing-stock by dressing differently from the world" (p. 458).

Remember this also. This was in 1863, and was clear and emphatic. But one year later, September, 1864, Elder and Mrs. White spent three weeks at Dr. Jackson's Health Home at Dansville, N.Y. Both were captivated with the new "Health Reform" taught there. Elder White wrote a flattering account of the institution and this system of health care.

Miss Austin, one of the physicians there, wore a "Reform Dress" with pants below the dress made like men's pants. Slightly modified, it was the same dress Mrs. White had condemned only a year before. But both she and her husband were captivated with it. Immediately she adopted it herself, and began to write revelations and testimonies to the sisters, saying God now wanted them to wear it. It will be seen that after her visit with Miss Austin "the Lord" changed his mind on the dress question, for she says:

"God would now have his people adopt the Reform Dress, not only to distinguish them from the world as his peculiar people, but because a reform in dress is essential to physical and mental health" (p. 525).

Here, again, she gives God as her authority for the new departure in dress. This dress was to be adopted by sisters, not only for health, but to distinguish them from the world as God's peculiar people. She quotes Numbers 15:38-41, where God directed the Israelites to wear a "ribbon of blue" on their garments to distinguish them from the other nations. So now the Adventists women were to put on the reform dress so as to be peculiar from the world. This was the very thing she had condemned previously. She give the exact length of the dress. She says: "I would say that nine inches as nearly accords with my view of the matter as I am able to express in inches" (p. 521). In her testimony before visiting Miss Austin she expressly said "an inch or two" above the streets; but now it is "nine" inches. Measure nine inches from the floor and it will be about half-way up to the knee on a woman of ordinary height. That was the way Miss Austin wore hers.

Mrs. White had patterns of the dress, coat and pants cut out of paper. These she advertised in the Review, took with her wherever she went, and sold for one dollar each! She thus pocketed quite a nice sum of easy money. She strongly urged that these paper patterns of hers be obtained by all. She says:

"I shall have patterns prepared to take with me as we travel, ready to hand out to our sisters whom we shall meet, or to send by mail to all who may order them. Our address will be given in the Review. . . Old garments may be cut over after a correct pattern. . . I beg of you, sisters, not to form your patterns after your own particular ideas" (p. 522). The only correct pattern was hers, the one she advertised in the church paper, carried with her everywhere she went, made out of cheap paper, and handed out to the sisters at only one dollar each! I was there, and that one dollar was the price. Many a poor sister who could ill afford it paid the dollar, and put on the pants.

I was married at Battle Creek in 1867, to a young sister of nineteen. It was at the height of this short-dress craze. Of course, as a minister's wife, she reluctantly put on the dress and wore it for eight years. So I know all about it. It was a shameful thing, and brought ridicule everywhere. On the street, people would stop and gaze at her and mock. I have seen troops of boys follow her, making fun, till she would step into a store to hide from them. We were both ashamed of it; but God's prophet said it was his will, and we must bear the cross! Here is the warning Mrs. White gave:

"I have done my duty; I have borne my testimony, and those who have heard me and read that which I have written, must bear the responsibility of receiving or rejecting the light given. If they choose to venture to be forgetful hearers, and not doers of the work, they run their own risk, and will be accountable to God" (p. 523). The issue was clear. Buy a pattern, cut off your dress, put on your pants, become peculiar, or reject the light, and meet the frown of God! So, quite largely, the faithful ones put on the dress. But it was a failure. The pants were hot in summer, and in winter the ankles were wet with snow. Husbands were mad, brothers would not go out with their sisters, and outsiders sneered and called them freaks. Girls with this dress on in school were avoided and ridiculed. But for eight years Mrs. White wore it and urged it. I have often sat in the desk with her when she wrote it and preached on it as a Christian duty. If God ever gave her a revelation about anything, he did about that, for so she said strongly over and over. But at length she saw it was a

mistake and a failure. So she went away to California and quietly laid it off herself, and never wore it afterward. Of course she was plied with requests for explanations; but she simply refused to give any. She said she had given the light. They could obey it or reject it. That was all! The fact was, she had been misled by Miss Austin, and dared not own it, for she had said it was light from heaven, and had made God responsible for it all.

Instead of assuming the responsibility for misleading the entire denomination on the subject, as she should have done, she threw the responsibility all on God, and blamed the sisters for abandoning the disgraceful and obnoxious custom, and for making it necessary for her to introduce "another less objectionable style." Here is what she wrote in 1875:

"As our sisters would not generally accept the reform dress as it should be worn, another less objectionable style is now presented" (Testimonies, Vol. IV., p. 640). This is the course she took in shirking and shifting responsibility for an objectionable custom which she herself introduced and sought to impose upon her own people as a Christian duty. But if others disobeyed God in putting off this reform dress, so did she. When my wife discarded it she gave a great sigh of relief, and told me how she had always disliked it. Not one in the denomination wears it now, though there it stands in the "inspired testimonies" as the word and will of God. This is only another illustration of the fact that Mrs. White in her revelations simply followed the lead of some one else, and was naturally inclined and easily influenced to take up with fanatical and extreme views, and advocate them as direct revelations from God.

NOTES 1. The dress reached halfway between the hips and the knees, not halfway between the ankles and the knees.

01.20. Chapter 20 - Her False Vision About the Planets

Chapter 20 - Her False Vision About the Planets

As previously stated, Elder Joseph Bates first met Elder White and his wife in 1846. He was keeping the Sabbath, and urged it upon them. Neither saw any great importance in it at first, but nominally accepted it to please Bates, as it was important to gain his influence. Mrs. White was having visions which Bates did not believe were of God; but they were anxious to convince him that they were genuine. Bates had been a sea captain, and had consequently studied the stars; had, in fact, become enthusiastic about astronomy. In the presence of Mrs. White and others he had often talked about the different planets, their positions, moons, and the "opening heavens." In his book, "The Great Second Advent Movement," page 260, Elder J.N. Loughborough, Mrs. White's great exponent and apologist, quotes a Mrs. Truesdale thus:

"We all knew that Captain Bates was a great lover of astronomy, as he would often locate many of the heavenly bodies for our instruction."

Mrs. White seemed to pay no attention to the subject, or to have any interest in it. But soon she had a vision about the various planets, which is thus told by Loughborough on page 258 of his book just quoted:

"One evening at the conference above mentioned [Topsham, Maine, 1846], in the house of Mr. Curtis, and in the presence of Elder (Captain) Bates, who was yet undecided in regard to these manifestations, Mrs. White, while in vision, began to talk about the stars, giving a glowing description of the rosy-tinted belts which she saw across the surface of some planet, and added, 'I see four moons.' 'Oh,' said Elder Bates, 'she is viewing Jupiter.' Then, having made motions as though traveling through space, she began giving descriptions of belts and rings in their ever-varying beauty, and said, 'I see eight moons.' 'She is describing Saturn.' Next came a description of Uranus with his six moons, then a wonderful description of the 'opening heavens.'" This was sufficient, and accomplished its purpose. Elder Bates was convinced, and became a firm believer in the visions. But what are the facts? Mrs. White simply saw what her companions at the time generally believed and talked about. Had God given her that view about the planets and the number of moons to each he would have given her the correct number in each case, and thus she would have revealed what astronomers at the time did not know, but later discovered. This would have proved her vision to be of God. But, blundering as she did, proves that the Lord was not in it. This vision was like all the rest of her revelations; she simply saw what others at the time had studied out and believed and talked about. Whether she pretended to see all this to win Elder Bates, or whether she really imagined she saw it, the fact remains that her statement of the number of moons to each planet was incorrect, and not in harmony with what we know to be the truth about them. Here cold facts which can not be denied prove her revelations to be wholly unreliable. Here are the facts as compiled by E.E. Frank, of New York City: "Jupiter has nine moons instead of four; Saturn has ten moons instead of eight; and Uranus has only four moons instead of six." These discoveries were made as follows:

Jupiter. In 1892, Bernard, at Lick Observatory, discovered the fifth moon of Jupiter; in 1905, Perrine, at the same observatory, discovered the sixth and seventh; in 1908, Melotte discovered the eighth at Greenwich; and in 1914, Nickolson, at the Lick Observatory, discovered the ninth.

Saturn. In 1899, Prof. W.H. Pickering discovered the ninth moon of Saturn, and in 1905, the tenth.

Uranus. Sir Wm. Herschel discovered the two largest moons of Uranus, and supposed he had seen four others, which was believed up to 1851, five years after Mrs. White's vision. In 1851, Lassell positively proved that Uranus has only four moons. For these facts and the names of all these satellites see "Manual of Astronomy," by Charles Young, Ph.D., LL.D., late professor of astronomy at Princeton University.

[Editor: Recent discoveries show Jupiter with 16 moons, Saturn with at least 18, and Uranus 15. Uranus also has rings which were not mentioned by Mrs. White] The conclusion is self-evident - Mrs. White's claim was false. She did not see Jupiter, for Jupiter has nine moons instead of four, as she said. She did not see Saturn, for Saturn has ten moons instead of eight (seven), as she claimed to see. She did not see Uranus, for Uranus has only four moons instead of six, as she claimed. Any yet she represents that the Lord showed her all these things in vision. This vision of the moons, corresponding exactly with what Elder Bates believed, convinced him the visions were of God. He asked her if she had ever studied astronomy, and she replied by saying that she did not remember ever having looked in a book on astronomy. That settled it with him. But she could easily have learned all this from his own previous conversations. Later discoveries have now shown that both Jupiter and Saturn have more moons than she said. Elder Loughborough is obliged to confess this. In a foot note on page 258 of his book already quoted he says: "More moons to both Jupiter and Saturn have since been discovered." As a matter of fact, Mrs. White herself, relating this vision, described Saturn as having only seven moons, the number then assigned to that planet by astronomers. Here are her own words in "Early Writings," page 32: "The I was taken to a world which had seven moons." But by the time Elder Loughborough had written his book, "Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists," another moon had been discovered, and the publishers had the audacity to change her words to read, "I see eight moons." (See page 126 of that work.) This was in 1892. When Elder Loughborough revised this book in 1905, and issued it under another title, still more moons had been discovered to this planet, hence his admission. The progressive discoveries of astronomy since Mrs. White had that vision have proved her revelation to be false. But it was a master stroke to win an influential convert to her cause. And it succeeded, fraudulent as it was. Were Elder Bates alive today he would be compelled to reject her alleged vision of the planets as spurious, in view of her contradictions of known facts discovered since his death.

Revelations and visions which can be produced on demand or made to order to suit an occasion, may safely be questioned and distrusted, as well as may the peepings and mutterings of familiar spirits which come at a call.

01.21. Chapter 21 - "Give Sunday to the Lord"

Chapter 21 - "Give Sunday to the Lord"

From the first Mrs. White taught that the Pope changed to Sabbath, that Sunday-keeping is "the mark of the beast," and that before the end Seventh-day Adventists were to suffer great persecution because they would not cease working on Sunday. A decree was finally to go forth to slay them and rid the earth of them (Early Writings, pp. 29, 47, 55, 143, 145, ed. 1882).

After a time, on account of their aggressive ways and their strong denunciations of those who observe Sunday, a few Seventh-day Adventists were imprisoned for short periods here and there for working on Sunday, and finally two of their publishing houses, one in London and one in Basil, Switzerland, were closed out for disregarding Sunday laws and laws regulating the hours of female labor. This set Mrs. White to thinking, and she finally had a revelation directing her people, the world over, to refrain from work on Sunday wherever the law requires it and prosecutions were threatened. They have all readily obeyed. But, following this instruction, how, then, can they ever be persecuted for Sunday work? In Australia there was a law requiring them to close their publishing house in Melbourne on Sunday. For three Sundays, after having had notice, they did not obey. Then they were threatened with arrest. What now? Did they brave the law and take the penalty as they had always said they would? Mrs. White, their divine oracle, fortunately was right there. Did she counsel martyrdom? Oh, no! She immediately produced a revelation directing them to obey the law, close the plant on Sunday, and devote the day to the Lord in religious work just as Sunday-keepers do.

Here are her instructions in "Testimonies for the Church," Vol. IX., No. 37, published in 1909. It is a square backdown from all she had published before. It avoids all possibility of persecution for Sunday work. She says: "The light given me by the Lord at a time when we were expecting just such a crisis as you seem to be approaching was that when the people were moved by a power from beneath to enforce Sunday observance, Seventh-day Adventists were to show their wisdom by refraining from their ordinary work on that day, devoting it to missionary effort" (p. 232). "Give them no occasion to call you lawbreakers." "It will be very easy to avoid that difficulty. Give Sunday to the Lord as the day for doing missionary work."

Further on she says: "At one time those in charge of our school at Avondale [Australia] inquired of me, saying, 'What shall we do? The officers of the law have been commissioned to arrest those working on Sunday.' I replied, 'It will be very easy to avoid that difficulty. Give Sunday to the Lord as a day for doing missionary work. Take students out to hold meetings in different places, and to do medical missionary work. They will find the people at home, and will have a splendid opportunity to present the truth. This way of spending Sunday is always acceptable to the Lord'" (p. 238).

It will be readily seen that Mrs. White now directs her people to keep Sunday exactly as all conscientious Sunday observers do; that is, in holding religious meetings and doing religious work!

They are to "refrain from their ordinary work on that day"; they are to "give Sunday to the Lord as a day for doing missionary work." And, to complete the somersault, they are told that "this way of spending Sunday is always acceptable to the Lord." A prospect of arrest suddenly converted Mrs. White to a zealous religious observance of Sunday. "Give the day to the Lord." And then especially notice: "This way of spending Sunday is always acceptable to the Lord." Good and true. Now, if it is acceptable to the Lord from Adventists, it must be acceptable to the Lord from Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and others. But the point is this: If Adventists follow this advice, how will they ever be persecuted for working on Sunday? What becomes of the prediction that an edict will be issued to kill them for violating a Sunday law? That is what Adventists have always taught before. But in 1909 they were directed to refrain from their ordinary work on Sunday, devote the day to religious exercises, and obey the law.

If the prospect of simply a fine will cause Adventists to obey the law and refrain from work on Sunday, would not the prospect of a death penalty quickly induce them to obey? Surely. It shows that their whole theory breaks down when put to a test.

Lastly, if Methodists, Baptists and other Christians have the mark of the beast because they "give Sunday to the Lord" in religious service, why will not Adventists also have it if they give the day to the Lord in the same way? Of course they will.

If Sunday-keeping is the awful thing Adventists say it is, then what Mrs. White here tells her people to do is positively sinful - a compromise with sin. It is as if Daniel had said to his three Hebrew companions: "When the people are moved by a power from beneath to compel you to bow down and worship images, give them no occasion to call you lawbreakers. That difficulty can be easily avoided. You are to show your wisdom by devoting the time to prayer. Bow down, but while bowed pray to the God of heaven. That kind of worship is always acceptable to God." In giving the instruction she did, Mrs. White herself removed the ground for the persecution under Sunday laws which she had previously predicted.

01.22. Chapter 22 - Conclusion

Chapter 22 - Conclusion

Mrs. White had much to say about the three messages of Revelation 14:6-10. These, she said, were the foundation of her message and movement. The first, she held, was fulfilled in William Miller's time-setting movement of 1843-4. For over sixty-five years she applied the second message, or fall of Babylon, to the Protestant churches, and said it could not apply to the "Romish Church." But, as we have seen, in 1911 she changed her teachings regarding this message, and applied it particularly to the Roman Church. If correct in her later exposition, she was in error, and taught error regarding the second message nearly all her life. The third message warns against false worship and receiving the mark of the beast. Nearly all her life Mrs. White taught that the mark of the beast is Sunday-keeping; but, as we have seen from the preceding chapter, near the close of her life she changed her views regarding this, and said that to "give Sunday to the Lord" was always acceptable to him. In other words, she mistook and taught error regarding all three of the very messages which she and her followers have held to be the foundation of their movement. If wrong on the fundamentals, how can she safely be relied upon in other matters? To summarize briefly some of her more prominent mistakes, the following may be noted:

She endorsed William Miller's time-setting of 1843-4.

She endorsed Captain Bates' time-setting for 1851.

She taught that there was no more salvation for sinners after Oct. 22, 1844.

She suppressed some of her early visions and writings, and yet, in 1882, issued a book claiming to contain all of her early writings.

She predicted that the Civil War would be a failure, that the nation would be ruined, and that slavery would not be abolished.

She characterized Lincoln's proclamations for days of humiliation and prayer as "insults to Jehovah."

She taught a "reform dress" which made her followers a laughing-stock, and which she herself gave up after attempting to force it upon her church for eight years as a divine revelation and a religious duty.

She wrote against the eating of both butter and eggs.

She forbade the eating of meat, and said, "Can we possibly have confidence in ministers who, at tables where flesh is served, join with others in eating it?" (Lake Union Herald, Oct. 4, 1911), and yet secretly she herself ate meat more or less most of her life.

She taught her followers that they should not apply their tithes as they saw fit, but applied her own and those of others as she chose.

She denied having been influenced by letters or conversations in the writing of her testimonies, when the opposite was the fact.

She based many of her rebukes on mere hearsay reports, and, contrary to the Scriptures, upon the testimony of only one witness.

She claimed to have been divinely commissioned to reveal secret sins, but miserably failed in this. In numerous instances she rebuked the wrong man, and frequently accused individuals of doing things they had not done.

She seriously erred in her vision regarding the planets and the number of their satellites.

She plagiarized to such an extent that one of her books had to be suppressed altogether, and another had to be revised at an expense of $3,000.

In 1905 she promised to explain her mistakes and blunders, and said that God would help her to do it; but in 1906 she said that God had told her not to attempt this.

One of the worst features of her life and writings is that she was always making God responsible for her mistakes and failures.

Her worst deception, as that of her followers, was to mistake her unfortunate affliction of epilepsy and epileptic fits as divine revelations and visions from God.

Mrs. White not only claimed that her writings are the "testimony of Jesus" and the "spirit of prophecy" referred to in Revelation 12:17 and Revelation 19:10, but she firmly held that she and her followers are the 144,000 of Revelation 7:1-4 and Revelation 14:5, although their present adult membership is over 150,000.

The great characteristic of the 144,000 as described in the last named Scripture is that "in their mouth there was found no guile."

Guile is deception. No guile, therefore, means no deception. But, as pointed out in so many instances in this book, Mrs. White’s claims to being an inspired prophet of God have been maintained very largely by deception, both on her own part and on the part of her defenders and supporters. Both she and they, therefore, fail to meet the very description and characteristic which Inspiration has seen fit to give of the 144,000. No genuine gift of God, no true gift of the Spirit, has ever required guile - deception, deceit, fraud, or double-dealing - to defend and sustain it. That she meant to be a Christian, and that her works contain many things good in themselves, need not be denied. Her motives we may safely leave with God. But her high claims are not defensible. They are disproved by too many patent and incontrovertible facts.

02.00. Seventh-day Adventism RENOUNCED

Seventh-day Adventism RENOUNCED by D.M. Canright

(1914)

Introduction By Rev. Theo. Nelson. LL.D., late President of Kalamazoo College.

I met for the first time the author of "Adventism Renounced" in the autumn of 1865. He was then a rising young minister in high favor with his people. Then, as now, I had entire confidence in his sincerity. Nor do I think it strange that, after more than twenty years devoted to Seventh-Day Adventist propagandism, he should finally renounce their doctrines, and return to the orthodox faith. It is not necessary to impute any sinister or unworthy motives. Rather, it is easy enough to believe that experience and study, or the evolution of intelligence, as well as the irresistible logic of events, would inevitably bring to pass this result. Seventh-Day Adventists have always made a great deal of the "signs of the times," of earthquakes and falling stars, of "wars and rumors of wars." Arguments which might profoundly impress the imagination of a youth during the troubled period of our great civil war, would naturally lose their hold upon the riper judgment of a man in these "piping times of peace."

Toward the Seventh-Day Adventists as a people I cherish none but feelings of kindness. Generally, their piety is undoubtedly genuine, though misanthropic and melancholy. They take a low view of human nature, and practically isolate themselves from their neighbors, and from those affairs which concern the well-being of society as a whole. They stand aloof from every movement which looks to human progress, because they believe that human progress is impossible, and that mankind are already doomed; that destruction is impending, "even at the door." In fact, their religious faith restrains, if it does not destroy, their sentiment of patriotism, and causes them to regard with suspicion, if not with feelings of hostility, the free government under which they live. Nothing can be more absurd than their interpretations of current events, and, especially, their belief that our general and state governments are about to be converted into engines of religious persecution and despotism. It cannot be otherwise than that many sincere Seventh-Day Adventists, who have been such by what they believed the imperative necessity of Scripture teaching, will be grateful to Mr. Canright for aiding them to put off a yoke which fetters their usefulness and galls their minds.

Seventh-Day Adventists believe and teach that before the second coming of Christ the United States will form a union of church and state, and, like France and Spain in the seventeenth century, will become a persecuting power. They hold that the prophetic Scriptures clearly foretell this extraordinary change in the form and spirit of our government. Touching the correctness of the interpretations of Scripture upon which their expectations are based, they admit no possibility of mistake. They assume to know that they have the right key to prophecy - that they have the "Present truth." They believe and teach that the Seventh-Day Adventists are to be especially tried in this ordeal that is being prepared by the civil government; that they are to be the chief victims of

the fiery persecutions that will be waged against the "Saints of the Most High"; that they are to suffer, at the hands of the secular power, imprisonments, tortures, "the spoiling of their goods," and perhaps death itself. Indeed, they stake their whole system of doctrine upon this meaning of the Word of God, and they regard these momentous events, which they claim the Bible forecasts, as much a reality as though those events had already transpired Those events are a reality to them and have the same value in argument, and the same authority in action, as history itself. In their publications and sermons they often adopt the style of the confessor who is already brought to the scaffold, or bound to the stake; they speak out in a tone of defiant, heroic submission, as though the fagots were being kindled and the crown of martyrdom were in full view. To one who is familiar with the history of religious persecutions, and has studied the progress and development of religious freedom, especially in Anglo-Saxon nations; to one who is fairly acquainted with the spirit of the age and country in which we live, this ostentatious martyr-spirit of our Adventist friends seems quite absurd. Were it not for their well known uprightness and probity of character, we should be disposed to challenge their belief, such is their eagerness to find its proof and confirmation in events which have no such meaning. Under our form of government would it be possible to achieve a more intimate and perfect union of "church and state" than is embodied in the government of monarchical English? Such a change would be a greater miracle than for God to grow a giant oak in an instant. The trend of our civilization, the most powerful currents of public opinion, are all in the opposite direction. Yet, even in England, Adventists are free to publish their peculiar doctrines, to establish churches, and to pursue their vocations like other men. Religious freedom is the spirit of the age, and, most of all, the spirit of the age in America. Hence, we say, there need be no fears for the grave forebodings of our Advent friends.

THEO. NELSON.

02.000. Preface to Fourteenth Edition

Preface to Fourteenth Edition

"To criticise, expose and condemn others is not a pleasant task; but when religious teachers enthrone error, and mislead honest people, silence would be unkind and censurable." Being profoundly convinced that Seventh-Day Adventism is a system of error, I feel it my duty to publish what I know of it. I do it in the fear of God. Knowing the sorrow it has brought to my heart and to thousands, I must warn others against it. I do not question the honesty of the Adventists, but their sincerity does not sanctify their errors. I have had to speak plainly, but, I trust kindly. I have had to treat each subject briefly, and leave many untouched, but I have taken up the main pillars of that faith! if these fall, the whole must go down.

It is now nearly twenty-five years since this book was first published. This is the fourteenth edition. It has been translated into several languages, sold by numerous publishing houses, gone to the ends of the earth wherever Adventism has gone, and has been the greatest obstacle that work has ever had to meet. Yet Adventists have ventured no answer to it. Say what they may, it is evident that they would gladly answer it if they could do so safely.

"Replies to Eld. Canright," quoted in this work, is not an answer to this book, but to a few articles I wrote for a paper long before the book was published. The pamphlet itself proves this. The title page is dated "1888," while my book was not published till one year later, 1889. See my title page. Then on page eighty of their pamphlet I read this: "He promises a forthcoming book, by which we presume he designs to sweep away clean everything which his articles have left. It will receive due attention, if thought worthy of it, when it appears." This shows that this "Reply" was no answer to my book. One was promised but never appeared. The book discusses many topics not even mentioned in the articles, and, of course, is much more complete every way. Considering that Adventists are always so ready for debate, discussion and replies, how is it that this book, that has bothered them more than all others which have appeared against them, is so carefully let alone by them? The reason is manifest to all candid people. And here is what my Advent brethren thought of me before I left them:

"Battle Creek, Mich., July 13, 1881. Brother Canright: * * * I feel more interest in you than in any other man, because I know your worth when the Lord is with you, as a laborer. James White."

"Battle Creek, Mich., May 22, 1881. * * * It is time there was a change of the officers of the General Conference. I trust that if we are true and faithful the Lord will be pleased that we should constitute two of that Board. James White."

"Battle Creek, Mich., Aug. 6, 1884. You have long been with us, and we will all love you. G.I. Butler."

"Martinsburg, Neb., July 14, 1884. You were a power in the world, and did a vast amount of good. * * * We need your help in the work greatly. Your precious talent, if humbly and fully consecrated to

God, would be so useful. There are so many places where it would be a great help. G.I. Butler."

Advent Review, March, 1887: "We have felt exceedingly sad to part in our religious connection with one whom we have long esteemed as a dear brother."

Advent Review, March 22, 1887: "In leaving us, he has taken a much more manly and commendable course than most of those who have withdrawn from us, coming voluntarily to our leading brethren, and frankly stating the condition of mind he was in. He did this before his own church, in our presence, and, so far as we know, has taken no unfair, underhanded means to injure us in any way. He goes from our midst with no immoral stain upon his character, chooses associations more pleasant to himself. This is every man's personal privilege if he chooses to take it." The quotations in my book are from the Adventist books published up to the date when I wrote my book, 1889. Since then most of their books have been reprinted and paged differently. To conform to these books as now paged, I would need to change many of my references. To do this I would have to reprint my whole book, as it is in electrotype plates. A change of a few plates would necessitate a change of all. So it leaves them as they were. The quotations are all there, only some are on a different page in their present editions. I took great care to have every quotation exactly correct. They are reliable.

I design to be perfectly fair towards my Advent brethren. I was with them twenty-eight years, from the age of nineteen to forty-seven, the most active years of my life. I was dearly loved by them and I loved them. I love them now. I have thousands of dear friends among them still. It was a terrible trial to break away from all these tender ties. Even now the tears fall fast as I write these lines. But truth and duty were dearer to me than social ties.

Again I bear them record that they are a sincere, devoted, self-sacrificing people, thoroughly believing what they profess. They have many excellent qualities, and many lovely Christian people among them. Like all churches, they have their full share of undesirable members, not from any immoral teachings, but from human frailty, common in all churches. Daily I pray for them that the Lord may bless all that is good in them and forgive, and, in some way, overrule for good when they are in error. This is all I dare ask for myself.

D. M. CANRIGHT. 1914. My Present Standing WHEN a prominent man leaves one church or party and joins an opposing one and gives his reasons for it he may expect that his old associates will reply to him. I expected no exception in my case when I renounced Adventism, so have not been disappointed. The great majority of my former brethren have been very friendly to me and treated me kindly. A few, a very few, have done otherwise. Their object has been to counteract my influence against what they regard as God's work. These few have started the report that I have been sorry I left Adventism, that I have said so, have tried to return to them, have confessed that my book was false, and some have said that I was very poor, a physical and mental wreck, with no hope of salvation, etc. These reports are accepted as facts by honest brethren and repeated till they are believed by many Adventists the world over. I have denied them in every possible way, but they are still believed and repeated, and doubtless always will be. I leave God to judge between us.

I now and here for the hundredth time solemnly affirm before God that I renounced Adventism because I believed it to be an error. I have never once regretted that I did so, have never intimated

to any one that I have had the least desire to go back to that people. It would be impossible for me to do such a thing and be an honest man. I am now (1915) well in body and mind, have a good home worth $10,000 or $12,000, and have four grown children, of whom any man would be proud. On leaving the Adventists I joined the Baptist church at Otsego, Mich., and became its pastor till it was built up into a prosperous church. They have been my ardent friends to this day. Twenty years ago I moved to Grand Rapids, Mich., took a new mission and built this up, organized it into a church which has become one of the strong churches of the city, having several hundred members with a fine edifice. Have twice been its pastor, always an active member. At present I teach a large adult Bible class every Lord's day and often preach for them. Have always been in perfect harmony with the church. They honor me as their father, consult me on all important matters, and hotly resent the foolish reports which some circulate concerning me.

Out of scores of printed testimonies before me I select only a few which speak for themselves:

"Grand Rapids, Mich., Nov. 1, 1907. "To whom it may concern: "Having received many letters from all parts of the United States from those that have been informed by Adventists that Rev. D.M. Canright was not a member of a Baptist church and many other things pertaining to his character, we very emphatically denounce any such statements and will say that he is now and has been for many years an active member of the Berean Baptist church of this city and twice its pastor, a man above reproach and above all a noble Christian. "Respectfully, W. H. Andrews, former clerk and charter member of the above named church. I hereby certify to the above. "REV. ROBERT GRAY, "Pastor of the Berean Church."

"Grand Rapids, Mich., April 9, 1910. "To whom it may concern, world wide: "DEAR BRETHREN: "This letter is to say that Rev. D.M. Canright has been known to the undersigned for many years as an earnest, consecrated Christian man, and a true minister of Jesus Christ. He has been 'a faithful and true witness' against the errors of the Seventh-Day Adventists in his books and tracts for many years. "OLIVER W. VAN OSDEL, "Moderator Grand River Valley Association. "ALEXANDER DODDS, "President City Baptist Mission Society. "W.I. COBURN, "President Baptist Ministers' Conference." The Baptists are not the only people who think well of the Rev. Mr. Canright. A Congregational minister adds his word: "This certifies that I have been acquainted with the Rev. D.M. Canright of this city for more than forty-five years. At least twenty years of that time he was an Adventist preacher, and during those years his reputation as a Christian man and as a preacher of rare ability was of the highest order. His name among the Adventist people of this state was of the highest order. His name among the Adventist people of this state was a household word for righteousness of character, and an able defender of their faith. And when he left the Adventist denomination, all who knew the man, if they were at all imbued with the Christian spirit, must admit that the change made by him was due to a candid, conscientious conviction of what he believed to be right. There could be no other motive in his case, for he was successful beyond many of his brethren, and honored by them in the highest degree. For at least twenty years he and his beloved family have lived in this city and he has maintained the same reputation that he had, as a Christian gentleman and respected citizen. What I have written is from personal knowledge of Rev. D.M. Canright and of the Adventist denomination in this state. "J. T. HUSTED, "Pastor of the Wallin Congregational Church. "Grand Rapid, Mich., April 12, 1910." The Methodist pastors add their tribute as follows: "Various inquiries having come to the different members of the Association concerning the character and standing of Rev. D.M. Canright, the regular monthly

meeting of the Methodist Ministers' Association of Grand Rapids, Mich., did, by an unanimous vote, adopt the following expression of its confidence in and regard for the personal worth and ministerial usefulness of Brother Canright. "Rev. D.M. Canright, formerly a minister in the Seventh-Day Adventist Association, more recently a minister in the Baptist Association of this city, has been known by some of our, number in person for several years and by reputation by the rest, and all our knowledge and information concerning him are of the most favorable kind. "Any reflections on his personal character as a man, a husband, a citizen, a son or a Christian are without foundation, in fact, are unwarranted by any facts known to his intimate acquaintances. He is honored among his brethren, respected in his own community, and is commended by us as being worthy of confidence and trust. He has had an honored and useful ministry, and in no sense is deserving of the attacks made on him. "Done at Grand Rapids, Mich., this 11th day of April 1910, by the authority of the Grand Rapids Methodist Ministers' Association, by "JOHN R. T. LATHROP, District Supt. "CHARLES NEASE, President. "J. R. WOOTEN, Secretary."

"Grand Rapids, Mich., April 11, 1910. "It is with sincere pleasure that I write concerning the character and integrity of the Rev. D.M. Canright. I have known him and his family a good many years, and do not hesitate to say that they are very estimable people, and have the confidence of their neighbors and friends in the community. "I consider Mr. Canright a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word; a man of the highest integrity and one who desires, in every project with which he is connected, to make righteousness his guide to action. "He has done business with our bank for a good many years and I have personally had reason to test his integrity and am unequivocal in my express of confidence in him. "Very truly yours, "CHARLES W. GARFIELD." (Mr. Garfield is president of a bank with $2,000,000.)

Adventists sometimes say I left them four or five times. I withdrew from that church just once, no more, that was final. Their church records at Battle Creek and Otsego will show that. For years I was troubled with doubts about some of their doctrines and three times stopped preaching for a period, but remained a member in good standing. At a large campmeeting I was persuaded to swallow my doubts, take up the work again, confess that I had been in the dark, and go on again. I yielded judgment to the entreaties of my brethren and the love I had for old associates and said what I soon regretted. I found it a terrible struggle to break away from what had held me so long.

Since I left them they try to make it appear that I did not amount to much anyway. "Sour grapes," said the fox to the delicious fruit which he could not reach! As a refutation of their detractions, see Chapter II of my book. I will here state only a few facts briefly:

During two years, 1876, 1877, I was one of the general conference committee of three which had control of all their work in the world. There is no higher authority in the denomination. How did it happen that I was placed in that office if I was not one of their best men? Year after year I was elected on the boards having charge of their most important institutions, such as their Publishing House, College, Sanitarium, Sabbath School Association, etc., etc. For proof of this see their printed year books. where my name appear constantly. I was made theological teacher in their college, president of a state conference, associate editor of a paper, etc. I selected and arranged the course of reading which all their ministers had to follow, and I was sent to the annual state conferences to examine these preachers in those studies, in their theology, and in their fitness for the ministry. Is such work usually committed to an inferior man? But it was as a writer in their

papers, as the author of numerous tracts, pamphlets and books covering nearly every controverted point of their faith, as a lecturer and debater in defense of their doctrines, that I was the best known during the last fifteen years I was with them. In these lines, not a man among them stood as prominent as I did. Every one at all familiar with their work during that period knows that I tell only the simple truth in the case. They know it, too. For my writings the office once paid me $500 in one check and many other times different sums. After twenty-seven years they still publish and use several of my tracts as being better than anything they have been able to produce since. My long and thorough acquaintance with Adventism and all their arguments prepared me to answer them as no other could. Hundreds of ministers from all parts have written me their thanks for the aid my book has been to them in meeting Adventism. Did not God in his providence prepare me for this work? I humbly believe he did, and this reconciles me to the long, and bitter experiences I had in that bondage. But if God and the truth is honored, I am content. The only question is, do I know their doctrines well enough to state them clearly, and have I the ability to answer them plainly? Let my work be the answer.

Since I withdrew Adventists have published five or six different tracts to head off my influence. If I amount to so little, why all this effort? What they do refutes what they say. God has preserved me to outlive nearly all the Adventist ministers with whom I began laboring. At seventy-five am full of faith in God and the hope of eternal life through our lord Jesus Christ.

I love those brethren still and know that most of them are honest Christian people, but in error on many of their views. I would be glad to help them if I could.

D. M. CANRIGHT, Pastor Emeritus of the Berean Baptist Church. Grand Rapids, Michigan.

02.01. Chapter 1 - Doctrines and Methods of Seventh-day Adventists

Chapter 1 - Doctrines and Methods of Seventh-day Adventists

Seventh-day Adventism originated about seventy-five years ago in the work of Mr. Miller, who set the time for the end of the world in 1843-4. Adding some doctrines to the original faith, Elder James White and wife in 1846 became the leaders of the Seventh-day branch of Adventism. Their headquarters were at different times at Paris, Me., Saratoga, Oswego, and Rochester, N.Y. In 1855 they settled permanently at Battle Creek, Mich., which remained the center of the work till recently. Their Doctrines In doctrine they differ radically from evangelical churches. The main points are these as taught in all their books: They hold to the materiality of all things; believe in the sonship of Christ; believe that they only have a correct understanding of the prophecies to which they give most of their attention; that the end of the world is to occur in this generation; that we are now in the Judgment which began in 1844; that the Seventh day, Saturday, must be kept; that keeping Sunday is the mark of the beast; that all should pay tithes; that Mrs. White is inspired as were the writers of the Bible; that the Bible must be interpreted to harmonize with her writings; that they are called of God to give the last warning to the World; that the dead are unconscious; that the wicked and the devil will be annihilated; that all churches but their own are Babylon and rejected of God; that everybody but themselves will soon become spiritualists; that when Christ comes only 144,000 out of all then living on the earth will be saved, and all these will be Seventh-day Adventists. Hence, they have no fellowship with other Christians; never work with them in any way, but zealously proselyte from all.

They believe in the Bible, in conversion, in purity of life, in rigid temperance, in strict morality, and in other good things common to all churches. There are many excellent persons among them. In character they are not to be compared with the spiritualists, infidels, etc., as is sometimes unjustly done. The Extent of Their Work Their Year Book for 1912 reports the following:

Conferences, 129; mission fields, 87; organized churches, 2,769; membership, 90,808; unorganized, 15,758; total, 104,528. Ordained ministers, 828; licensed ministers, 458; missionaries, 1,234; book canvassers, 1,697; total laborers, 4,346; Sabbath Schools, 4,151; membership, 101,161; church schools, 594; students, 13,357; colleges and academies, 86; students, 7,169; publishing houses, 28; employees, 610; sanitariums, 74; employees, 1,989; tithes, $1,338,689.65; average per member, $12.81; contributions for missions, home church work, tithes and all funds by the denomination, $2,223,767.52.

They publish 121 periodicals in twenty-eight languages. Books and tracts published in ninety-one languages. The above will give a fair idea of the strength of that church. However, their main efficiency is in the distribution of their literature. Every member, old and young, down to little children, is taught and urged to engage in every way possible in distributing these tracts, papers and books through every possible channel. Every one believes he is doing God’s work when he does this. Hence every member is a missionary in some way. The result is their literature is coming to be widely scattered the world over. Yet the results of all this tremendous outlay of

money and work are very meagre. In the last four years with 4,000 laborers in the field, they have only averaged a gain of 4,000 members per year, or one for every worker. They have been at work now for seventy-five years to get 104,000 members. The Mormons, starting about the same date, now number 500,000, nearly five times as many. The Christian Scientists, only about half as old, have over a million members. There is very little real spiritual power in it. The work is done mostly by hard labor and argument, not by any such mighty power as attended the work of the Apostles, or Luther, or Wesley, or Moody and many others. Their work now extends to all parts of the civilized world and into many heathen lands. The number of their actual converts does not tell the harm they do. Where they convert one they confuse a score, who after that have no settled faith in any church, and are useless for any Christian work. Other conscientious persons are bothered and worried over it for years, not knowing what to do. Their Hostility to All Other Churches

One of the highly objectionable features of that system is the bitter hostility of its believers towards all other churches. Their theory is that all churches but their own were utterly rejected of God in 1844 for not embracing Miller's doctrine. Thus Mrs. White says: "I saw the state of the different churches since the second angel proclaimed their fall [in 1844]. They have been growing more and more corrupt.... Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body.... The churches were left as were the Jews; and they have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird. I saw great iniquity and vileness in the churches; yet they profess to be Christians. Their professions, their prayers and their exhortations are an abomination in the sight of God. Said the angel, God will not smell in their assemblies. Selfishness, fraud and deceit are practiced by them without the reprovings of conscience." Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, page 189, 190. She says it is the devil who answers their prayers. Thus: "I saw them look up to the throne and pray, Father give us thy spirit; Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence." Early Writings, page 47. Again: "The nominal churches are filled with fornication and adultery, crime and murder, the result of base, lustful passion; but these things are kept covered." Testimonies, Vol. II, page 449. All intelligent people know that such statements are a misrepresentation of the evangelical churches today. Elder White says: "Babylon, the nominal church, is fallen; God's people have come out of her. She is now the synagogue of Satan." Present Truth. April, 1850.

Hence they say that the revivals and conversions in the churches are largely a deception, the work of the devil, not of God. Mrs. White says of them: "The converts are not renewed in heart or changed in character." "They will exult that God is working marvelously for them, when the work is that of another spirit. Under a religious guise, Satan will spread his influence over the land. HE HOPES TO DECEIVE MANY BY LEADING THEM TO THINK THAT GOD IS STILL WITH THE CHURCHES." Great Controversy, page 294, 296. On this the Review and Herald, May 3, 1887, says: "we are aware that to assume that this revival work, so unquestionably accepted by all the churches, is not genuine, will cause the hands of Christendom to be raised in holy horror.... If He [God] is with us, He has not been with the popular churches in any marked manner since they rejected the Advent message of 1843-4, and they are congratulating themselves over delusive appearances, and a prosperity which has no existence in fact. The hand of God cannot direct two movements so antagonistic in nature."

Believing this, they eagerly watch for evidence to prove it and shut their eyes to any facts against it. So they rejoice at any unfavorable thing they can hear against ministers, churches, or members. They report it, repeat it, publish it, magnify it, and live on it. To weaken, divide, or break up a

church, is their delight. They heartily join with worldlings, infidels and atheists in their opposition to churches, and thus strengthen their unbelief and help them to perdition. They have gathered up all the most unfavorable things possible to find against the churches and put it in a book occupying thirty pages, and this they hand out for all to read. It is sad to see honest men devoting their lives to such highly censurable work, which must please Satan well. Who is Deceived?

Seventh-day Adventists dwell much on how easy it is to be deceived, to be led by Satan, when we think it is the Lord - to believe a lie for the truth. It is amusing to see how innocently they apply this to all others, and never dream that is has any application to themselves! What, THEY deceived? THEY misled? Impossible! They KNOW they are right. Exactly, and that is just the way all feel, whether they be Mormons, Shakers, Catholics, or what not. The Adventists themselves are an illustration of the ease with which people are misled. Their Methods of Work

Tent Meetings. Largely they use tents to enter new fields. Being a novelty, they attract attention. At first they present subjects which will offend no one till they gain the confidence of the people. Gradually they introduce their peculiar dogmas, then come out more boldly, till at length they denounce all other churches as Babylon, and their pastors as hirelings and deceivers. They say these pastors cannot defend their doctrines; dare not try. They offer rewards to any who will prove so and so; boast how they have scared this one, defeated that one, and silenced another. If in sermons the least reference is made to them, they call it persecution, give out a review, and do everything to provoke controversy. When the resident pastors are compelled to defend themselves, the Adventists claim to be greatly abused.

If a doctor, lawyer, teacher, or business man should enter a town and denounce all others of his profession as quacks, fools, or deceivers, how would he be treated? All would combine against him as a common enemy. This is the way the pastors and churches meet the attacks of the Adventists, because compelled to. Like Ishmael of old, the hand of the Adventist is against every man, and hence every man’s hand is against them. Genesis 16:12. It is useless for them to deny this, for all know it to be true. They all do it. I was taught that way and followed it, and taught others to do the same.

Camp meeting. Adventists hold many camp-meetings yearly. Here their ablest speakers preach their doctrines to thousands, and distribute their literature widely. They hire the papers to print lengthy flattering reports of their meetings, which they write themselves. Their reporters are trained for this special work. They gain wide attention, and impress many in this way.

Bible Readings. Hundreds of their men, women, and even young girls, are trained with printed lessons which they learn by heart, to go from house to house and give Bible readings. At first they conceal their real object and name, till they get a foothold. Then they cautiously introduce their tenets, work against pastors and churches, and lead many away.

Book-selling. Hundreds also are employed to canvass for their doctrinal books. The real nature of the book is studiously concealed, and the subscriber is deceived into buying a radical Advent book.

Distribution of Tracts. In every possible way, publicly, privately, from tent or church, by book-agents, colporteurs, Bible-readers, or private individuals, in depots, on boats, in stores, or families, through the mails, by sale, loan or gift, their tracts are persistently crowded everywhere.

Missions. They have Missions in many of the large cities and in foreign lands; but they are largely proselyting agencies. They do little among the heathen, or for the destitute and fallen, but go into the best families to which they can gain access, and gather the converts whom other missionaries have made. Thus Mrs. White instructs them: "Mistakes have been made in not seeking to reach ministers and the higher classes with the truth.... Educate men and women to labor for these higher classes both here and there and in other countries." Testimony No. 33, pages 108, 109. Jesus sent his disciples into the highways and hedges for the poor, lame and blind, for publicans, harlots and sinners; but Mrs. White does not relish that kind. She wants them from "the ministers and higher classes," "the whole who need no physician," those who can bring talent and money into the cause. Where They Work. Adventists have the best success in new fields, where they are least known. Hence the western States is where they are most numerous. In New England, where they started, they have had to struggle hard to hold their own. In some of the older fields they have lost in numbers, in others the gain is very small. In hundreds of places where they were fair sized, active churches in the past, now no church at all, or a straggling, discouraged handful. Battle Creek is a fair illustration. This was their headquarters for forty years. Once there were 2,000 Sabbath keepers here, all united. Now there are less than 1,000, divided into four opposing parties, their influence entirely gone. The same is true elsewhere. About all the converts they make are at the outset. After a few years' acquaintance, they have no influence and few or none join them. Their churches grow smaller, generally, till they are unnoticed. The average membership of their churches is 29 - exceedingly small; how different from the evangelical churches! The longer these are in a town the stronger they grow, and the more influence they have generally. But Adventism does not wear.

How to Meet Adventism

People are led into Adventism from lack of information. Hence, when Adventism enters a town the people should be told plainly what it is, what its effects are, and wherein it is unscriptural. Quite generally pastors make a mistake in letting it alone for weeks, till it has gained a foothold. I always noticed that where the pastors united and worked against us on the start, we could do but little. So I would advise churches and pastors to take right hold of the matter earnestly as soon as people are interested in it. Preach on it; visit those who are being led away; hold Bible-readings; furnish them with proper books and tracts. Sit down patiently and answer arguments. Visit them again and again. Adventists will work a whole year, will go a hundred times, will give them scores of tracts to proselyte one person. If we would work a tenth as hard, scarcely one would be led away. People love to be noticed. The very attention they receive from the Adventists often wins them more than their arguments.

What Will Be Their End?

Adventism is founded on time, and time will kill it. It began by setting a definite time, 1844, for the end of the world, and failed. Now they hold that it must come in this generation beginning in 1844. This is only another way of time setting. In time all this will fail and overthrow their system. Then will come doubt, discouragement, divisions, apostasies, infidelity, and ruin to souls. This end is inevitable. The wider their influence now, the more terrible the disaster then. These wild, enthusiastic, fanatical moves which end in failure are the delight of Satan, as they bring disgrace upon the cause of Christ and end in infidelity. That such will be the end of Adventism I have not a

doubt.

Lack of Education and Talent Among the Adventist Leaders The men whom God has chosen to lead out in the great religious movements of the past have, with few exceptions, been men of high education, refinement, and great talents. Moses, the founder of Judaism, "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds." Acts 7:22. Nehemiah, who restored Jerusalem after the captivity, was cup-bearer to the king. Nehemiah 2. So Daniel, the great prophet, had "knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom." Daniel 1:17. He was prime minister of a mighty empire for many years. Paul was so renowned for his learning, that the king said to him: "Much learning doth make thee mad." Acts 26:24. He did for Christianity ten times more than all the other apostles together. It is to him, and not to the other apostles, that the Gentile world is indebted for Christianity. Then the twelve, though uneducated, had the advantage over all other reformers, that they were taught directly by the Son of God, and could work miracles.

St. Augustine, A.D. 353-430, the father of Christian theology, to whom the church owes almost as much as to Paul, was highly educated. As is well known, Luther was a thorough scholar, educated in the best schools of his day, and filled a professor's chair in a university. So Calvin and Melanchton were both profound scholars, occupying professor's chairs in halls of learning. Zwingle, the great Swiss reformer, was celebrated for his learning and scholarship. Wiclif [sp], the "Morning Star of the Reformation," was a graduate of Oxford, England, and a doctor of divinity. Cranmer, the great English reformer, was a graduate, a doctor of divinity, archbishop, and regent of the kingdom. Wesley, the father of Methodism, was a graduate of Oxford, a man of vast reading, the author or editor of commentaries, grammars, dictionaries, etc. It is a false idea that God generally uses ignorant men as leaders in reform, as the above great names will show.

Now look at the founders of our heretical sects. Joanna Southcott was wholly illiterate, a mere washer-woman. Ann Lee, the foundress of the Shakers, received no education, worked in a cotton factory, and was cook in a hospital. Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, received no education, and Brigham Young very little. Not one of these persons were of influence in the world, outside of their own deluded followers.

How is it with the leaders of Adventism? Wm. Miller, the founder, was reared in the backwoods, in poverty, and received only the poor advantages of a common district school. Except some general reading, this was the extent of his education.

Elder White, the leader of the Seventh-day Adventists' party, only secured sufficient education to teach a common district school. He was no student of books. In all my travels with him, I seldom saw him read half an hour in any book. Of the languages or the sciences he knew nothing, and little even of common history. Mrs. White received no school education, except a few weeks when a child. She, like Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee, and Joseph Smith, was wholly illiterate, not knowing the simplest rules of grammar. Not one of the leading men in that work ever graduated from college or university, and many are illiterate as Mrs. White herself. Elder J.N. Andrews, Elder Smith, and one or two more, by diligent study and reading out of school, became well informed men in their line. After Elder White came Elders Butler and Haskell as leaders, neither of them educated men, nor of half the natural talent of Elder White. The present leaders are small men also. Such men are poorly prepared to lead out in a great reformation in this educated age. Not a man among them has now, or ever had, a particle of influence in the world, or any office or

responsible position in state or nation. How different from the great reformers of the past, who often had extensive influence for good, not only with the masses, but with the great men and kings of earth. Hence, from whatsoever side we view Adventism, it has none of the marks of a genuine reformation sent of God to bless the world.

Elder A.A. Phelps, for years editor of a First-day Adventist paper says: "I watched and waited, and worked, with patience, meakness and loyalty, in hearty co-operation, and with an earnest desire to see such unity, enterprise, breadth and moral power, as ought to characterize a scriptural and heaven-inspired movement. How slowly and reluctantly I yielded to the conviction - forced by sad facts and illustrations that I have not even dared to detail - that I was only throwing away my life in stemming such waves of discord, indolence, looseness, narrowness, dogmatism and spiritual death as I could not overcome."

Reader, if you are still outside of this spiritual Babylon, take warning from those who have been through the mill, and stay out.

Later, 1914. Already strong men among them admit that, (1) Mrs. White had made many mistakes in her inspired (?) writing; (2) Now contradicts what she once wrote; (3) Has copied from many other authors what she claims as revelations from God; (4) Has often been influenced by others to write what they wanted to help their projects. Time has proved this so clearly that it can no longer be denied. Hence her revelations are steadily losing influence with their able men. She is now eighty-seven years old and is reported as having largely lost her mind. The laity, specially in foreign lands, being ignorant of all these facts, still regard her as the voice of God to them.

02.02. Chapter 2 - An Experience of Twenty-Eight Years in Adventism

Chapter 2 - An Experience of Twenty-Eight Years in Adventism

I long hesitated about bringing personal matters into this book, but could see no way to tell my story without it. My experience illustrates the power which error and superstition have over men. I am amazed at myself that I was held there so long, after my better judgment was convinced that it was an error. I propose to tell the simple facts, just as they were, hit whom they may. Public men become public property, and as such their conduct and work should be laid open and discussed. This is my reason for criticizing the course of Elder White and wife, and others. They invite criticism by claiming to be reformers, better than other people.

I was born in Kinderhook, Branch county, Mich., Sept. 22, 1840. I had no religious training till I was sixteen. I was converted among the Methodists under the labors of Rev. Mr. Hazzard, and baptized by him in 1858. I soon went to Albion, N.Y., to attend school. Here, in 1859, I heard Elder and Mrs. White. He preached on the Sabbath question. I was uneducated, and knew but little about the Bible. I had no idea of the relation between the Old and New Testaments, the law and the gospel, or the difference between the Sabbath and the Lord’s day. I thought he proved that the seventh day was still binding, and that there was no authority for keeping Sunday. As I was anxious to be right, I began keeping Saturday, but did not expect to believe any more of their doctrine. Of course I attended their meetings on Saturday and worked on Sunday. This separated me entirely from other Christians, and threw me wholly with the Adventists. I soon learned from them that all other churches were Babylon, in the dark and under the frown of God. Seventh-day Adventists were the only true people of God. They had "the truth," the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They defended Mr. Miller’s work of 1844, believed in the visions of Mrs. White, the sleep of the dead, the annihilation of the wicked, feet washing, etc. At first these things staggered me, and I thought of drawing back; but they explained them plausibly and smoothed them over, and said they were no test anyway. Having no one to intelligently aid me, I began to see things as they did, and in a few weeks came to believe the whole system. I was again baptized, as their converts from other churches generally are, so as to get clean out of Babylon. Persuaded that time was short, I gave up going to school, dropped the study of all else, listened to their preaching, devoured their books and studied my Bible day and night to sustain these new views. I was now an enthusiastic believer, and longed to convert everybody to the faith. I had not a doubt that it was the pure truth. This is about the experience of all who go with them, as I have since learned. In May, 1864, I was licensed to preach. Soon began with Elder Van Horn at Ithaca, Mich. We had good success; raised up three companies that year. In 1865 worked in Tuscola county, and had excellent success. Was ordained by Elder White that year. Up to this date I had not a doubt about the truthfulness of our faith. As I now began to see more of Elder White and wife, and the work at headquarters, I learned that there was much trouble with him. I saw that he ruled everything, and that all greatly feared him. I saw that he was often cross and unreasonable. This troubled me a

little, but not seriously. In 1866 I was sent to Maine with Elder J.N. Andrews, the ablest man among them. This was a big thing for me. I threw myself into the work with great enthusiasm, and was very happy. Elder Andrews was strong in the faith and very radical, and I partook of his spirit. We had excellent success. By this time I had become quite a writer. I returned to Battle Creek in 1867. At that time there was great trouble with Elder White, and many church meetings were held to investigate the matter. It was clear to me that he was wrong, but Mrs. White sustained him in her "Testimonies" and severely blamed the church. Elder Andrews and a few others proposed to stand up for the right, and take the consequences. My sympathies were with them; but others feared, and finally all wilted and confessed that "we have been blinded by Satan." This was signed by the leading ministers, and humbly adopted by the whole church. See "Testimonies," Vol. 1, page 612. This shook my faith a good deal, and I began to question Mrs. White's inspiration. I saw that her revelations always favored Elder White and herself. If any dared question their course, they soon received a scathing revelation denouncing the wrath of God against them.

About this time several of our able ministers, with quite a party in the West, drew off from the body, in opposition to Elder White and the visions. They were denounced as "rebels," were doomed to perdition, and it was predicted that they would soon come to ruin! But they have continued their work for about fifty years, having several thousand believers. Their headquarters are at Stanberry, Missouri, where they publish two papers, books, etc. They have done a good work in exposing the fallacy of Mrs. White's inspiration. But I dared not open my mind to a soul. I was only a youth, and had little experience. Older and stronger men had broken down and confessed. What could I do? I said nothing, but felt terribly. I wished I had never heard of the Adventists. Shortly I was back on my field in Maine. Busy with my work, preaching our doctrine, and surrounded with men who firmly believed it, I soon got over my doubts. I have since learned that scores of others have gone through a similar trial. In 1868 I went to Massachusetts. Being away from the trouble at headquarters, I got on finely. But in May, 1869, I was in Battle Creek for a month. Things were in bad shape. Elder White was in trouble with most of the leading men, and they with him. I was well convinced that he was the real cause of it all, but Mrs. White sustained him, and that settled it. They were God's chosen leaders, and must not be criticized or meddled with. I felt sad. I was working hard to get men into "the truth," as we called it; to persuade them that this was a people free from the faults of other churches; then to see such a state of things among the leaders disheartened me greatly. So far, I myself had had no trouble with any one, and Elder White had been very cordial to me. But I saw then that if I ever came to be of any prominence in the work I should have to expect the same treatment from him that all of the others got. The more I saw of the work, the more objections I saw to it. I will not stop to give them here, as I will give them together in Chapter V.

I had been so thoroughly drilled in the Advent doctrines that I firmly believed the Bible taught them all. To give up the Advent faith was to give up the Bible. So all my brethren said, and so I thought. That year I went to Iowa to work, where I remained four years, laboring with Elder Butler, who soon became president of their general conference. We had good success and raised up several churches. I finally opened my mind to Elder Butler, and told him my fears. I knew these things troubled him as well as myself, for we often spoke of them. He helped me some, and again I gathered courage and went on, feeling better. Still, I came to see each year more and more that somehow the thing did not work as I had supposed it would and ought. Wherever Elder White and

wife went they were always in trouble with the brethren, and the best ones, too. I came to dread to meet them, or have them come where I was, for I knew there would be trouble with some one or some thing, and it never failed of so being. I saw church after church split up by them, the best brethren discouraged and maddened and driven off, while I was compelled to apologize for them continually. For years about this time, the main business at all our big meetings was to listen to the complaints of Elder White against his brethren. Not a leading man escaped - Andrews, Waggoner, Smith, Loughborough, Amadon, Cornell, Aldrich, Walker, and a host of others had to take their turn at being broken on the wheel. For hours at a time, and times without number, I have sat in meetings and heard Elder White and wife denounce these men, till I felt there was little manhood left in them. It violated all my ideas of right and justice, and stirred my indignation. Yet, whatever vote was asked by Elder White, we all voted it unanimously, I with the rest. Then I would go out alone and hate myself for my cowardice, and despise my brethren for their weakness.

Elder and Mrs. White ran and ruled everything with an iron hand. Not a nomination to office, not a resolution, not an item of business was ever acted upon in business meetings until all had been first submitted to Elder White for his approval. Till years later, we never saw an opposition vote on any question, for no one dared to do it. Hence, all official voting was only a farce. The will of Elder White settled everything. If any one dared to oppose anything, however humbly, Elder White or wife quickly squelched him. Long years of such training taught people to let their leaders think for them; hence, they are under as complete subjection as are the Catholics.

These, with other things, threw me into doubt and discouragement, and tempted me to quit the work. I saw many an able minister and scores of valuable men leave us because they would not stand such treatment. I envied the faith and confidence of brethren who went on ignorant of all this, supposing that Battle Creek was a little heaven, when, in fact, it was as near purgatory as anything I could imagine. Many poor souls have gone there full of faith and hope, but have soon gone away infidels. In 1872 I went to Minnesota, where I had good success. By this time I had written much, and so was well known to all our people. In July, 1873, myself and wife went to Colorado to spend a few weeks with Elder White and wife, in the mountains. I soon found things very unpleasant living in the family. Now my turn had come to catch it, but instead of knuckling down, as most of the others had, I told the elder my mind freely. That brought us into open rupture. Mrs. White heard it all, but said nothing. In a few days she had a long written "testimony" for wife and me. It justified her husband in everything, and placed us as rebels against God, with no hope of heaven only by a full surrender to them. Wife and I read it over many times with tears and prayers; but could see no way to reconcile it with truth. It contained many statements which we knew were false. We saw that it was dictated by a spirit of retaliation, a determination to break our wills or crush us. For awhile we were in great perplexity, but still my confidence in much of the doctrine and my fear of going wrong held me; but I was perfectly miserable for weeks, not knowing what to do. However, I preached awhile in Colorado and then went to California, where I worked with my hands for three months, trying to settle what to do. Elders Butler, Smith, White and others wrote to us, and tried to reconcile us to the work. Not knowing what else to do, I finally decided to forget all my objections, and go along as before. So we confessed to Elder White all we could possibly, and he generously forgave us! But from that on my faith in the inspiration of Mrs. White was weak. Elder White was very friendly to me again after that.

Now the Adventists say that I have left them five times, and this is one of the five. It is utterly untrue. I simply stopped preaching for a few weeks, but did not withdraw from the church nor renounce the faith. If this is leaving them, then most of their leading men have left them, too, for they all have had their periods of trial when they left their work awhile. About 1856, Elders J.N. Andrews and J.N. Loughborough, who were then the most prominent ministers among them, and several other persons, left the work and went into business at Waukon, Iowa. Mrs. White gave an account of this in "Experience and Views," pages 219-222. Elder White and wife went there, and, after a long effort, brought them back. Mrs. White says: "A dissatisfied party had settled in Waukon.... Brother J.N. Loughborough in discouragement had gone to work at his trade. He was just about to purchase land," etc., page 222. These men did just what I did.

Elder Uriah Smith, by far the ablest man then in their ranks, also had his seasons of doubt, when he ceased to work, and engaged in secular employments. Hear his own confession: "That I have had in my experience occasional periods of trial, I do not deny. There have been times when circumstances seemed very perplexing; when the way to harmonize apparently conflicting views did not at once appear, and under what have seemed for the time strong provocations to withdraw from the work, I have canvassed the question how far this could reasonably be done, or how much of this work could consistently be surrendered." Replies to Elder Canright, page 107. His own words show that he has doubted different parts of the theory, the same as I did. For years we were on intimate terms; often traveled and labored together. We freely talked over these matters. His doubts and trials were very similar to my own. This ran through a long period of years, till it was feared that he would quit them entirely. His wife was nearly driven to insanity over similar trials. Finally they broke down, "confessed" the same as I did once, and now profess to be satisfied. He wrote to me that he had to endorse Mrs. White’s visions out of policy. The thing is so unreasonable, that most of them at times are more or less troubled over it, just as I was. In the language of J.W. Morton, "I pity their delusions, and abominate the spiritual tyranny by which they and others are held to the most unscriptural dogmas. Even Mr. Smith, for whom, however he may denounce me, I entertain only the most kindly feelings, is in a position that calls for tender commiseration. He is expected, as the great man of the denomination (for he undoubtedly is by far the ablest man they have), to give a full and explicit endorsement of Mrs. White’s claims of inspiration; and yet whoever scans his public utterances on this point - especially he who has skill to ’read between the lines’ - can see that his endorsement is so feeble as to be no endorsement at all. Such a position is one in which I would not place my worst enemy. He is, in part at least, under the heel of a spiritual tyranny. Oh, that Uriah Smith had the courage, and the manliness, to assert, before God and man, his right to that ’soul liberty’ which is the inheritance of every child of God!"

Elder Geo. I. Butler, who for many years took the place of Elder White as leader of the denomination, got into trial with his brethren, and, practically, out of the work. Till middle life he was a small farmer. Naturally he was a humble, good man, with a strong sense of fairness. Elder White became jealous of him. Later, Mrs. White also turned against him and required a servile submission which he would not make. Said when he could not be an Adventist, and be a man, then he would be a man, as others had decided. Disappointed and soured, under pretext of ill-health, he went off to Florida on a little farm - another example of the blighting effect of Adventism. He is now doing what I did two or three times, only from a different cause. Has he, then, left them? In 1874 Elder White had arranged to have a big debate held at Napa City, Cal.,

between Elder Miles Grant, of Boston, Mass., and one of our ministers. Though Elder White and wife, Elder Cornell and Elder Loughborough, their ablest men, were there, they selected myself to defend our side, which I did for about a week, while the other ministers sat by. I mention this to show the confidence they had in me, though I had been in so great a trial but a few months before. In 1875 we returned to Michigan. Elder Butler was now out with Elder White, who took every possible opportunity to snub him; but I was in high favor, was sent to attend their state meetings in Vermont, Kansas, Ohio and Indiana. With Elder Smith, was sent as delegate to the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference. In 1876 I was sent to Minnesota, then to Texas, and so on through most of the Southern States, to look after our interests there. Each year greater responsibilities were laid upon me. That year I raised up a large church at Rome, New York, and labored over the State. Went with Elder White and wife to Indiana and Illinois, and was then sent to Kansas to hold a debate, and to Missouri for the same purpose. This year I was elected a member of the General Conference Committee of three, with Elder White and Elder Haskell, and continued on the committee two years. It is the highest official authority in the denomination. In 1877 I went to New England, where I raised up two churches and did other work. I spent 1878 in general work in various States, as Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Colorado, and Ohio. In the fall was president of the Ohio conference. In 1879 labored in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee. At the general conference at Battle Creek in the fall, things were in a bad shape. Elder White was cross, and Mrs. White bore down heavy on several ministers. Harshness, fault-finding and trials were the order of the day. I felt that there was very little of the spirit of Christ present. I got away as quickly as possible. I saw more and more clearly that a spirit of oppression, criticism, distrust and dissension was the result of our work, instead of meekness, gentleness, and love among brethren. For the next whole year these feelings grew upon me, till I began to fear we were doing more harm than good. My work called me among old churches, where I could see the fruit of it. Generally they were cold and dead, backslidden, or in a quarrel, or nearly extinct, where once they had been large and flourishing churches. I lost heart to raise up more churches to go in the same way. One day I would decide to quit them entirely, and the next day I would resolve to go on and do the best I could. I never suffered more mental anguish in my life. I labored that year in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio. In the fall of 1880 I resolved to leave the Adventists, and, if I could, go with some other church. I was president of the Ohio conference. Our annual state meeting was at Clyde, Ohio. Elder and Mrs. White were there. My mind was made up to leave them as soon as the meeting was over. Against my protest they re-elected me president. Mrs. White urged it. Said I was just the man for the place; yet her special claim is to be able to reveal the hidden wrongs in the church. Here was an important matter. Why did she not have a revelation about it? No, I was all right so far as she knew. The next week I resigned, went east, and wrote Elder White that I would go with them no longer. Then she sent me a long written revelation, denouncing me as a child of hell, and one of the wickedest of men, though only two weeks before she thought me fit to be president of a conference! For three months I taught elocution. I knew not what to do. I talked with ministers of other churches, but they did not seem to know how to help me. I could settle on nothing. I held on to my Christianity and love for Christ and the Bible, and preached and worked as I had opportunity. I was glad I had decided to leave the Adventists, and felt much better. Finally I met my present wife, who was an Adventist. Then I had a long talk with Elder Butler, Elder White, Mrs. White and others, and was persuaded that things were not as I had imagined. They said I was in the dark, led

by Satan, and would go to ruin. All the influence of old friends, associations, habits and long cultivated ideas came up and were too strong for my better judgment. I yielded, and resolved again to live and die with them. In my judgment and conscience I was ashamed of the surrender I had made, yet I tried to feel right and go on.

Death of Elder White

Early in 1881 I went with Elder White to New York. By this time he had lost the leadership of the people. Elders Butler and Haskell had taken his place, and hence he was very hostile to them, working against them, and planning all the while to get them out and get back in again himself. But the people had largely lost confidence in him as a leader. He wished me to work with him against them, saying that we would then be on the General Conference Committee together. He had good grounds to oppose Haskell, who was always a crafty, underhanded man. Elder White wrote me thus: "February 11, 1881 - I wish Elder Haskell were an open, frank man, so I need not watch him." Again: "Battle Creek, Mich., May 24, 1881 - ...Elders Butler and Haskell have had an influence over her [his wife] that I hope to see broken. It has nearly ruined her. These men must not be suffered by our people to do as they have done... I want you to unite with me... It is time there was a change in the offices of the General Conference. I trust that if we are true and faithful, the Lord will be pleased that we should constitute two of that board."

I could give much more to show how little confidence the leading men had in each other. I wrote Elder White that I could not unite with him nor work with him. July 13, 1881, he wrote me again: "I have repeatedly abused you, and if you go to destruction, where many, to say the least, are willing you should go, I should ever feel that I had taken a part in your destruction.... I do not see how any man can labor with me." Soon after this he died. I have no doubt that Elder White believed in the Advent doctrine, and persuaded himself that he was called of God to be a leader. He had some excellent qualities, and doubtless meant to be a Christian, but his strong desire to rule and run everything, together with an irritable temper, kept him always in trouble with some one. No one could work with him long in peace. Elder Butler told me that his death was providential to save the body from a rupture. Mrs. White was so offended at Butler, that she would have no communication with him for a long while. All these things helped me to see that I was being led by selfish, ambitious men, who were poor samples of religious reformers. That year I labored in Canada, Vermont, Maine, New England, and Michigan, and was elected member of the State Executive Committee of Michigan that fall. I worked another year in Michigan. But I was unhappy; I could not get over my doubts; I had no heart in the work. Several leading ministers in the State felt about the same. I then decided to quietly drop out of the ministry and go to farming. This I did for two years, but retained my membership with the church and worked right along with them. But I was in purgatory all the time, trying to believe what I could not. Yet I was not settled on any other church, and feared I might go wrong and so stood still. In the fall of 1884, Elder Butler, my old friend, and now at the head of the Advent work, made a great effort to get me reconciled and back at work again. He wrote me several times, to which I made no answer. Finally he telegraphed me, and paid my fare to a camp-meeting. Here I met old friends and associations, tried to see things as favorable as possible, heard explanations, etc., etc., till at last I yielded again. I was sick of an undecided position. I thought I could do some good here anyway; all my friends were here, I believed much of the doctrine still, and I might go to ruin if I left them, etc. Now I resolved to swallow all my doubts, believe the whole thing anyway, and stay with them for better or for worse.

So I made a strong confession, of which I was ashamed before it was cold. Was I satisfied? No. Deep in my heart I was ashamed of myself, but tried to feel that it was not so. But soon I felt better, because I had decided. Gradually my faith came back, till I again really felt strong in the whole doctrine, and had no idea I should ever leave it again. In a few weeks I was sent to attend large meetings in Pennsylvania, New York, Minnesota, Iowa, and New England; assisted in revival meetings in Battle Creek; was appointed with Elder Butler to lecture before the ministers on how to labor successfully; conducted a similar course in the Academy at South Lancaster, Mass.; was at the state meetings in New York, Michigan, Indiana and Ohio. In the spring of 1886 was appointed to lecture before the theological class in the Battle Creek College, and Associate Editor of the 'Sickle'. By my urgent appeal, an effort was made to bring up our ministers to some plan of study in which they are very deficient. I was on the committee to arrange this. I selected the course of studies and framed all the questions, by which they were to be examined. I was then furnished a shorthand reporter, and in the summer was sent to ten different states, namely, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kansas, Colorado, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, and Michigan, to attend their state conferences, examine their ministers, report their meetings for the daily press, etc., and this I did. In our conflict with the Disciples at Des Moines, Iowa, it was agreed that each side should select a representative man and hold a debate on the Sabbath question. They selected Professor D.R. Dungan, president of Drake University. Our people selected me. We expected a notable time, and I made every possible effort to be ready. That preparation did much to convince me of the unsoundness of some of our positions on the covenants, the two laws, etc. In our General Conference that fall, a sharp division occurred between our leading men over the law in Galatians. One party held it was the ceremonial law, the other the moral law - a square contradiction. After a long and warm discussion the conference closed, each party more confident than before. There was also much disagreement over other points of doctrine, and a good deal of warm party feeling. This, with other things, brought up my old feelings of doubt, and decided me that it was time for me now to examine and think for myself, and not be led nor intimidated by men who could not agree among themselves.

I used every minute I could get for several weeks, carefully and prayerfully examining all the evidence on the Sabbath, the law, the sanctuary, the visions, etc., till I had not a doubt left that the Seventh-day Advent faith was a delusion. Then I laid the matter before the leading men at Battle Creek, resigned all the positions I held, and asked to be dismissed from the church. This was granted February 17, 1887. That was the first and only time I ever withdrew from the church, nor was any charge ever made against me during the twenty-eight years I was with them. As soon as I took my stand firmly, to be a free man and think for myself, a great burden, which I had carried all these years, rolled off. I felt like a new man. At last I was out of bondage. I have never for a moment regretted the step I took.

They now report that I left them four or five times before, and then went back. This is entirely untrue. From the time I joined them, in 1859, till I withdrew, in 1887, I remained in good standing in that church. After I was licensed to preach in 1864, my credentials were renewed each year except one, when I was farming and did not ask for them. Till I left them, in 1887, I never preached nor wrote against them once; nor did I unite with any other church, nor teach any doctrine contrary to theirs. Let them deny any of these statements if they can. They say I may yet return to them. They know better. The moment I took my stand decidedly, that matter was settled forever. The fact that I

remained with them under all these trials for twenty-eight years, shows that I am not a vacillating man, as they now try to think.

Why I Did Not Leave Them Sooner

I am often asked why I did not leave them sooner. Why it took me so long to find that it was an error. Then the Adventists affirm that I must have been dishonest while with them, or I am dishonest now. They say I am an apostate now, because I left them and joined the Baptists. My answer is this: If to change one's opinion and join another church makes one an apostate, then more than half their members are apostates, for they have come from other churches to join the Adventists. Again, they circulate and commend highly a book called "Fifty Years in Rome," written by a man who was many years a learned priest in the Roman church. They say that his high standing and long experience in that church makes his book invaluable. But they say that the fact that I was with them in high standing so long, and now have left them, only proves that I am a hypocrite!

Any candid man can see the inconsistency of their positions. I united with the Adventists when I was a mere boy, uneducated, with no knowledge of the Bible, of history, or of other churches. I went into it through ignorance. For years my zeal for that faith, and my unbounded confidence in its leaders, blinded me to their errors. But, as I grew older, read my Bible more, read history, met with other churches, heard sermons and read books against Adventism, became better acquainted with our leaders, with the inside workings of the church, learned more about its unfavorable origin, the many mistakes we had made, saw the fruit of it in old churches, on families and society, got hold of the early writings of Mrs. White and others; gradually I began to see that Adventism was not just what I had first supposed it to be. When I embraced it in 1859, Seventh-day Adventism was only fourteen years old, the believers were few, and it was comparatively untried. But when Adventism was twenty-five years older, ten times as large, and had fully developed its spirit and shown its fruits, when I had had the education, observation and experience of a quarter of a century, I think my judgment in the matter ought to be worth more than when I embraced it as a green boy.

Again, it was only during the last few years that I gained possession of early Adventist documents, which show how they now deny and contradict what they once taught. These are now either suppressed or kept out of sight, so that not one in a thousand of them knows or will believe that they ever existed. My doubts of the system did not come to me all at once and clearly. It was well known that for the last dozen years I was with them, I was greatly troubled over these things. Gradually, year by year, the evidence accumulated, till at last it overbalanced the doctrine, and then reluctantly and sorrowfully I had to abandon and renounce it. God pity the soul that has to go through what I did to be honest to his convictions of right.

Positions Which I Held When I Left Them

Notwithstanding it was well known to all that I frequently had serious doubts about their faith, yet, as soon as I took hold with them again, each time they immediately put me forward and set me at the most important work. Elder Butler says: "He doubtless would have been [elected to important office] had he not proved himself unreliable in so many instances. His ability would have justified it." Review and Herald Extra, Nov. 22, 1887. Suppose, now, that I had been an office-seeking

man, caring more for place and position than for truth and conscience, what would I have done? I would have gone right along, pretending to be full in faith and in harmony with them. But instead of this, time and again, I went directly to their influential men, Elders White, Butler, Haskell, etc., and told them my doubts. Let candid men judge of my motives. The day I left them I held the following positions: Was teacher of theology in their college at Battle Creek, where I had a class of nearly two hundred of their best young people; was associate editor of the Gospel Sickle; was writing the lessons for all their Sabbath Schools throughout the world; had the charge of some eighteen churches in Michigan; was member of the Executive Committee of the International Sabbath School Association; member of the Executive Committee of the Michigan State Sabbath School Association; and at the last session of the general conference was chairman of the International Sabbath School Association, and was on nine different committees, several of them the most important in the conference, as the one on distribution of laborers over all the world, the theological committee, the one on camp meetings, on a special course of study in our college, on the improvement of the ministry, etc. This shows what they thought of my ability. I had just gotten out a new pamphlet, "Critical Notes," of which they printed an edition of 10,000 after I left them. Others of my works they have revised, left my name off, and use them still. Why reprint mine after I have left them and renounced what they teach? They now say that my writings are cheap and worthless. But while I was with them they published over twenty different productions of mine, and circulated hundreds of thousands of them, translated several of them into other languages, and paid me hundreds of dollars for them. Strange that all at once I have become so imbecile, and my writings so worthless. Any one can see the animus of all this.

Elder Smith, in Replies to Canright, page 25, says I left them at a time when my withdrawal embarrassed them more than it would have done at any other time. This confesses that I was becoming more and more useful to them, and all know that I was. At the time I left I was getting higher pay than ever before, and was on friendly terms with all. All the leading men, as Butler, Haskell, Smith, etc., were my warm personal friends, ready to do all in their power to assist me. Had I desired office, or better position, all I had to do was to go right along without wavering, and positions would come to me faster than I could fill them. But if I left them, where could I go? What could I do? How even make a living? I took this all in, and it required all the courage and faith in God I could master to take the risk.

It cost me a terrible struggle and a great sacrifice, for in doing it I had to leave all my life-long friends, the cherished hopes of my youth, the whole work of my life, all the means of my support, every honorable position I held, and bring upon myself reproach, hatred and persecution. I had to begin life anew, among strangers, with untried methods, uncertain where to go or what to do. No one who has not tried it can ever begin to realize the fearful struggle it requires. It is the dread of all this which holds many with them who are yet dissatisfied where they are. I know that this is so, for many have confessed it to me, and yet remained where they were. Anyone of candor and fairness can see readily that self-interest and personal ambition would have held me with them. Yet, as soon as I did leave them, though I went out quietly and peaceably, and let them entirely alone, and even spoke favorably of them, they immediately attributed to me all sorts of evil motives, base sins, and ambitious designs. They seemed to feel it a sacred duty to blast my reputation, and destroy my influence, if possible. "Apostate" was the epithet all applied to me. I was compared to Baalam, to Kora, Dathan and Abiram, to Judas, Demas, and a whole list of evil

characters. Not one honest or worthy motive was granted me. The meanest and wickedest reports were circulated as to what I had done or said - things that I would despise even to think of. Yet all were eagerly accepted and believed as undoubted truth. But I expected it, for it is the way all are treated who dare to leave them and give a reason for it.

During the twenty years now since I left them, they have had spies constantly on my track, who have watched and reported the least thing I have said or done, to torture it into evil, if possible. This they circulate to the ends of the earth, and it comes back to me in newspapers and letters. They have issued four different publications against me, and Mrs. White, in her last "revelation," has devoted three articles to myself! Yet I don't amount to anything; never did! "Sour grapes," you see. It has been widely reported that I was smitten with a terrible disease, had broken up my church, been expelled from the denomination, and more yet, concerning all which the Lord judge between us. The pastors of all the churches here, and public men of the place have had to make written statements to meet these attacks in distant states. Sometimes this has seemed hard to bear, but knowing that I was right, I have had grace and patience to keep steadily at my work, and leave the rest with God and my friends.

I am in constant receipt of letters from all parts of the country, saying that the Adventists affirm that I have asked to be taken back among them! They will report it till I die, and long after. This book shall be my answer. They are so certain that the curse of God will follow all who leave them, or that they will become infidels, or return to them, that they cannot be reconciled to have it otherwise. A Sample Letter

"Glenwood Springs, Colo., March 29, 1889. D.M. Canright, Otsego, Mich.: My Dear Friend and Brother - If the lightning's shivering crash had torn my scalp loose from my head, I would not have been more surprised than I was today by having placed in my hands your pamphlet entitled "The Jewish Sabbath." I have read after you for years, sold your valuable works, and preached the "Third Angel's Message." Now, I wish to ask you, how do our people treat you? To my knowledge you were a great favorite, and quoted oftener than any standing near the head. Do they go back on you as hard as they did on Snook? I suppose that your great research and life-long study of the subject in hand goes for nothing with them, and that you are classed among the fallen angels. F.A.B."

Ordained a Baptist Minister

April 19, 1887, at Otsego, Mich., where I had lived for eight years, I was ordained as a minister of the Regular Baptist Church, by an exceptionally large council, composed of several of the ablest ministers of the state. The 'Otsego Union' of that date says: "Regularly appointed delegates were present from Baptist churches in Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Plainwell, Three Rivers, White Pigeon, Allegan, Battle Creek, Paw Paw, Hickory Corners, Prairieville and Otsego. Rev. A.E. Mather, D.D., of Battle Creek, was elected moderator of the council, and Rev. T.M. Shanafelt, D.D., of Three Rivers, secretary. The order of exercises was as follows: Reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. H.A. Rose, of Kalamazoo; prayer, by Rev. D. Mulhern, D.D., of Grand Rapids; ordination sermon, by Rev. Kendall Brooks, D.D., President of Kalamazoo College; prayer of ordination, by Rev. M.W. Haynes, of Kalamazoo, with laying on of hands by Rev. H.B. Taft, of White Pigeon, Rev. E.A. Gay, of Allegan, and Rev. H.A. Rose, of Kalamazoo; hand of fellowship, by Rev. T.F. Babcock, of Prairieville; charge to the pastor, by Rev. L.B. Fish, of Paw Paw; charge to the church,

by Rev. I. Butterfield, of Grand Rapids.

"Rev. D.M. Canright has thus been fully recognized by a large and representative council as a regular Baptist minister, and pastor of the Baptist church in Otsego."

I have never regretted leaving the Adventists, nor for one moment had the slightest desire to return.

02.03. Chapter 3 - Adventism: A Yoke of Bondage

Chapter 3 - Adventism: A Yoke of Bondage

Largely, people are drawn into the Seventh-day doctrine through fear, fear of being damned if they refuse. Once in, they try to feel happy, but very few really are. With a large class, the more intelligent ones, there are so many doubts and fears, such a sensible want of something which they do not find, that they are unhappy. Many of their ministers have gone through the same trials that I have, and scores have left them, as I did, while others have fixed it up and remained with them. Elder White himself had doubts. Mrs. White says of him: "He should make it a rule not to talk unbelief or discouragement." "My husband has cherished this darkness so long by living over the unhappy past, that he has but little power to control his mind when dwelling upon these things." Testimonies, Vol. III, pages 96, 97. Mrs. White herself, as we might expect, is troubled with infidelity. She says: "In the night I have awakened my husband, saying, 'I am afraid that I shall become an infidel.'" Testimonies, Vol. I, page 597. Nearly all their prominent ministers had their time of trial, the same as I did, when they ceased preaching and went at other work, as we have seen.

I will quote a few words from letters received: "I have had many blue times in my experience because of these doubts.... Once I decided that I must follow the convictions of my own judgment in these things; but when the time came the pressure was so strong that I tried to convince myself that I was wrong.... The facts are, I am just miserable.... It seems like a terrible thing to take a course that will cause all the cherished friends of this world to look upon you as one fallen from grace; and here I am, bound with these chains." Another writes: "It seems to me that the views held by Seventh-day Adventists are so burdensome that they will crush me. They are a yoke of bondage which I cannot stand up under. Still I do want to be right." Another minister, D.H. Lamson, writes: "How am I straightened, while the fetters are being forged for most unwilling limbs!... What distress we are in as a people! how miserable! and is there no relief?" And still another talented minister, W.C. Gage, writes me: "Our ministers, and people as well, are growing to be a denomination of hypocrites, by a slavish fear of expressing an honest belief.... I am sick and disheartened.... The basis of confidence is gone, and I shall only await the outcome of the matter." Still another, Uriah Smith, writes: "There is a fear, on the part of the powers that be, of free thought and free discussion. So far as this is the case, it is a shame and disgrace to us." And yet these brethren patch up the matter some way, and go right on as though nothing were wrong. I know how to pity them, for I myself have passed through precisely the same experience. And another writes: "I wish I had never heard the Advent doctrine preached. Previous to that, I know that I did enjoy the blessing of God. I was not troubled about doctrine.... I think I then had some influence for good over others, but I fear my change of faith had a bad influence over my children." Strange to say, these are the very men who now denounce me the worst because I had the courage of my convictions, while they haven't.

These are fair samples of how scores among them feel, from men in leading positions, to the humblest in the church. Largely they keep it to themselves, but occasionally it will out. Many of them almost get out, and then fall back, to linger along in bondage all the rest of their lives. "But if these persons are in such bondage, why not break loose, and be free? Who would harm them? Be it remembered that there is a bondage worse than African slavery - the bondage of religious tyranny and superstition. I was held there for years, and know its power.

Milton F. Gowell, Chicago, gives so true a picture of Advent experience, that I quote him in a letter to me. I was often at his father's house, in Portland, Me.; when he was a boy. He says: "My recollections of those days are full of the terrors of law, prophetic charts, Mrs. White's visions, the Sabbath, Sabbath, Sabbath, health reform, bloomer dresses, and a great zeal for being industrious on Sunday, and little or nothing of Christ. All the DOING was indelibly impressed on my mind as a boy, but the BELIEVING on Christ for salvation, and RESTING in his finished work, I have no remembrance of whatever. How many there are that join the Seventh-day Adventists utterly unsaved, knowing nothing of the grace of God, hearing always barely the law. I joined them at the age of fourteen, under conviction, guilty before God, but unsaved, though I was baptized and received into the church as a SABBATH KEEPER. I received no peace, no rest, till I entered into rest by believing about three and a half years ago; saved from the borderland of infidelity." This is just the impression which all the children of that people are receiving - cold legalism. While this young man was finally saved from infidelity, hundreds of them are not, as I well know.

Prominent Persons Who Have Left the Adventists

It is nothing new for men to leave a party, good or bad; but so large a number of prominent persons have left the Adventists as to excite surprise. It is clear that there must be something wrong in the system itself. First, according to the best of my judgment, from one-third to one-half of all who begin the observance of the Sabbath, sooner or later abandon it. At different times large numbers have left them, mostly on account of Mrs. White's visions. We will name a few of the ministers who have departed from them: J.B. Cook and T.M. Preble, the pioneers who started the movement, both renounced it; O.R.L. Crozier, Ann Arbor, Mich., has renounced the Sabbath; Elder B.F. Snook, the leading man in Iowa, is now a Universalist; Elder W.H. Brinkerhoof, of Iowa, has renounced the faith; Elder Moses Hull, the ablest speaker they ever had, is now a Spiritualist, and Elder Shortridge, a minister of much talent, has also gone the same way; Elders Hall and Stephenson, at the time very prominent in the work, went to the Age-to-Come party; C.B. Reynolds, of New York, has become a noted blasphemer; Elder H.C. Blanchard, Avilla, Mo., renounced the doctrine; ditto T.J. Butler, of the same state; Elder L.L. Howard, Maine, H.F. Haynes, New Hampshire, left them; Nathan Fuller, Wellsville, N.Y., became a libertine; M.B. Czechowski went to Europe and died in disgrace; H.F. Case, Elder Cranmer and Philip Strong, all of Michigan, left them.

Elder J.B. Frisbie, their pioneer and most efficient preacher for years in Michigan, finally left them. Dr. Lee, of Minnesota, who inaugurated the work among the Swedes, now opposes them. Elder A.B. Oyen, missionary to Europe, and editor of their Danish paper, has renounced the faith. Living right at the head of the work for many years, he had the best of opportunity to know all about its workings. Elder D.B. Oviatt, for many years president of the Pennsylvania Conference, renounced the faith, and is now a Baptist minister. So Elder Rosquist and Elder Whitelaw, both of Minnesota,

have recently left them and gone to the Baptists. Other ministers of the West have also gone over to the Baptists. C.A. Russell, Otsego, Mich., an excellent man, once preached that doctrine with me, but is now a Methodist. H.E. Carver, H.C. Blanchard, J.W. Cassady, A.C. Long, Jacob Brinkerhoof, J.C. Day, H.W. Ball, Goodenough, Bunch, and others, once members of that church, have written against it. Elder Hiram Edson and Elder S.W. Rhodes, noted pioneers in the work, died confirmed cranks, and a trial to the church. The sad example of their leading ministers who have been guilty of adultery, proves that their church has nothing to boast of over other churches in the purity of its ministers and members. Their College Professors

They have been very unfortunate in their college professors. Professor S.S. Brownsburger, the first Principal of their College at Battle Creek, Mich., which position he occupied for years, and then filled the same position in their college in California, is now wholly disconnected from the work. Elder W.H. Littlejohn, who next stood at the head of the college, was expelled from the church and fell into doubts. Next came Professor A. McLearn as head of the college. He has renounced the faith, and now opposes them strongly. Professor Vesey, a learned teacher in that college, has forsaken the faith. Professor C.C. Ramsy, born in that faith, was professor of mathematics in the Battle Creek college for three years; then filled the same place for three years in their college in California; then was called to take charge of their academy in the East, which he did for three years more. He was editor of their educational journal, prominent in Sabbath School work, and many other ways. He has renounced that faith, but remains an earnest Christian. Others of their teachers of lesser note have also left them. What is the cause of such results? There must be something wrong. Their Physicians

They have been equally unfortunate with their physicians in their sanitarium at Battle Creek. Dr. H.S. Ley, an excellent man, was the first physician-in- chief. He left the institution in a trial, and was out of work for years. Dr. Wm. Russell, a talented doctor, came next. What he there saw of Adventism made him an infidel, and he was dismissed. Next, I believe, came Dr. M.G. Kellogg. The treatment he received drove him into scepticism for years. Then came Dr. Sprague and Dr. Farfield, both of whom renounced the faith, and, I believe, are sceptical now. Mrs. Lamson and Miss Fellows, both matrons of the sanitarium, lost faith in the doctrine. Dr. Smith, brought up in the faith, renounced it. Here again we see that education unfits men for Adventism. I am not acquainted with another church which has lost so large a proportion of its most prominent men. Every year, nearly, so far, more or less have gone away from them, till they have lost more talent than now remains with them.

It Leads to Infidelity A strong argument with Adventists is, that most of those who leave them become infidels, as all know. But, after long watching, I became satisfied that it is Adventism which has made them infidels. Look at Romanism. Wherever it has had sway a while, it filled the land with infidels. Go among the Mormons at Salt Lake. Large numbers of their children are becoming infidels. The natural rebound from fanaticism and superstition is into infidelity and scepticism. Right here in Otsego we have several infidels, the grown-up children of Adventists. I know them and meet them all over the country, and their numbers are increasing. I feel sure that the ripe fruit of Adventism in the years to come will be a generation of doubters. Their Church Backsliding

Seventh-day Adventists claim to be raised up of God, to reform the church of to-day. They claim to be purer, more spiritual, and on a higher plane than other Christians. All other churches are

Babylon and apostates, while they are the chosen saints. But now, after their church has had only fifty years trial, and hence is still small and young, and so ought to be better than older and larger churches, I can quote confessions from their own writers, proving that they are as wordly, backslidden and corrupt as they make out other churches to be. I will give a few. Elder G.I. Butler, in the Advent Review, May 10, 1887, says: "A terrible stupor like that which enveloped the disciples in the Saviour's agony in the garden, seems to hang over the mass of our people." Mrs. White, in Testimonies, Vol. I, says: "The Spirit of the Lord has been dying away from the church," page 113; "The churches have nearly lost their spirituality and faith," page 119; "I saw the dreadful fact that God's people were conformed to the world with no distinction, except in name," page 133; "Covetousness, selfishness, love of money, and love of the world, are all through the ranks of Sabbath-keepers," page 140; "Vital godliness is lacking," page 153; "There is but little love for one another. A selfish spirit is manifest. Discouragement has come upon the church," page 166; "Spirituality and devotion are rare," page 469. Many of them are not even honest. She says: "As I saw the spirit of defrauding, of over-reaching, of meanness, even among some professed Sabbath-keepers, I cried out in anguish," page 480; "There is but little praying. In fact, prayer is almost obsolete," page 566; "Not one in twenty of those who have a good standing with Seventh-day Adventists, is living out the self-sacrificing principles of the word of God." page 632. Of the Battle Creek church she says: "I can select family after family of children in this house, every one of whom is as corrupt as hell itself." "Right here in this church corruption is teeming on every hand," Vol. II, pages 360, 361; "Sin and vice exist in Sabbath-keeping families," page 391; "We have a dwarfed and defective ministry," Vol. IV, page 441. In Testimony, No. 33, just published, Mrs. White says: "There is a deplorable lack of spirituality among our people.... There has been a spirit of self- sufficiency, and a disposition to strive for position and supremacy. I have seen that self-glorification was becoming common among Seventh-day Adventists," pages 255, 256. Thus as they grow older, the have to confess to all the weaknesses and short- comings which they have so eagerly charged against other churches.

I could quote whole pages of such confessions as these from Mrs. White and their leading men. They are compelled to say it. It is common in their camp- meetings to see half their members forward as backsliders. Their preaching is largely scolding their members for their coldness. In fact, the thing is a practical failure in whatever way you look at it. Are they any better, any more spiritual, than the regular churches which they denounce so? No, as the above shows. After being well acquainted with both, I say confidently that there is as much devotion and spirituality among the Evangelical churches as among Adventists.

If, then, these things in the other churches prove that they are Babylon, they prove the same of the Advent church, too. (See Appendix A)

02.04. Chapter 4 - Origin, History and Failures of Adventism

Chapter 4 - Origin, History and Failures of Adventism

Every little while, from the days of Christ till now, individuals, and often large sects, have arisen, proclaiming the Second Advent at hand and themselves the God-appointed messengers to warn the world. Right on this point Jesus warned his church: "Take heed that no man deceive you.... The end is not yet." Matthew 24:4-6. Yet right away it was said that Jesus would come before John should die. John 21:23. The Thessalonians had to be corrected by Paul for expecting the Advent immediately at hand. 2 Thessalonians 2:1-8. In the middle of the second century arose the Montanists. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "Ecstatic visions announcing the approach of the Second Advent of Christ... were set forth as divine revelation." Art. 'Montanism.' Like Seventh-day Adventists, they adopted a severe discipline - condemned the wearing of ornaments, intercourse with the world, etc. They created a great sensation, obtained a numerous following, and flourished for a century or more.

Tenth Century Adventism The following is from the "History of the Christian Church," by M. Reuter, D.D., Century 10, Chapter 2, pages 202, 203: "Among the numerous opinions, however, which disgraced the Latin church and produced from time to time such violent agitations, none occasioned such universal panic, nor such dreadful impressions of terror or dismay, as a notion that prevailed during this [tenth] century of the immediate approach of the day of judgment." "Public and private buildings were suffered to decay, and were even pulled down, from an opinion that they were no longer of any use, since the dissolution of all things was at hand." The Fifth-Monarchy men of England, about 1660, "believed that the time was near at hand when, to the four great monarchies of Daniel's prophetic vision, was to succeed the fifth, which was to break in pieces all others, and to 'stand forever.'" Johnson's Encyclopedia, article Fifth-Monarchy Men. They undertook to set up the kingdom by overturning the English government. The Irvingites of England "declare the speedy coming of Christ;" have "prophets," "revelations," "tongues," "gifts," etc. They have gathered large congregations and are spreading over the world.

Swedenborg, Ann Lee, Joanna Southcott, Joe Smith, etc., all made the speedy advent of Christ the ground-work of their systems, as is well known. Hence, movements of this kind are nothing new.

Seventh-day Adventism originated in the well-known movement of William Miller, who set the time for the end of the world in 1843-44. They claim now that Mr. Miller's move was right, and in the providence of God. They claim to be simply carrying on the same work which he began. In all their books and sermons they point to 1844 as their origin, and endorse the work of the Millerites in 1843 and 1844. The following from Mrs. White will settle the point: "I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that his hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures." Early Writings, page 64. God helped them make the mistake! "I saw that God was in the proclamation of the time in 1843." Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I., page 133. So God wanted them to set that time! "I saw that they were correct in their reckoning of the prophetic

periods; prophetic time closed in 1844." Page 107. Again: "The Advent movement of 1840-44 was a glorious manifestation of the power of God." Great Controversy, Vol. IV., page 429. Elder White says: "We hold that the great movement upon the Second Advent question, which commenced with the writings and public lectures of William Miller, has been, in its leading features, in fulfillment of prophecy. Consistently with this view, we also hold that in the providence of God, Mr. Miller was raised up to do a specific work." Life of Miller, page 6. So it will be seen that Seventh-day Adventists still believe in and defend the Millerite movements of 1843 and 1844. Indeed, they claim that all other churches who did not accept and endorse Miller's work were rejected of God on this account. Thus Mrs. White: "As the churches refused to receive the first angel's message [Miller's work], they rejected the light from heaven and fell from the favor of God." Early Writings, page 101.

Here, then, we have the origin of Seventh-day Adventism, the fountain from which it flowed. As a stream will be like its fountain, let us examine it. Elder and Mrs. White, Elder Bates, Andrews, Rhodes, Holt, Edson, and all the founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church were in the movement of Miller, and helped in setting and preaching the time in 1843, 1844, and carried the Advent work right on afterwards. The work of Mr. Miller is so well known, that I need but refer to the facts about it. William Miller was born at Pittsfield, Mass., 1782, but he was reared at Low Hampton, N.Y. He was a farmer, with only the poor advantages of a country school. He united with the Baptist church. About 1831 he claimed that he had discovered by the prophecies the exact time, the very year, and, finally, the very day when Christ would appear and the end of the world would come. He succeeded in converting perhaps fifty thousand people to his views. The first date fixed was 1843. It failed. Then he fixed a day in October, 1844, and that failed. Many other times have since been fixed by Mr. Miller's followers, and all have failed. Over fifty years have come and gone, and the end has not come yet.

What was the one great burden of Miller, the one point on which he differed from the Evangelical churches? All these churches believed in the personal Second Advent of Christ just as strongly as Miller did. They loved Jesus and preached the Second Advent, even teaching that it was near at hand. But the Millerites said they knew the TIME when it was to be, and that time was 1843- 4. They staked all upon this. The issue was plain and definite. All who did not endorse their SET TIME were "opposers," "enemies," "in the dark," "evil servants," rejected of God and lost, just because they would not believe in setting a time for the end. Here are Miller's words: "I believe the time can be known by all who desire to understand.... Between March 21, 1840, and March 21, 1844, according to the Jewish mode of computation of time, Christ will come." Life of Miller, page 172. Jesus says: "Ye know not when the time is." Mark 13:33. But the Millerites thought they knew better than Jesus Christ did. So they condemned all who did not agree with them. Here is a mild sample of what they said and the spirit that possessed them: "This is God's truth; it is as true as the Bible." "There is no possibility of a mistake in this time." "Those who reject this light will be lost." "Those who do not accept this argument are backsliders," etc. History of Advent Message, page 596. And this is the spirit that has followed them ever since - a harsh, denunciatory spirit against all who did not agree with their figures, interpretations and theories. But their set times came and passed without the least regard to their figures and facts, proofs and demonstrations, prayers and predictions. Remorseless old Time, the true tester of every theory, marched right on and demolished them all. This demonstrated the folly and error of the Adventists. Miller's

prediction was a wretched abortion. He preached and propagated a falsehood. He preached that the world would end in 1843, and it didn't. He set 1844 for it to come, and it didn't. If ever a religious movement on earth was demonstrated to be a humbug and a failure, it was Millerism. But if Millerism was a failure, then Seventh-day Adventism is also, for that was the fountain from which this has flowed; that was the foundation on which this is built. Deuteronomy 18:22 : "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." This, surely, is a simple and fair test. By this rule the Lord was not in Miller's move.

"But were not the Adventists in 1843-4 very confident that they were right?" Confident is no name for it. They were SURE that they were right, they KNEW they were right, for they proved it all by the Bible, every word of it, positively. The Bible said so; to deny it was to deny the Bible. But it failed all the same. It is just so with Seventh-day Adventists now. They are the most positive people in the world, though they have made scores of terrible blunders. That no one will know the time of the second advent is as plainly taught as words can teach. Read the following: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only;" "Watch, therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come;" "Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh;" "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." Matthew 24:36; Matthew 24:42; Matthew 24:44; Matthew 25:13. "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is." Mark 13:33. "It is not for you to know the time or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." Acts 1:7. Jesus said, "Ye know not when the time is;" Miller said, "We know when the time is." Jesus said, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons;" Miller said, "We know all about them." Jesus said, "No man knows the day;" Miller said, "We know the exact day." Which was right? The disappointments of the Adventists, time and again, during the past fifty years, in setting the date for the end of the world have clearly demonstrated their folly. The whole Advent move was conceived in error, born in a mistake, has grown up in folly, and must die in disgrace. "But were not the Millerites honest?" There is no doubt of it, but that proves nothing as to their correctness. The Fruit of Millerism

"By their fruits ye shall know them." Millerism, for about four years, in a few states, created a great excitement. Churches were divided and broken up, pastors left their flocks to "lecture" on "time," while argument and strife were the order of the day. As the time set drew near, in thousands of cases, the Adventists not only left their work and their business, but gave away their property. Crops were left ungathered, goods were distributed freely, so that many who had been well to do were left penniless. After the time had passed, these were destitute and their families suffered. Many had to be arrested and put under guardianship, to protect their families. Then the wildest fanaticism broke out here and there, which brought disgrace upon the very name of religion. Many said the Lord had come, probation was ended, it was sin to work, all property must be held in common, all the churches were apostate, Babylon, etc. Some Adventists had spiritual wives, some went to the Shakers, many went back into the churches, some into despair, and hundreds into doubt and infidelity - just what might have been expected. The glorious doctrine of the Second Advent was covered with shame, Satan rejoiced, while the cause of Christ was greatly injured. For proof of these facts, I refer to the testimony of thousands now living, and to the published works of the Adventists themselves. Thus Elder U. Smith is compelled to say: "The Advent Body were a

unit [in 1844] and their testimony shook the world. Suddenly their power was broken, their strength paralyzed. They passed the point of their expectation, and realized not their hope. That a mistake had been made somewhere, none could deny. From that point the history of a majority of that once happy, united people has been marked by discord, division, confusion, speculation, new mistakes, fresh disappointments, disintegration and apostasy." The Sanctuary, pages 13, 14.

Paul said, "God is not the author of confusion." 1 Corinthians 14:33. Then surely he was not the author of Adventism, for the confusion it produced is unparalleled in religious history. Ten souls were ruined by it where one was saved. Immediately after 1844 they split up into numerous parties, each contradicting and condemning all the rest. Instead of renouncing the whole thing, as sane men ought to have done, each one set himself to find some "explanation" of their mistake. Hardly any two agreed, while each one was sure he had the true explanation. Their utter confusion is well illustrated by the following anecdote told by Mr. Miller himself: The first person in his own parish who fully embraced his views was an old woman, an humble Christian. Mr. Miller sent her his papers when he had read them. One week he received sixteen different sheets, all purporting to be Advent publications, but the most of them advocating contradictory sentiments. He sent them to the old woman. Soon she sent for him, and on his arrival began: "Have you read all these papers?" "I have looked them over." "But are they all Advent papers?" "They profess to be." "Well, then," said she, "I am no longer an Adventist. I shall take the old Bible and stick to that." "But," said Mr. Miller, "we have no confidence in one-half there is advocated in these papers." "We?" exclaimed the old lady, "who is WE?" "Why," replied Mr. Miller, "WE are those who do not fellowship these things." "Well, but I want to know who WE is." "Why, all of us who stand on the old ground." "But that ain't telling me who WE is. I want to know who WE is." "Well," said Mr. Miller, in relating the story, "I was confounded, and was unable to give her any information who WE were." History of Second Advent Message, pages 414, 415. And so it has continued unto this day. What do Adventists believe? Go ask what language was spoken by the people after the Lord confused their tongues at Babel. Adventism is a second Bable[sp]. But Seventh-day Adventists say "We are united; we believe alike." Partly true, but they are only one branch of this Advent Babel. Such a brood of errors and heresies as has resulted from Adventism, cannot be found in the history of the church before. Time- setting, visions, miracles, fanatics, false prophets, sleep of the dead, annihilation of the wicked, non-resurrection of the wicked, future probation, restoration, community of goods, denial of the divinity of Christ, no devil, no baptism, no organization, etc., etc. Gracious! And these are the people sent with a "message" to warn the church! They had better go back and learn and agree on what their "message" is, before they run to deliver it. The other Adventists have set the time for the end of the world in 1843, 1844, 1847, 1850, 1852, 1854, 1855, 1863, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1877, and so on, till one is sick of counting. Learning nothing from the past, each time they are quite as confident as before. This fanatical work has brought disgrace upon the doctrine of the Second Advent, so that it is not dwelt upon as much as formerly in other churches. The study of the prophecies has been brought into disrepute by the unwise course of the Adventists. No thoughtful man can fail to see this.

Seventh-day Adventists and Time-Setting

It is the one constant boast of the Seventh-day Adventists that THEY never set time; THEY don't believe in it. But they deceive themselves and deceive others when they say so. Elder White, their leader, engaged in preaching three different set times for the Lord to come, viz., 1843, 1844, 1845.

here are his own statements on this: "I found myself happy in the faith that Christ would come about the year 1843." Life Incidents, page 72. Then he tells how he preached it. Of 1844, he says: "I stated my conviction that Christ would come on the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month of that year [1844]." Pages 166, 167. "It is well known that many were expecting the Lord to come at the seventh month, 1845. That Christ would then come we firmly believed. A few days before the time passed, I was at Fairhaven and Dartmouth, Mass., with a message on this point of time." 'A Word to the Little Flock,' by James White, page 22. So their leader was a time-setter. Mrs. White, their prophetess, was in the time-setting of 1843 and 1844. She herself says: "We were firm in the belief that the preaching of definite times was of God." Testimonies, Vol. 1, page 56. Of the first date she says: "With carefulness and trembling we approached the time when our Saviour was expected to appear." Then she tells her disappointment. Testimonies, Vol. 1, page 48. Again: "Our hopes now centered on the coming of the Lord in 1844." Page 53. She was a time- setter. Elders Bates, Andrews, Rhodes, and all the first crop of Seventh-day Adventists were in the time-setting of 1843, 1844. They still endorse Miller's time-setting of 1843 and 1844 as right and approved of God. How much truth, then, is there in their assertions that they have never set time? But they say, "WE did not keep the Seventh-day when WE set time; therefore WE never set time!" That is too thin. The thief says, "I did not wear this coat when I stole the sheep, therefore I never stole him!" They say that they have given the THREE messages. Well, the first message was in 1844 when they set time. Are they the same people, or are they not?

Again they endorse Mr. Miller's work as of God. But Miller is responsible for all the time-setting done by the Adventists since his time, because they are the legitimate outgrowth of his work. He began setting time. He did it the second time. He taught them how to do it. He fathered the idea. He inculcated it in all his followers. They then simply took up and carried on what he had begun. Seventh-day Adventists claim to be the original Adventists, and endorse Miller's work. In doing this they endorse time- setting, and should justly bear all the odium of that fanatical business. But don't Seventh-day Adventists rise to explain why they were disappointed in 1843, and again in 1844, and for forty years since? O, yes; but we naturally become a little suspicious of the man who is compelled to be constantly explaining his conduct. Straight works needs no explanation. They say the Lord caused them to be disappointed in 1843, on purpose to test their faith, that was all! In 1844 they made just one little mistake, that was all! They then taught that the earth was the sanctuary. Come to find out, the sanctuary us up in heaven, and Jesus did really come, in a certain sense, that very year! So they were right, after all. Don't you see? Clear as day. Now they have the whole matter removed from the troublesome facts of earth, where we can test them, to the beautiful theories of heaven, where no one can go to report on facts which might spoil their theories. Now they can speculate and argue in safety. But sober, thinking men see through all this. It is merely a make-shift to get out of a difficulty.

Miller's Confession - He Opposes Seventh-day Adventism

All the other Adventists long ago renounced the 1843-4 time-setting as an error. Thus: "The majority of Adventists took the position that the TIME was an error of human judgment." History of the Second Advent Message, page 383. Hear Mr. Miller himself: "On the passing of my published time, I frankly acknowledged my disappointment.... We expected the personal coming of Christ at that time; and now to contend that we were not mistaken, is dishonest. We should never be ashamed frankly to confess our errors. I have no confidence in any of the new theories that grew

out of that movement, namely, that Christ then came as the Bridegroom, that the door of mercy was closed, that there is no salvation for sinners, that the seventh trumpet sounded, OR THAT IT WAS A FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY IN ANY SENSE." History of the Advent Message, pages 410, 412. From this we see: 1. That Miller, the founder and leader of that move, owned that it was an error. 2. He repudiated the idea that it was a fulfillment of prophecy in any sense. 3. He especially points out the Seventh-day Advent position as utterly wrong. He knew all about their arguments of the three messages, the sanctuary, the Sabbath, etc., and yet he not only rejected them, but earnestly warned his people against them, so that very few of the original Adventists ever accepted them. Hear Mrs. White herself on this point: "I saw leading men watching William Miller, fearing lest he should embrace the third angel's message and the commandments of God. As he would lean towards the light from heaven, these men would lay some plan to draw his mind away. I saw a human influence exerted to keep his mind in darkness, and to retain his influence among them. At length WILLIAM MILLER RAISED HIS VOICE AGAINST THE LIGHT FROM HEAVEN." Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 1, page 167.

Thus the father and founder of Adventism condemned and opposed the position which Seventh-day Adventists took with regard to his own work. He had sense enough to see, and honesty enough to confess, that it was a mistake. But they will not have it so. They know better than he himself. They will have it that it was a wonderful fulfillment of Revelation 14:6-7. Miller denies it. Thus it will be seen that Seventh-day Adventists give an interpretation to Miller's work which he himself condemned. Not a leading man in Miller's work ever embraced the views of the Seventh-day Adventists, but have always opposed them as fanatical and as a side issue. None of the leaders of Seventh-day Adventism, such as White, Andrews, Bates, Rhodes, etc., were ever of any note in Miller's work, though they were all in it; yet afterwards they claimed to be the only ones who had the right view of it. All the rest were "in the dark," "foolish virgins," "apostates," etc. How modest!

Mistakes of Adventists A people who have made as many mistakes as Adventists have, ought to be very modest in their claims, and ought to see that they have been led by men and not by the Lord. 1. They set the time for the end of the world in 1843, and failed. 2. They set it again in 1844 and failed. 3. Elder White, the leader of the Seventh-day Adventists, set 1845 for the end, and failed again. 4. They held in 1844 that the earth was the sanctuary, another mistake, as they admit now. 5. They all held for some time after 1844 that probation for sinners was ended - a fearful mistake. See chapter 8 of this book. 6. For ten years Seventh-day Adventists began the Sabbath at 6 P.M., instead of at sunset as now. Thus they broke the Sabbath every week! 7. They kept their children out of school for years, because time was so short they would need no education. Those children now have grand-children! 8. They gave away their goods in 1844, because they would not need them after that! 9. They would not vote, for that was like the fallen churches. Now they vote freely. 10. They held that it was wrong to take a church name, for that was Babylon. Now they have a name. 11. Church organization was wrong, for that was like Babylon. Now they organize. 12. For years they said it was denying their faith to set out trees, for they would never grow to bear fruit. 13. Led by a revelation from Mrs. White, the sisters put on short dress with pants. None of them wear it now. 14. For thirty years they would not take up any collection on the Sabbath. Now they do it every week. 15. For fifty years they have been expecting the end of the world to come inside of five years, and it has not come yet. 16. They said Jesus would come to the earth in 1844.

Now they say that was a mistake; he came to judgment in the sanctuary above. Thus: "The Adventists of 1844...thought the bridegroom would come; and THEN HE DID COME - not to this earth, as they incorrectly supposed, but to the MARRIAGE." "They simply mistook the KIND of coming referred to." U. Smith, in Parable of the Ten Virgins, page 13,14. He owns that: 1. They got the time wrong in 1843. 2. The place wrong. 3. The event wrong. Now let him add, 4. The whole thing wrong, and he will be right! 17. Then they said the door was shut, Matthew 25:10; now they say that this was wrong; it is open yet. Thus: "There can be no other place for the shut door but at the autumn of 1844." Elder White, in Present Truth, May 1850. "The door is still open, and other guests may come." U. Smith, in Parable of the Ten Virgins, page 17, February, 1889. These are the people who always KNOW they are just right! 18. They once adopted a rigid vegetarian diet - not meat, no butter, only two meals per day, etc., but it was a failure. It killed many and ruined more, till they had to modify it and live like other people.

These are only samples out of numerous mistakes the Adventists have made; and this they have done with an inspired prophetess right at their head for forty-four years! These simple, undeniable facts alone should be enough to open the eyes of all to see that the Lord has not led them in their work.

02.05. Chapter 5 - My Objections to the Seventh-day Adventist System

Chapter 5 - My Objections to the Seventh-day Adventist System

It was born in a mistake. The origin of Adventism was in the Millerite time-setting of 1843 and 1844, which all know was a mistake.

That work produced great fanaticism, and wrought disaster to thousands of souls.

Out of that movement has grown a whole brood of errors, as they themselves will admit.

Seventh-day Adventism is a system of popery - one-man power. From the first, Elder White took this position, and molded the whole system to fit it. He would and did rule and dictate in everything in all the field. He would make it hot for one who dared to start anything which he had not bossed. He was head and president of everything. So now a few run everything. Their word is law. It is contrary to the Gospel, and has resulted in the mental degradation of the mass of that people. A few think for all.

The mere word of Mrs. White, an uneducated woman, is accepted as the voice of God to them dictating in everything. "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them." Isaiah 3:12.

From the start, Elder and Mrs. White would take up publicly the faults, real or imaginary, of any one and every one, ministers, editors and all, and expose them before the whole congregation. If any objected, they were "rebels." All this was then printed in her "Testimonies" as inspired, and circulated for all to read. This has begotten in all a habit of criticising and fault-finding, which is reprehensible to the last degree. Any one might have foreseen that it would result in this. Mrs. White herself now says: "There has been a picking at straws. And when there were no real difficulties in the church, trials have been manufactured." Testimonies, Vol. 1, page 144. "Love for one another had disappeared, and a fault-finding, accusing spirit has prevailed. It has been considered a virtue to hunt up everything about one another that looked wrong, and make it appear fully as bad as it really was." Page 164. Mrs. White herself has set the example, and she is largely followed, till they are a denomination of fault-finders.

It is a fundamental doctrine with them that all the other churches are apostate and corrupt. Hence they are eagerly on the watch for every evil thing they can pick up against them. This is poor business, and it begets in themselves a hard, unlovely spirit.

They are constantly on the watch for all the evidence they can gather, showing that the world is rapidly growing worse. This again has a bad effect on themselves, tending to make them sour and gloomy.

Their ministers are mere lecturers, going from place to place, staying only a few weeks at a time, and repeating the same old sermons over and over. As a consequence they became narrow and

small and dry. Their preaching is almost wholly doctrinal and argumentative. This makes them hard and combative, instead of tender and charitable.

Their churches are very small, generally numbering from fifteen to forty. They have no pastors, and seldom any preaching. Their meetings are held on Saturday, when others are at work, hence not a soul attends except themselves. So their meetings are small and dull and tiresome, especially to youth and children. Never mingling with other churches, they soon fall into a rut and become very dry. The great mass of them are uncultured, and their local leaders are farmers or mechanics. The decorum seen in other churches is generally wanting in theirs. Their children are noisy, and often the members too. This is not good.

Their theory compels them to be narrow and uncharitable. They cannot work at all with other Christians in anything. This is another bad feature of that system. They condemn all Christian workers who do not follow them. See how Jesus rebuked that narrow, bigoted spirit: "And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not, for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me; for he that is not against us is on our part." Mark 9:38-40.

In a community they have no influence whatever over the irreligious. Not one of them attends their meetings; not a child outside of their own families attends their Sabbath schools. Other churches, by their public meetings, sermons and schools on Sundays, have a mighty influence for good over the unconverted.

Their work is largely proselyting. Truly, "they compass sea and land to make one proselyte." They will work just as hard to get a good old Christian out of another church as they will to convert a sinner. They tear down more than they build up.

They count all lost who reject their "message." Their missions of which they boast so much are the dread of all other missionaries, as they work as hard to proselyte members from churches as they do to convert raw heathens or sinners. Thus, of their "mission" in London, Elder Haskell says: "Thirteen have taken their stand on the Sabbath.... These have come principally from the Church of England." Review, April 10, 1888. Yes, their converts are always "principally" from other churches. I became sick of such work.

By their arguments they confuse the minds of many, so that they know not what to believe. They set them against other churches, and so they drift away from all and are entirely lost. Adventists have done a large amount of this work, and their influence in that line is fearful.

Many of their children grow up to keep neither Saturday nor Sunday, nor to attend any church, and hence they become irreligious.

Sunday-breakers who hunt, fish, sport or work that day, are encouraged in it by the arguments and examples of the Adventists. This certainly is evil. A community where Sabbatarians live has no quiet rest-day at all.

The power of God does not attend the Advent work as it should, if it is His special work. During my long experience with them, I was impressed with the fact that, as a rule, the work was exceedingly dry and powerless. This disheartened me greatly. I saw that it was so with all their ministers, from large to small. Their year book for 1888 shows that they did not average one convert to each

minister!

In fields where they have been the longest and are best known, they have the least success. As soon as it is well understood what it really is, they can do nothing.

The apostles, the reformers, and others whom God has sent, have built up large societies, and wielded a great influence for good in society. But the Adventists never do. They have no influence for good on society. This feature of the work often troubled me. Notice how the heretical and fanatical sects generally withdraw themselves from community, and build up a little exclusive society by themselves. See the Shakers, the Mormons, the Oneida Community, the followers of Mrs. Southcott, etc. Seventh-day Adventists become a little exclusive party in any community where they are. They go by themselves, and take part in almost nothing which interests others. Take my own town as an example. They have had a church here for thirty years, numbering from fifty to seventy-five. They take no part nor interest in any social, literary, moral, sanitary, temperance or religious work outside of their own. They are never thought of as helpers in any such necessary and noble work. They never attend a prayer meeting, a revival effort, or a Sabbath School except their own. The Young Men's Christian Association, which is wholly unsectarian, is doing a noble work to save the young men of the place. Not one Adventist attends or takes interest in it. On the contrary, the Adventist store is open for trade, and thus becomes a resort for idlers and Sunday breakers. In whatever way considered, their influence is detrimental to the best interests of religion and good society.

How different it was with the followers of the true reformers, Luther, Wesley, Calvin, etc. They stood with the people, worked for them, and made society generally better.

The moment a person becomes a thoroughly converted Seventh-day Adventist, he is spoiled for any further usefulness in society. This is their record everywhere, as all will testify who know them. To convert men to their doctrine is the all-absorbing passion of their lives, leaving them neither interest, time nor means for anything else.

I came to see that the great burden of Adventists was about merely speculative theories concerning which they cannot KNOW positively that they are correct after all. Such are their theories about the sleep of the dead, destruction of the wicked, the sanctuary in heaven, the time when Jesus will come, their interpretation of the image beast of Revelation 13:11-18, the mark of the beast, etc. Do they KNOW that they are right about these? No, they think they are, and others equally honest, pious and intelligent, think differently. I came to feel that it was foolish for me to spend my life over what after all I did not know was really so. But we do know that it is right to evangelize the heathen and the vicious of our cities, to save the drunken and fallen, to preach Christ and convert sinners, and to work for everything that will improve the condition of men and society NOW. But with Adventists these things are secondary or neglected entirely, while they constantly put their pet theories first and dwell upon them most of the time.

All in their system that has been a blessing to them is held also by all evangelical churches, such as faith in God, in Jesus and the Bible, a pure heart, holy life, self-denial, etc. Nothing good has come to them or to the world by those doctrines which are peculiar to Adventist, as the TIME of the advent, the condition of the dead, the Sabbath, the visions, etc.

Having been disappointed so many times and so long, taking so gloomy a view of things generally, they are as a class a very discouraged and unhappy set of people.

It is "another gospel," Galatians 1:6, which the apostles never preached. I was long impressed with the fact that we Adventists preached very differently from the apostles. For instance, we were always preaching and writing about the Sabbath, while Paul in all his fourteen epistles mentions it but ONCE, Colossians 2:16, and then only to condemn it! "We find in the New Testament 'preach the gospel,' fifty times; 'preach Christ,' twenty-three times; 'preach the word,' seventeen times; 'preach the kingdom,' eight times; 'preach the law,' or 'the Sabbath,' not once!" Warner.

They are unpatriotic. Not a soul of them, man or woman, in field or hospital, lifted a finger to aid in putting down the rebellion or slavery. They staid [sp] at home and found fault. See Mrs. White's Testimonies, Vol. 1, pages 253-268. If a man had gone to war he would have been expelled from the church, for Mrs. White forbade it. Hear her: "I was shown that God's people, who are his peculiar treasure, cannot engage in this perplexing war, for it is opposed to every principle of their faith." Testimonies, Vol. 1, page 361. They hold that our nation is "the beast" of Revelation 13:11-18, which will soon become a tyranny. Mrs. White says: "The nation will be on the side of the great rebel leader," the Devil. Testimony No. 31, page 132. So they all feel.

Their false ideas of Sunday leads them to join with infidels, atheists, Jews, saloon-keepers and the irreligious generally in opposing any restriction on Sunday desecration. It is one of the anomalies of the age to see a Christian church unite with the worst elements of society and the enemies of Christ, to oppose the best interests of society and the sacrificing work of the most devout and intelligent of the land. What is a religion good for, anyway, which spoils a person for all practical usefulness in society? What does it mean to "love your neighbor"?

The Adventists and the Prophecies The Adventists claim great light above all others on the prophecies. The old women and the little children among them confidently believe that they know more about the prophecies than all the commentators and scholars in the world. They can tell exactly what every horn, and wing, head and tail, trumpet and vial, beast or angel in all the prophecies means! Any possibility of mistake? Not the slightest. And yet probably no people ever made as many mistakes in the same length of time as Adventists have.

Consider how little critical knowledge of exact historical dates and facts common people really possess. The great mass of intelligent business men, farmers, mechanics, mothers and housekeepers, would be poor judges in such matters. Most of them know nothing about it. They could not intelligently dispute any statement a lecturer might make on such points. These Advent preachers go before such an audience night after night for six or eight weeks, with their positive statements boldly made and often repeated, till their deluded hearers think them to be the most wonderful historians, and accept their statements as undoubted truths! So of their Bible readers, who go from house to house to expound the deep things of God. I know them well, have taught many of them, and have been in their training schools. Many of them could not get a third grade certificate, nor have they ever read a volume of history. They simply learn by rote, parrot-like a lesson which they repeat glibly to the astonished farmer or unread mother. Get them off this track and they are dumb. They are like those whom Paul rebuked, "Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm." 1 Timothy 1:7. This fits them exactly. (See Appendix B and C.)

02.06. Chapter 6 - The Two-Horned Beast and the Messages

Chapter 6 - The Two-Horned Beast and the Messages

Seventh-day Adventists lay great stress upon their interpretation of this symbol. Revelation 13:11-18. Their theory of the mark of the beast, and his image, the seal of God, the Third Angel's Message, and all their special work about the Sabbath is built upon their assumption concerning that beast. If they are mistaken here, their whole system collapses. They claim that this beast is the United States, and that soon we shall have here church and state united, the image of the beast, the papacy. The mark of the beast is Sunday-keeping. A law will enforce this upon Seventh-day Adventists. They won't obey. Then they will be outlawed, persecuted, and condemned to death! Of all the wild Advent speculations in the prophecies, this deserves to stand among the wildest.

Does the Bible SAY that this beast is the United States? Oh, no; they have to assume and argue out all this.

Do they KNOW that their arguments on this are infallibly correct? No.

Were their leaders quite as sure in 1843, and then again in 1844, that they were right? Yes; and yet they failed both times.

Have they not made many mistakes in interpreting the prophecies? Yes; many of them.

Did not Elder White, their leader, set three different times for the end of the world, and fail in all? Yes.

May they not then POSSIBLY be mistaken also in this? Of course, as they must admit. So their system rests upon an uncertainty. Or are they infallible?

Do our hopes of heaven depend upon such uncertainties as these? Would it not be safer to follow the plain precepts of Christ (Matthew 7:24-25), than to turn after these uncertain speculations? Better than to follow the lead of Adventists who have been making mistakes over and over again for eighty years? "Take heed that no man deceive you." Jesus. Matthew 24:4. I will offer a few out of many facts showing that their application of this symbol is not correct.

While Seventh-day Adventists largely quote and follow the leading commentators and Protestant churches in their application of the other beasts, here they take a wild leap into the dark, unsupported by one single biblical scholar. Evidently this lamb-like beast represents the Papacy, or the spiritual and ecclesiastical power of the Roman church, and is so applied by every commentator I have consulted. Thus: "This beast is the spiritual Latin empire, or, in other words, the Romish hierarchy." Clarke, on Revelation 13:11. "It was, therefore, the emblem of the Roman hierarchy." Scott, on Revelation 13:11. "The generality of interpreters confine this second beast to the papal power." Eclectic Commentary on Revelation 13:11-18. "An exact description of the rise of the spiritual power of the Papacy." Notes on Revelation 13:11, by the American Tract Society.

"The beast with two horns like a lamb is the Roman hierarchy, or body of the clergy, regular and secular." Joseph Benson. "The two-horned beast or Romish church." Bishop Newton. Albert Barnes the same. Indeed, there is a perfect agreement among all commentators that this lamb-like beast represents the Papacy. For the argument on this I only need refer the readers to the commentaries.

Against this unanimous agreement of all Protestant churches and authorities, you have the unsupported speculations of the Adventists, who have made so many mistakes before. The proofs that this lamb-like beast is the Papacy are many, clear, and easily seen; while the effort to apply it to the United States is labored, and the arguments strained, long, and far-fetched. Thus, in U. Smith's "Thoughts on Revelation," he devotes only ELEVEN pages to the dragon of Revelation 12:1-17, and only EIGHT pages to the leopard beast of Revelation 13:1-10, but wades heavily through OVER ONE HUNDRED PAGES on the eight verses relating to the two-horned beast! This alone is proof of the desperate task he had on hand to prove that it was the United States.

Beginning with Revelation 11:19, and ending with Revelation 14:5, is a line of prophecy reaching from the First to the Second Advent - the dragon, the leopard beast, and the lamb-like beast. The dragon, Revelation 12:1-17, is the pagan Roman empire. So all agree; Seventh-day Adventists as well. The dragon had "seven heads and ten horns." Revelation 12:3. This is succeeded, Revelation 13:1-10, by the leopard beast with "seven heads and ten horns." What is this? Evidently the same Roman empire, the same ten kingdoms of Europe, with merely a change of religion from pagan to Catholic. Thus, Dr. Clarke: "The beast here described is the Latin empire, which supported the Romish or Latin church." On Revelation 13:1. So says Scott and all I have seen. This was the civil or political power of the ten kingdoms after professing Christianity. That this ten-horned leopard beast is not the Papacy nor the Catholic church, is shown by Revelation 17:1-5, where the same beast is again introduced with a woman riding on and ruling over it. The beast is the civil power, while the woman is the church. Even Elder Smith had to confess this. He says: "We here have the woman, the church, seated upon a scarlet-colored beast, the civil power by which she is upheld and which she controls and guides to her own ends as a rider controls a horse." On Revelation 17:1-5. So, then, the leopard beast is the civil power. Just what it is in Revelation 17:1-18 is what it is in Revelation 13:1-18. Did the Papacy have ten horns? Did it have seven heads? No, but political Rome did. That the lamb-like beast of Revelation 13:11-18 is not the United States at all, but is the Papacy , or ecclesiastical and spiritual power of the Romish church, is manifest. 1. Revelation 17:1-5, where the woman, the church, is distinct from the ten-horned leopard beast and rules over it, shows that the beast is not the Papacy. 2. Just so; the lamb-like beast of Revelation 13:1-18 rules through the power of the leopard beast. 3. Whatever the woman is in Revelation 17:1-18, that is what the lamb-like beast is in Revelation 13:1-18. Hence, they both are the papal power of Rome.

Notice the similarity of the two: a woman in one place, a lamb in the other, both having the appearance of gentleness and innocence. The church is represented by a pure woman, 2 Corinthians 11:2, and by lambs, John 21:15; false religious teachers are represented by bad women, Revelation 2:18-23, and by beasts clothed like sheep, Matthew 7:15. The woman and the beast work together in Revelation 17:1-18; so the lamb-like beast and the leopard beast work together in Revelation 13:12; Revelation 13:14. The woman is drunk with the blood of saints, Revelation 17:6; the lamb beast causes the saints to be killed, Revelation 13:15. The woman is

burned with fire, Revelation 18:8; so is the lamb beast, Revelation 19:20. The woman sits upon the beast, guiding and ruling it, Revelation 17:3; so the lamb beast "exerciseth all the power of the first beast," Revelation 13:12. It does not simply exercise SIMILAR power, or AS MUCH power as the beast, but it uses the power of the beast itself, the same as the woman did. He does not himself kill anyone, but CAUSES them to be killed, Revelation 13:15. This is exactly what the Papacy did. It ruled over the kings of the earth, Revelation 17:18, and "caused" heretics to be put to death by the secular power. "He exerciseth all the power of the first beast."

It has ever been the boast of the Roman church that SHE never puts heretics to death. She simply anathematizes them, turns them over to the civil powers, and by her influence with these, CAUSES them to be killed by the secular powers. How exact is the language: he "causeth" it to be done; "he exerciseth [or useth] all the power of the first beast."

Seventh-day Adventists argue that the leopard beast, Revelation 13:1-10, is the papacy, because it does the same work as the little horn of Daniel 7:8; Daniel 7:25, which is agreed by all to be the papacy. But they overlook the fact that the leopard beast does all its work simply as the agent of the church, the woman in Revelation 17, and the lamb-like beast in Revelation 13:1-18. Hence, of course, it does the same work that the little horn of Daniel 7:1-28 does.

Notice the inseparable connection between the leopard beast and the two- horned beast, the Roman civil government and the Papacy. 1. The lamb-like beast controls all the power of the first beast. Daniel 7:12. 2. He does this in the presence and in the sight of the beast. Daniel 7:12, Daniel 7:14. This shows that both occupy the same territory. 3. He causes men to worship the beast. Daniel 7:12. 4. He causes men to make an image to the beast. Daniel 7:14. 5. He causes men to receive the mark of the beast. Daniel 7:16-17. 6. The two beasts are working together when Christ comes. Revelation 19:1-21, Revelation 20:1-15. 7. Together they go into the fire. Daniel 7:20.

Evidently, then, these two beasts operate together in all their work. This is precisely what the Catholic church and the Catholic political powers of Europe have done for ages, as all know. Has the United States ever thus cooperated with the papacy? Emphatically, no. Is any man fanatical enough to believe that it ever will? The papacy has exactly fulfilled every specification of the lamb-like beast. 1. It came up in the right place "in his presence." Diaglott, Bible Union, Living Oracles, etc. 2. It came up at the right time after the wounding of the head. Revelation 13:3. The interpretation adopted by Clarke, Scott, and the best authors, "refers it to the extinction of the old Roman Empire under the imperial form in the latter part of the fifth century, and its revival again under Charlemagne." Notes of Am. Tract Society. 3. The papacy came up in the right manner, peaceably and quietly. 4. It had the appearance of a lamb. 5. It has spoken like a dragon. 6. It has exercised all the power of civil Rome. 7. It brought the earth in subjection to Rome. 8. By its great signs and wonders it has deceived millions for ages. 9. It has made an image to the beast. 10. It has caused millions to be killed. 11. It has imposed its worship and mark upon all. 12. It has prohibited heretics from buying or selling. This is too well known to require proof. The lamb-like beast is not the United States; because:

"This two-horned beast symbolizes a religious or ecclesiastical government. The false prophet of Revelation 19:20 performs the same work as this beast (see Revelation 19:14), and therefore must be identical with it. This is admitted by Seventh-day Adventists. Now, as a prophet is a

religious teacher, a false prophet must be a false religious teacher; and as this applies to a government, it must therefore apply to an ecclesiastical government. Such the United States is not, for its government is PURELY political; for one clause of its constitution is as follows: 'Congress shall MAKE NO LAW respecting an establishment of RELIGION, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'" The Two-Horned Beast, by A.C. Long.

The manner of its rise. The lamb-like beast comes up quietly and peaceably "out of the earth," Revelation 13:11, while the other beasts come up out of the troubled sea. Revelation 13:1. So the papacy came up quietly at first, with all the appearance of a lamb, but afterwards it spoke like a dragon. Witness its persecutions and tyranny. Not so with our nation. It was born in a terrible war of seven years. Then followed the war of 1812, the war with Mexico, the war of the Rebellion, and war with Indians almost every year. Not very peaceable.

It was to exercise ALL the power of the first beast. Seventh-day Adventists say that the first beast is the Papacy, which put to death over fifty million people, ruled over other kings, and over the consciences of men. Even Adventists do not believe the United States will do this.

"Church and state must be united. This is against one of the fundamental principles of our government. The constitution expressly forbids it, consequently it must first be changed. And will the intelligent voters of these United States, with the history of past ages before them, deliberately change one of the main pillars of our government, and raise up the Inquisition, the block, the rack, etc., and thus put to death many persons, simply for their religious faith? It does not look reasonable." A.C. Long. Besides, all the tendency of the age is against a union of church and state.

Arguments Answered.

1. "The two-horned beast must be the United States, because it can apply nowhere else."

ANSWER: It applies admirably to the Papacy.

2. "There must be some symbol to represent this great nation."

ANSWER: There is none for Russia, for Mexico, Brazil, Japan, China, and a dozen other nations, most of them professing Christianity too.

3. "The United States came up at the right time, about 1798, when the head received its deadly wound. Revelation 13:3."

ANSWER: This very point overthrows the argument for the United States; for that wound was given at the very rise of the leopard beast, more than 1,200 years before 1798. Look at Daniel 7:3-10; all the work of the beast comes AFTER the wound and not BEFORE. This locates the rise of the lamb-like beast just when the Papacy rose.

4. "The United States came up in the right place."

ANSWER: This is exactly what it DID NOT DO. The beast is located in Europe, and a whole ocean rolls between the two; whereas the two-horned beast was to come up "in his presence," in Europe, not America.

5. "Our government has ’come up’ from small beginnings to a wonderful nation."

ANSWER: The Papacy began much smaller, and has ’come up’ to be much larger.

6. "Our government is lamb-like."

ANSWER: So was the Papacy in its rise and all its professions. A lamb in appearance, a dragon at heart, fits Rome much better. Our government does not put on sheep’s clothes to hide wicked designs. It acts openly and boldly. But the Papacy professed outwardly to be a humble follower of the Lamb, while inwardly it was a dragon.

7. "No crown on his horns. Hence it must be a republic - the United States."

ANSWER: The ten-horned beast of Daniel 7:1-28 had no crowns, yet all were kingly governments. So the dragon, Revelation 12:3, had no crowns on his ten horns, yet all were kingly governments. So there were crowns upon his seven heads, yet several of these heads represented forms of government that had no crowns. So this argument fails.

8. "Spiritualism has wrought miracles here."

ANSWER: The miracles of spiritualism are a humbug, nor are they in any way recognized or used by our nation in making laws. But in the prophecy the miracles are wrought by the official authority, and not by private individuals, wrought to secure and enforce laws for persecution. Daniel 7:14. Spiritualism does not do this. And surely our nation will never lower itself to the working of miracles by official authority! But papal Rome has abounded in lying miracles, by which she deceived her followers for ages. Our nation is now over one hundred years old, and, according to Adventists, five or ten years more will end its work. But out of eight verses of the prophecy only ONE is yet fulfilled, is our nation. 1. The beast was to come up. Fulfilled. 2. He was to come out of the earth. Fulfilled. 3. Was to have two horns. Not fulfilled. 4. Was to look like a lamb. Fulfilled. But these specifications are much better fulfilled by the Papacy than by the United States.

5. Was to speak as a dragon. Not fulfilled. 6. Was to exercise all the power of the first beast. Not fulfilled. 7. Must cause the earth to worship the first beast. Not fulfilled. 8. Must do great wonders. Not fulfilled. 9. Must bring fire from Heaven. Not fulfilled. 10. Work miracles. Not fulfilled. 11. Was to make an image to the beast. Not fulfilled. 12. The image is to speak. Not fulfilled. 13. To cause all to be killed who do not worship the beast. Not fulfilled. 14. To cause all to receive the mark. Not fulfilled. 15. To prohibit all from buying or selling who do not have the mark. Not fulfilled.

Out of FIFTEEN points only FOUR have been fulfilled, and these relate simply to its rise. Of all the work it was to do, not a thing has been done yet. Adventists are always saying that the rest is just about to be done. But in the past forty years not one single point has been fulfilled, nor is there the least prospect that it ever will be. Unless God works a miracle, no such things as they are looking for can be accomplished anyway. The mark was to be enforced upon bondmen, verse 16; but slavery is abolished, and that can not be fulfilled here, but it was fulfilled under papal Rome. Souls were beheaded for not worshipping the beast. Revelation 20:4. This was all fulfilled under the Papacy, but Seventh-day Adventists themselves say no one will be killed here.

We have now proved conclusively that the two-horned beast is not the United States. This being so, then Seventh-day Adventists are wrong on the image of the beast, the mark of the beast, the

Third Angel's Message, and the Sunday question, and hence their whole theory collapses. The Image of the Beast. What Is It? In Revelation 13:14-17; Revelation 14:9-11; Revelation 15:2; Revelation 19:20; Revelation 20:4, great prominence is given to "the image of the beast." God's wrath is threatened against all who worship it. It must, then, be some very wicked thing. Seventh-day Adventists claim that the image will be formed by a union of church and state in our nation. That will be an image to Catholicism, the beast, they say. See "Thoughts on the Revelation," page 581. Their great mission is to warn men of this coming image. Sunday-keeping, the Pope's Sabbath, is to be the chief feature of this image. After thorough investigation, I am satisfied that there is no truth in this claim.

If a union of church and state constitutes an image to the beast, then this image has been formed ages ago, and by different nations, wherever there has been a union of church and state as in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, Norway and Sweden, Mexico, Brazil, Abyssinia, Puritan New England, etc. But this would overthrow the Seventh-day Adventist theory that the image has never yet been formed.

They say that the Papacy is the beast to whom the image is formed. Elder Smith thus defines the Papacy: "The Papacy, then, was a church clothed with civil power." Thoughts on Revelations, page 585. Is this definition correct? No; it is utterly false, as every scholar knows. It was made to fit a theory as false as the definition. Look at any dictionary. "Papacy: 1. The office and dignity of the Pope... 2. The Popes taken collectively." Web. The Papacy existed long before it was clothed with civil power. It has no civil power now, yet it is the Papacy still. So, then, an image to the Papacy does not necessarily include civil power or a union of church and state at all. On this false assumption is built the Advent theory of the image.

What is the Papacy? See Webster above. It is that ecclesiastical system of worship of which the Pope is head. Its distinguishing marks are these: 1. Popes. 2. Cardinals. 3. Monks. 4. Nuns. 5. Celibacy. 6. The mass. 7. Worship of the virgin. 8. Worship of saints. 9. Use of images. 10. Sign of the cross. 11. The confessional. 12. Use of incense. 13. Holy water. 14. Claim of infallibility. 15. A gorgeous worship, and the like. This is the Papacy, as known to everybody the world over. Now unite our Protestant churches with our state, pass a law and fine Sabbath-keepers, and how many of the above distinguishing features of the Papacy would you have? Not ONE. In order to have an IMAGE to the Papacy, you must have at least the main features of it, as above. But even Adventists do not expect to see any of the above items in their Sunday law. Their idea of an image to the beast is a senseless, unscriptural affair from the first to last.

A stringent national Sunday law, such as Adventists expect, would by no means constitute an image to the Papacy; because Catholics never had nor taught such a Sunday institution as that would be. Their Sunday is, and always has been, a loose holiday, a day for games, sports, beer gardens, saloons, dancing, voting, and even work, with a little church service and Mass in the morning. Look at the Sunday in any Catholic country or community. Such a strict Sunday as Adventists expect would be no more like that than a sheep is like an ox; hence, not an image to it. The Adventists themselves have shown that the doctrine of a strict Sunday did not originate with the Catholics, but with the Presbyterians and Puritans in the sixteenth century. History of the Sabbath, Chapter XXV. So, then, their Sunday law would constitute an image to the church of Scotland instead of the church of Rome! So their theory breaks down on all sides.

All this on the supposition that the Papacy is the leopard beast to which the image is to be made. But we have proved that the leopard beast is not the Papacy, but the empire of Rome under the ten kingdoms after their adoption of Christianity. But their conversion was only nominal. They brought with them very largely their pagan doctrines, customs, religious rites, images, gods, shrines, temples, and pomp of worship. This became the model after which the Papacy was gradually but finally formed. The Papacy in its full and final development was an image of this half heathen, half Christian, worldly kingdom.

The Deadly Wound, and How it Was Healed The utter fallacy of the Seventh-day Adventist theory of these beasts is shown by the fact that they locate the deadly wound of Revelation 13:3 in 1798, at the END of the forty-two months of Revelation 13:5, after nearly all the work of the beast is done. But in the prophecy it is distinctly located in the very BEGINNING of the work of the leopard beast. Read Revelation 13:1-10, and see where the wound was made, Revelation 13:3. The worship of the beast, his power, his blasphemies, his persecutions of the saints, his forty-two months, his 1260 years reign, the subjection of all the earth to him - all these come AFTER the wound is healed, not before. On the overthrow of paganism, the breaking up of the empire by the northern barbarians, and the final extinction was about to be entirely extinguished. But right here Christianity conquered those barbarians, and brought them under the rising influence of the Papacy. New life was infused into the old carcass, the empire was revived, the wound was healed. See Barnes, Clark, Scott, etc. The Mark of the Beast: What Is It?

Seventh-day Adventists assert in the most positive manner that the Pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday. "The Pope has changed the day of rest from the seventh to the first day." Mrs. White, Early Writings, page 55.

Then they affirm that "Sunday-keeping must be the mark of the beast." The Marvel of Nations, by U. Smith, page 183. "The Sunday Sabbath is purely a child of the Papacy. It is the mark of the beast." Advent Review, Vol. I, No. 2, August, 1850. They thunder this into the ears of the people, and threaten them with God’s wrath if they keep Sunday, till they frighten ignorant souls to give it up.

This change in the Sabbath, they say, was made by the Popes at the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364. Replies to Elder Canright, page 151. This was over 1500 years ago.

All who keep Sunday, they assert, worship the beast and receive his mark. "Sunday-keeping is an institution of the first beast, and ALL who submit to obey this institution emphatically worship the first beast and receive his mark, ’the mark of the beast.’ .... Those who worship the beast and his image by observing the first day are certainly idolaters, as were the worshippers of the golden calf." Advent Review Extra, pages 10 and 11, August, 1850. This language is too plain to be mistaken. All who keep Sunday have the mark of the beast.

But, strange to tell, they now all deny that any one has ever had the mark of the beast. "We have never so held," says Smith, Marvel of Nations, page 184. All right, though this is a square denial of what they once taught, as above. It is a common thing for them to change their positions and then deny it. We proceed:

The United States will soon pass a strict Sunday law and unite church and state; then all who will keep Sunday will have the mark. Marvel of Nations, page 185.

Answer. Does the Bible say that the mark of the beast is keeping Sunday? No, indeed. That is only another one of their assumptions. To establish this, they have to make a long, roundabout set of arguments, built upon inferences, none of which are sound. Their theory is false, because:

The Jewish Sabbath was abolished at the cross. [Colossians 2:16] Hence, it was not changed by the Pope.

Sunday is the Lord's day of Revelation 1:18. See Chapter X of this book.

The Pope never changed the Sabbath. This point I have proved beyond all question in Chapter XI. This fact alone upsets their whole argument on the mark of the beast.

The Papacy is not the beast to whom the image is made, as they assume. Here again there whole story is demolished.

Merely keeping Sunday would not be an image to the Papacy any way, as I have shown.

The two-horned beast is not the United States at all, but is the Papacy, as I have clearly proved.

The image to the beast was made ages ago by the Papacy. So every one of their arguments for the mark of the beast fails.

The Absurdities of Their Position.

Sunday-keeping has been the mark of the beast for 1500 years. During all this time millions have kept Sunday on the sole authority of the Roman church, and yet no one had the mark!

The keeping of Sunday has been time and again and in many countries enforced by law and severe penalties, just as they say it will be in the future here, and yet none of those who have kept it as thus enforced have had the mark of the beast!

Church and state have been united in various countries, and have enforced this institution of the Papacy, as they call it, and yet it was not enforcing the mark of the beast!

For over 1500 years, taking their own dates, all the pious of the earth, the martyrs, the reformers, the Luthers, Wesleys and Judson, have observed Sunday and enjoyed the blessing of God, but now, all at once, the whole world, Christians and all, are to be damned and drink the wrath of God for doing just what all holy men have done for ages! Of Sunday-keeping in the future, Mrs. White says: "That must be a terrible sin which calls down the wrath of God unmingled with mercy." Great Controversy, page 282. This terrible sin is just what all the church of Christ has practiced for ages, and yet have had God's blessing! How absurd.

It is attempted to dodge this point by saying that those of other ages did not have the light on the Sabbath. I have shown the falsity of that on other pages. Luther, Bunyan, Baxter, Milton, all had the "light" on the Sabbath question, and rejected it and wrote against it. Then I can do it, too, and not have the mark of the beast, if they did not.

If it is worshipping the beast to rest from physical labor on Sunday after one knows that Sunday is the Pope's Sabbath, then many Seventh-day Adventists are worshippers of the beast. Why? Because they often rest on Sunday. Book agents, colporters, teachers, drummers, persons visiting relatives, ministers in new places, etc., all frequently rest on Sunday, and even go to church all

day! Are they worshippers of the beast? Why not? Do you say they only do it for convenience or from policy? Just so they can rest on Sunday for the same reason when the law shall require it, and not worship the beast any more than Adventists do now.

Deny it as they may, the Seventh-day Adventist teachings do make all Sunday-keepers, both now and in past ages, worshippers of the beast, having the mark of the beast. Here is proof in their own words:

The Pope changed the Sabbath. Sunday is only the Pope's day. See above.

"The mark of the beast is the change the beast made in the law of God," in the Sabbath. Marvel of Nations, page 175. Then the mark of the beast existed as soon as the change was made, which they locate 1500 years ago. Is not this conclusion inevitable? If the mark of the beast is the change of the Sabbath which was made by the Papacy in the fourth century, then that mark has existed ever since. There is no escape from this conclusion.

All who have kept the law since that date, as changed by the beast, have been keeping the law of the beast, not the law of God; have been worshippers of the beast, not worshippers of God. Here is their own argument for it: Referring to the prophecy that the Papacy should "change times and laws," Daniel 7:25, which they claim the Pope fulfilled A.D. 364, by changing the Sabbath to Sunday, Elder Smith says: "When this is done [which is 1500 years ago], what do the people of the world have? They have two laws demanding obedience" - the law of God and the law of the Pope. If they keep the law of God, as given by Him, they worship and obey God. If they keep the law as changed by the Papacy, they worship that power.... For instance, if God says that the seventh day is the Sabbath, on which we must rest, but the Pope says that the first day is the Sabbath, and that we should keep this day, and not the seventh, THEN WHOEVER observes that precept as originally given by God, is thereby distinguished as a worshipper of God; and he who keeps it as changed is THEREBY MARKED as a follower of the power that made the change.... >From this conclusion no candid mind can dissent." Marvel of Nations, pages 174 and 175.

Then, for the past fifteen hundred years, all who have kept Sunday have been "marked" as followers of the beast and have worshipped him! From their own argument, does not this inevitably follow? Of course, it does. When they try to deny and evade this abominable conclusion, they simply contradict and stultify themselves. Either their argument is a fallacy, or else this conclusion must follow. Look at this hideous Moloch which they have set up to frighten the ignorant. The Pope in the fourth century changed the law of God by changing the Sabbath to Sunday. This change is the mark of the beast; whoever after that keeps the law as thus changed, is keeping not the law of God, but the Pope's law; is worshipping, not God, but the Pope. But all Christians for fifteen hundred years have kept Sunday, the Pope's Sabbath, the mark of the beast, and, as Smith says, were "thereby marked as followers of the power that made the change." From this conclusion there is no escape. And so all Sunday-keepers have had the mark of the beast, and have it now. But they say that they do not teach that anyone as yet has had the mark of the beast. This shows the absurdity of their argument. Sunday-keeping is the mark of the beast, yet Sunday-keepers have not got the mark of the beast! For instance: I have a hundred counterfeit bills; I pay them out to fifty men in Otsego, and they take and keep them, yet not a man of them has a counterfeit bill! Isn't that clear - as mud? But they don't know that they are counterfeit bills, and so are not guilty for having them. But have they not got counterfeit bills for all that? Certainly. So, if Sunday-keeping

is the mark of the beast, then every man that keeps Sunday has the mark of the beast, whether he knows it or not. God may not hold them guilty for it, but they have it just the same. Now, as soon as these fifty men are informed that their bills are counterfeit, are they not guilty if they use them after that? Yes. So, as soon as a man is informed that Sunday is the mark of the beast, if he keeps it after that has he not the mark of the beast as truly as ever he can have it? And if he still keeps Sunday voluntarily is he not just as guilty before God as though the law compelled him to keep it? Yes, and more so; because now he has no excuse, while then he could plead that he was compelled to do it. So, then, it needs no Sunday law to give men the mark of the beast. All Sunday-keepers have it already, and as soon as they are informed that Sunday is the mark of the beast, then they are guilty as worshipers of the beast. But Seventh-day Adventists have already informed thousands upon this point. Then if they have not the mark of the beast, why not? Surely I have been enlightened on it, and yet I keep Sunday, the Pope's Sabbath, the mark of the beast. Have I the mark of the beast? Let them answer if they dare. Remember that Luther, Milton, Baxter, Bunyan and Miller were all informed on the Sabbath question, and still wrote against it and kept Sunday. Reader, this Advent mark of the beast is an absurdity and only a scare-crow. Don't be frightened.

Even if the Pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday, that would not make Sunday HIS mark. The mark of any person was that which he used to mark things as belonging to him. In Bible times a master would put his mark on the right hand or forehead of his slaves. Heathen gods had their worshipers marked so. This custom is referred to and used here as an illustration. So the worshipers of the beast would be required to do something which would mark or distinguish them as his followers. But keeping Sunday does not distinguish a Catholic from members of other churches, for all churches keep Sunday - the Greek, Armenian, Lutheran, Episcopal, Methodist, etc. The Pope has never used Sunday to distinguish his followers from others, nor as proof of his authority as head of the church. He does point to the keys of St. Peter and his regular apostolic succession from him as proof of his authority. Says Dowling: "The Popes assert their divine right of supremacy in consequence of their claiming to be the successors of the Apostle Peter." History of Romanism, page 44. On this, not on Sunday-keeping, they base their claim of power. Some obscure catechism is quoted, claiming authority for the church to "command feasts and holy days," because that church has made Sunday holy. This falls infinitely short of making Sunday the proof of all their authority, the one "mark" of that church.

4. It is absurd to say that resting on Sunday is such a fearful crime as Adventists affirm. Hear Elder Smith: "Sunday-keeping must be the mark of the beast." "The reception of his mark must be something that involves the greatest offense that can be committed against God." Marvel of Nations, pages 170, 183. So keeping Sunday is more wicked than lying, stealing, or even murder or idolatry! Such a statement is monstrous. In the mind of any candid, thinking man, it must break down under the weight of its own absurdity.

What, Then, is the Mark of the Beast? (See appendix D)

Elder Smith himself stated this as clearly as need be: "It will evidently be some act or acts by which men will be required to acknowledge the authority of that image and yield obedience to its mandates." "So the mark of the beast, or of the Papacy, must be some act or profession by which the authority of that power is acknowledged." Marvel of Nations, pages 169, 172. Exactly; any act

or acts by which men show their reverence for the beast or his image, any form of worship by which they acknowledge his authority, that would be worshipping the beast and his image and receiving his mark. Dr. Clarke says: "The Latin [Catholic] worship is the universal badge of distinction of the Latin church from all other churches on the face of the earth, and is, therefore, the only infallible MARK by which a genuine papist can be distinguished from the rest of mankind." On Revelation 13:16. This is the position taken by Protestants generally, and I believe it to be correct. A conformity to the system of worship set up by the Papacy, that great anti-Christian power, the image to the beast, would be worshipping the beast and his image and receiving his mark. To worship the beast is a great crime; but is it a crime to devote a day to God, even though the Bible has not required it? Surely not, for Paul says: "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord." Romans 14:6. About doing this he says: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Verse 5. So we are at liberty to regard Sunday unto the Lord, if we so choose. Hence, it cannot be a sin as Adventists claim, and so cannot be the mark of the beast. The Three Messages, Revelation 14:6-12 The one great claim of Seventh-day Adventists is that they are preaching the three messages of Revelation 14:6-12. This is their constant theme. So the Mormons claim that Joe Smith preached this message. But there is not a particle of foundation for the claim in either case. Read the first message, verses 6,7. An angel is seen preaching the gospel to every nation, saying: "Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." This was fulfilled by the apostles and early Christians, as they preached the gospel to all nations. Jesus said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16:15. The angel in Revelation 14:6-7, is seen preaching the gospel to every nation, as Jesus commanded. Compare Paul’s sermon to the idolatrous heathen at Lystra, Acts 14:15, with the words of the first message, Revelation 14:7, and they will be seen to be almost identical. Said Paul, We "preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein." So Revelation 14:7 says "Worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea." This, then, was a message to idolaters, announcing to them the living God who made all things, but of whom they had been ignorant. This is exactly what the early church preached to the heathen nations till idolatry was overthrown.

Paul says the gospel "was preached to every creature which is under heaven," Colossians 1:23. This was before he died, and this exactly fulfilled Revelation 14:6-7. But the Advent work of 1844 was a small, local affair, limited to a few states; much less was it preached to all nations.

Adventists claim that Wm. Miller preached this message in 1840-4. He did no such thing. The burden of preaching was that the end of the world would come in 1843 and then in 1844. But he preached what failed both times, as we know. Does God send men to make such blunders as that? Miller did not preach the hour of judgment come. That was an afterthought, an interpretation put upon his work which was not thought of at the time.

It is claimed that the apostles could not have preached this message, as the judgment did not come in their day. Let us see. Jesus preached thus: "Now is the judgment of this world." John 12:31. Jesus said, "NOW is the judgment." Who will contradict him and say it wasn’t? Peter said: "For the time IS COME that judgment must begin at the house of God." 1 Peter 4:17. Then the judgment did begin there. Here are two direct testimonies, and that is enough. So in exact harmony with these, the First Angel announces, "The hour of his judgment is come." Revelation

14:7. If anyone wants to see the truth, this is clear enough; if they don’t want to, there is no use arguing with them further.

Second Message, Verse 8

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." What is Babylon, that great city? It is fully described in Revelation 17:1-18, Revelation 18:1-24, and is regarded by all Protestants as the Roman church. Adventists themselves agree with this, though endeavoring to make Babylon also include the Protestant churches. Even with their view Babylon, "the great," must refer primarily to Rome, and only include other fallen churches as a secondary idea, as her daughters. Seventh-day Adventists claim that this message was preached by the Millerites in 1844. When the churches refused to believe Miller that the end of the world would come in 1844, and that he could tell the very day, then and for this unbelief all these churches were rejected of God and fell. Mrs. White says: "Satan has taken full possession of the church as a body....Their profession, their prayers, and their exhortations are an abomination in the sight of God." Early Writings, page 135. What awful thing had they done to fall so? Why, Miller said the world would end in 1844, and they said it wouldn’t. He was wrong and they were right, but God rejected them and blessed the Millerites! This is a fair illustration of the egotism and inconsistency of the Adventists. Did they preach what Revelation 14:8 says? No! They said Babylon was fallen BECAUSE she rejected Millerism, but the message gives a far different reason. Babylon fell "because she made all nations drink of the wine of her fornication." The Bible gives one reason, Adventists give another. Did the Protestant churches in America in the short space of about five years, during Miller’s preaching, and by simply rejecting his time-theory - did they thus make all nations drunk? The idea is absurd. This message must have a far deeper and broader meaning than this. So they never preached this message. Just a few of the churches in the eastern states heard and rejected Millerism; for all this the tens of millions of church members throughout the whole world, who never even so much as heard of Miller, were rejected of God! What an unreasonable position. Again, Babylon must at least include Rome. Did the Catholic church fall in 1844? No, for she fell ages ago, as every Protestant knows. So, then, the fall of Babylon does not mean what Adventists say, nor did they preach what the message says. A thousand times more probable is the application of this message to the work of Luther and the Reformation. Till the time of Luther the Papal church was supposed to be the true church, and as such it ruled over the kings of earth and the consciences of men. Luther startled the world with the bold proclamation that the Roman church was the "Mother of harlots," "Babylon the great," of Revelation 17:1-6, and that she was fallen, as stated in Revelation 14:8; Revelation 18:1-4. October 6, 1520, he published his famous book on the "Babylonish Captivity of the Church."

I will quote from D’Aubigne’s History of the Reformation, Vol. II: "Luther had prepared a mine, the explosion of which shook the edifice of Rome to its lowest foundation. This was the publication of his famous book on the ’Babylonish Captivity of the Church,’ which appeared on the 6th of October, 1520." Page 130. In it he said: "I know that the Papacy is none other than the kingdom of Babylon ." Page 131. "Christians are God’s true people, led captive to Babylon." Page 133. "All the evils that afflicted Christendom, he sincerely ascribed to Rome." Page 138. Says Luther: "It is true that I have attacked the court of Rome; but neither you nor any man on earth can deny that it is more corrupt than Sodom." Page 139. "This Babylon, which is confusion itself." "Rome for many

years past has inundated the world with all that could destroy both body and soul. The church of Rome, once the foremost in sanctity, is become the most licentious den of robbers, the most shameless of all brothels, the kingdom of sin, of death, and of hell." Page 140.

Here was a proclamation of the fall of Babylon, which was worthy of the name. Truly, Rome had made all nations drunk with her wine. She had ruled over all nations; had become rich; had lived in splendor; had killed the saints; had become the habitation of every evil spirit. All this is exactly portrayed in Revelation 17:1-6, where "Babylon the great," of Revelation 14:8. is more fully described. Then in Revelation 18:1-4 the announcement of the fall of Babylon, as noticed in Revelation 14:8, is more fully explained, but it is the same message. This fits Luther's work exactly.

Luther's message was a mighty cry, which enlightened the earth, announced the fearful corruptions of Rome, and called out of her millions of people, and gave to the world that mighty power, Protestantism. In all the history of the world such a mighty religious move had never before been seen. This was worthy of a notice in prophecy.

Consider this fact: While Adventists find hundreds of prophecies, whole chapters of them, applying to their little work, they find none foretelling the great religious movement of the Reformation which revolutionized the world! It illustrates how they interpret everything to fit themselves. No; the second message of Revelation 14:8, the fall of Babylon, applies to the Catholic church, not to Protestants, and was given three hundred and fifty years ago by Luther, not by the Millerites in 1844. The Third Message, Revelation 14:9-12 This warning against the worship of the beast and his image, and his mark, has been given by all the Protestant churches for the last three hundred years. Look at the multitude of books against popery and the corruptions of Catholicism. From press and pulpit has been thundered one continual warning against apostate Rome. Never was a prophecy more plainly fulfilled than this.

Seventh-day Adventists say that they are giving this message. Never was a claim more absurd.

They are mistaken entirely as to what the beast, image, and mark are, as I have shown.

According to their own showing, they have been preaching for seventy years against a thing which does not exist - the image, which they say is yet to be made!

That part of the message about the torment of the wicked, their smoke going up for ever and ever, etc., they never preach; for it is just what they don't believe.

Their egotistical claim that they are the only ones who "keep the commandments of God," is shown to be false in Chapter XX.

There are six angels mentioned in Revelation 14:1-20. If the first three represent messages of warning, then the other three do also; and, hence, there are yet three messages more to come after the Third Angels message! What do Adventists have to say about these? Nothing.

These few brief points are sufficient to show that their application of the three messages is entirely wrong. Is the Sabbath God's Seal?

Seventh-day Adventists claim that "the seal of God is his Holy Sabbath." Thoughts on Revelation, page 452. They are not sent to "seal" the 144,000 of Revelation 7:1-8 ready for translation. Not a soul living on earth when Jesus comes will be saved, unless he is thus sealed by keeping that day. Early Writings, page 11.

Does the Bible say that the Sabbath is the seal of God? No; this is another Adventist assumption which they claim to prove by a long, round-about, far-fetched set of inferences. It takes one of their ablest speakers an hour to make it appear even plausible when he has no opposition. Even then few can see through it.

The word "seal," as a noun and a verb, is used sixty-five times in the Bible, but not once is it said to be the Sabbath.

They argue that SIGN and SEAL are synonymous terms, meaning the same thing; and as the Sabbath is called a sign (Exodus 31:17), it is therefore a seal. To this I object, because (1) SEAL is never defined by the word SIGN, nor SIGN by the word SEAL; nor is one term ever given as the synonym for the other. I have carefully examined fourteen different dictionaries, lexicons and cyclopedias, and find no exception to this statement. (2) This original term for seal (Hebrew, ’chotham’; Greek, ’sphragis’) is never rendered sign. (3) The original word for sign (Hebrew, ’oth’; Greek, ’semeion’) is never rendered seal. Hence they are not synonymous terms.

Romans 4:11 is used to prove that a sign is a seal; but it does not prove it. Anything may be put to two entirely different uses, as I may use my cane for a staff or for a pointer, but is therefore a staff and a pointer the same? No. So in Romans 4:11, circumcision was used as a sign and also as a seal; but this does not prove that a sign is a seal. So the Sabbath is a sign. Exodus 31:17 Possibly God might also use it as a seal, but does he? Where is the proof? Nowhere.

The Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel. Exodus 31:17. So was circumcision. Romans 4:11. But neither is a sign to Christians.

The Sabbath was abolished at the cross. Colossians 2:16. Hence it cannot be God’s seal now.

If the Sabbath is God’s seal with which he seals his people for translation, then every one who has the Sabbath is sealed and ready for translation. When God puts his seal upon a man, that must settle it that he is God’s. So in Revelation 7:2-4, where the angel sealed a man with the seal of God, did he not thereby become one of the 144,000 who were "without fault?" Revelation 14:1-5. Yes. Then, if the Sabbath is the seal, all who keep it are sealed and ready for Heaven. But (1) the old Pharisees all kept the Sabbath strictly; (2) millions of Jews keep it now; (3) all Seventh-day Baptists keep it; (4) the Marion party, who bitterly oppose Seventh-day Adventists, all keep it; (5) many Seventh-day Adventists keep it who have been expelled from their churches for their sins. Are all these sealed and ready for salvation? No. Then the Sabbath as a seal, as the proof of God’s favor, as a test of character and fitness for Heaven, fails entirely. Hence, it cannot be God’s seal.

What then, is God’s seal? It is plainly stated to be the Holy Spirit. Thus: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." IICor, 1:22. "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." Ephesians 1:13. "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Ephesians 4:30. These texts are plain

enough as to what the seal of the Lord is. It is the Holy Spirit. Strange that men will set aside these plain texts, and try by long, uncertain arguments to make out that the old Jewish Sabbath is the seal, when the Bible never says a word about it.

Adventists argue that the Sabbath is the seal to the decalogue. They say there is nothing else in the Ten Commandments to tell who gave that law. The assertion is utterly false. The very first words of the decalogue tell who gave it: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Exodus 20:2-3. This tells as plainly as possible who gave that law, and cuts up by the roots the Adventist argument on the seal. Now look at their "Law of God" chart. These words as God put them are left off. If left on they would clearly contradict the Advent argument.

02.07. Chapter 7 - The Sanctuary

Chapter 7 - The Sanctuary

Seventh-day Adventists make everything turn upon their view of the sanctuary. It is vital with them. If they are wrong on this, their whole theory breaks down. The reader should, therefore, study this subject carefully. They dwell upon it constantly, and affirm that they are the only ones in all Christendom who have the light on the subject. I will devote only a few pages to it, just enough to show the fallacy of their system.

They based their time of 1844 upon Daniel 8:14. "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The sanctuary was the earth. It was to be cleansed by fire at the second advent. The 2300 days ended in 1844. Hence, Christ must come that year. They proved it all by the Bible; so there could be no mistake, they said. But Christ didn't come. Now what? Fanaticism dies hard, positive men don't like to yield. So they now find that the sanctuary does not mean the earth at all, as they had said, but a real building in heaven, just like the tabernacle which Moses built. That was a tent with two rooms, the Holy place, containing the table, a candlestick, and golden altar; the Most Holy, containing the ark, in which were the tables of stone, and over which was the mercy seat and cherubim. See Hebrews 9:17. The priests ministered in the first place every day in the year, but only the high priest went into the Most Holy, and he only on the last day of the year. Leviticus 16:1-34. On that day he cleansed the sanctuary of the sins confessed there during the year. All this was a type of just such a building in heaven, where Christ ministers. Hebrews 8:1-5; Hebrews 9:1-9; Hebrews 9:24. In 1844 he left the first place and entered the Most Holy to cleanse the heavenly sanctuary, which, really, is the judgment. This explains their disappointment. Jesus went into the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to begin the judgment in 1844, instead of coming to earth, as they first expected and preached! To prove all this they make long, inferential arguments, which are open to objections from all sides.

Do the Adventists KNOW that they are right about this question? No.

If this subject is as plain and as important as they say it is, it is strange that nobody ever found it out before.

After being perfectly familiar with their view of it, and knowing all their arguments, I feel sure they are mistaken about it.

1. God sent the Adventists with a last solemn message to earth upon which the destiny of the church and the world depended. The very first thing they did was to get the wrong year, '43 instead of '44. Then, when they got that fixed up, instead of announcing the real event to take place, the change in Christ's work in the sanctuary in heaven, they said he was to come to earth, raise the dead, and burn the world, when nothing of the kind was to occur!

2. Not one in fifty of the original Adventists ever found out the real mistake they had made. Not even one of the leading Adventists, like Miller, Himes, Litch, etc., ever accepted this sanctuary

explanation. Only a mere handful out of the great mass of 1844 Adventists found out the truth about the sanctuary, and these were men of no note in Miller's work.

3. Miller himself opposed the Seventh-day Adventist's move, rejecting the idea of the sanctuary, the Sabbath, and the third angel's message. What a hopeless tangle that Advent work was! No wonder people rejected it. What if Moses had opposed Joshua, and John the Baptist had opposed Christ? Miller was sent to do a work, got it wrong, and then opposed those who did finally get it right!

4. Instead of receiving the "light" of the sanctuary question from Mrs. White's vision, or from heaven, they got it from O.R.L. Crosier. But he soon gave it all up as an error, and has opposed the Seventh-day Adventists for many years. It looks badly for a theory when its very authors renounce it.

5. Seventh-day Adventists at first adopted the sanctuary theory to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844, a theory which Mrs. White and all of them held at that time. Here is my proof on this point: Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 1 1887. Elder D.M. Canright: "I kept the seventh day nearly a year, about 1848. In 1846 I explained the idea of the sanctuary in an article in an extra double number of the Day Star, Cincinnati, O. The object of that article was to support the theory that the door of mercy was shut, a theory which I and nearly all Adventists who had adopted William Miller's views, held from 1844 to 1848. Yes, I KNOW that Ellen G. Harmon - now Mrs. White - held the shut door theory at that time." Truly yours, O.R.L. Crosier

Now listen to Mrs. White: Topsham, Me., April 21, 1847. "...The Lord showed me in vision more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light on the cleansing of the sanctuary, etc., and that it was his will that Bro. C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day Star (extra), Feb 7, 1846. I fell fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that extra to every saint...." E.G. White, "A Word to the Little Flock," pages 11,12.

Here you have the origin and object of that sanctuary theory. Before me lies "The Present Truth," Vol. I, No. 6, December, 1849, by James White. "The Shut Door Explained," is the leading article, in which it is argued from the type Leviticus 16:17, that when the high priest entered the Most Holy there could be no more pardon for sin. "On this day of atonement he is a high priest for THOSE ONLY whose names are inscribed on the bread-plate of judgment," page 44. No more salvation for sinners, is what their sanctuary theory was then used to prove. The whole volume is full of this idea.

6. Their argument from the type on this point was right; in the type no sin could be confessed and conveyed into the sanctuary after the high priest entered the Most Holy. Leviticus 4:1-7; Leviticus 16:17; Leviticus 16:23-24. So if this was a type of the entrance of Christ into the Most Holy in heaven in 1844, then truly the door of mercy did close there, and all sinners since are lost.

7. No work whatever was to be done on the day of atonement, or day when the sanctuary was cleansed. Leviticus 23:27-32. The law was very strict. If the Advent argument on the sanctuary is correct and the day of atonement began in 1844, then they ought not to have worked a day since. Hence, many Adventists after 1844 held that it was a sin to work; but time starved them out, and they had to go at it again.

8. Finally, being compelled to abandon the position that the door of mercy was entirely shut against sinners in 1844, they next taught that ONLY THOSE could be saved who KNEW of the change Christ made in the sanctuary in Heaven in 1844. Thus Elder Smith, in "Objections to the Visions Answered," pages 24- 26, says: "A knowledge of Christ's position and work is necessary to the enjoyment of the benefits of his mediation.... A general idea of his work was then (previous to 1844) sufficient to enable men to approach unto God by him.... But when he changed his position (in 1844) to the Most Holy place... that knowledge of his work which had up to that point been sufficient, was no longer sufficient.... Who can find salvation now? Those who go to the Saviour where he is and view him by faith in the Most Holy place.... This is the door now open for salvation. But no man can understand this change without definite knowledge of the subject of the sanctuary and the relation of type and anti-type. Now they may seek the Saviour as they have before sought him, with no other ideas of his position and ministry than those which they entertained while he was in the first apartment; but will it avail them? They cannot find him there. That door is shut!" So Mrs. White: "They have no knowledge of the move made in Heaven, or the way into the Most Holy, and they cannot be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there. ... They offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus has left." Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, page 171,172. What abominable doctrine! No one can be saved unless they know of the change which Christ made in Heaven in 1844. But no one except Seventh-day Adventists has the slightest idea of that change. Reader, think of this.

9. But now they have abandoned this view of the sanctuary and hold that all who honestly seek God may be saved without any of this "light" on the sanctuary. Thus they have already held four different positions upon the sanctuary question: 1. It was the earth. 2. The door of mercy was shut to all sinners in 1844. 3. It was open only to those who learned about Christ's change in 1844. 4. It is now open to all. What will they hold next?

After thoroughly investigating the whole subject of the sanctuary, I feel sure that they are in a great error on that point.

1. God's throne was always in the Most Holy place of the sanctuary, between the cherubim, over the ark, never once in the Holy place. For proof on this point see Leviticus 16:2; Numbers 7:89; 1 Samuel 4:4; 2 Kings 19:15. Smith argues that God's throne was sometimes in the Holy place and refers to Exodus 33:9. But here the Lord appeared OUTSIDE the tabernacle, and not in the Holy place at all. So his text fails him.

2. When Jesus ascended to Heaven, eighteen hundred years ago, he went directly to the right hand of God and sat down on his throne. Hebrews 8:1. Hence, he must have entered the Most Holy then, instead of on 1844.

3. "Within the vail" is into the Most Holy place. "And thou shalt hang up the vail under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the vail the ark of the testimony: and the vail shall divide unto you between the Holy place and the Most Holy." Exodus 26:33. Also see Leviticus 16:2; Leviticus 16:12-13.

None can fail to see that "within the vail" is in the Most Holy place where the ark was. This is just where Jesus went eighteen hundred years ago. Proof: "Which HOPE we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail; whither the forerunner is

for us entered, EVEN Jesus made a high priest for ever." Hebrews 6:19-20. As the high priest went "within the vail," so Jesus, our high priest, went "within the vail," into the Most Holy place, to the right hand of God and sat down on his throne. Nothing could be more plainly stated. This upsets the whole Advent theory of 1844. For further proof see Exodus 27:21; Exodus 30:6; Exodus 40:22-26; Leviticus 4:6; Leviticus 4:17; Leviticus 16:15; Leviticus 24:3; Numbers 18:7; Matthew 27:51.

4. "Before the throne," Revelation 8:3. Elder Smith asserts that "the throne of God was in the first apartment of the sanctuary," because it is said that the seven lamps and the golden altar were "before the throne," Revelation 4:5; Revelation 8:1-13, Revelation 3:1-22. It is as desperate cause which seizes upon such proof. The same argument would prove that the ark and God's throne were always in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary, which we know to be false. As there was only a vail which divided the Holy from the Most Holy, where God's throne was, things in the Holy place were said to be "before the Lord," as they were so near to the throne, which was just behind the curtain. Proof: Exodus 27:20-21; Exodus 30:6-8; Exodus 40:23-25; Leviticus 4:6; Leviticus 4:15-18. Even outside of the tabernacle entirely, where the beasts were killed, was "before the Lord," as Leviticus 4:15 shows. Abraham walked "before the Lord," Genesis 24:40, yet he was on earth, and the Lord was in heaven.

5. Not a single text can be found in all the Bible where the ark and cherubim and throne were in the Holy place of the earthly sanctuary, the type; yet in the antitype they have the throne of God in the Holy place, not on some special occasion, but all the time for 1800 years, just contrary to the type!

6. Adventists always assume and say that "the temple of God is the Most Holy place." Sanctuary, page 234, by U. Smith. But this is false. The Most Holy place, or the oracle, was a ROOM IN THE TEMPLE, but it was not the temple itself. In fact the Scriptures carefully distinguished between the temple and the oracle or Most Holy. See 1 Kings 6:5, 1 Kings 5:16-17, 1 Kings 6:19, 1 Kings 6:23, 1 Kings 7:50. The temple was the house, the whole building. 1 Kings 7:50; 2 Kings 11:13; 1 Samuel 3:3; Matthew 21:12; Luke 1:9; Revelation 11:19.

7. When was the temple in heaven opened, Revelation 11:19? Adventists use this text to prove that the Most Holy place in the heavenly sanctuary was not opened till 1844. But it fails them: 1) Because, as we have proved above, the temple is not the Most Holy place, but the whole building. 2) Because the heavenly temple was opened when Christ began his ministry there, 1800 years ago. Hebrews 8:1-2; Hebrews 9:8 to Hebrews 12:3) Because Revelation 11:19 properly belongs with Revelation 12:1-17, and begins that new line of prophecy, instead of closing the line in Revelation 11:1-19. The Syriac thus divides it. Clarke, Barnes, Scott, and every commentator I have consulted, connects this verse with Revelation 12:1-17 as the introduction. Says Scott: "V. 19 - This verse introduces a new subject, and should have been placed at the beginning of the next chapter." Certainly; for when was the temple in heaven opened? When Jesus went there to begin his ministry, of course. Hebrews 9:8-12. Thus fails the main pillar of the Adventists sanctuary theory.

Thus far I have argued on their own grounds that there is a real building up in heaven, just like the sanctuary on earth. But that whole thing is extremely questionable.

1. As children are taught moral truths by object lessons, so God taught the Jews spiritual truths by the object lessons of the types of worship. Hence, it does not follow that in Christian worship there must be just such material things used up in heaven. Rather the presumption is against it.

2. The whole temple service was for the Aaronic priesthood; but Christ is not a priest after the order of Aaron, but is after that of Melchisedec, Hebrews 7:11. Melchisedec had no temple nor temple service, so Christ should have none. From Adam till Moses there was no temple nor priestly service in heaven. Smith admits this. "There were no holy places laid open, and no priestly work was established in heaven." Sanctuary, page 238. Exactly; for that was under the Melchisedec priesthood, just as now. If no temple was needed there for 4000 years, none is needed there now.

3. Paul directly states that the types of the law were "NOT the very image of the things" they represent, Hebrews 10:1. But Adventists make their argument on the assumption that they were exact images of things in heaven, thus ignoring Paul's statement.

4. Paul says that Christ is a minister of a greater and more perfect tabernacle, Hebrews 9:11. Then it must differ from the earthly one.

5. Paul says it is one "not made with hands," Hebrews 9:11. This shows that it is not a material building.

6. Paul says that Jesus' flesh is the vail, Hebrews 10:20. This shows that the temple was only figurative.

7. Scarcely one of the types had an antitype just like it. Thus lambs and oxen were the type of which Jesus was the antitype. But he was a MAN and they were BEASTS. The bodies of those beasts were BURNED, Hebrews 13:11-12, but Christ, the antitype was not burned. They were slain at the door of the sanctuary, Leviticus 17:3-4, but Jesus was not slain at the door of the sanctuary. Their blood was carried into the temple and put on the altar, Leviticus 4:6-7, but the blood of Christ was spilt on the ground. The Levitical priests made offerings daily, but Christ only once for all, Hebrews 9:25-26; Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 10:10; Hebrews 10:12; Hebrews 10:14. Elder Smith says: "The fact that Moses made two apartments in his likeness of the heavenly temple is a DEMONSTRATION that the latter has two apartments also." Again: "The Priests here on earth, in both apartments, served unto the example of a like service in heaven. Now Jesus is the only priest in heaven, and he must perform this 'like service.'" The earthly priests offered, every day, the morning and evening sacrifice, sprinkling the blood of fresh-slain victims in the outer sanctuary. So for more than eighteen hundred years, Jesus, according to Mr. Smith, must have offered his own fresh-shed blood in the outer apartment of the heavenly sanctuary twice every day; that is more than 1,300,000 times from his ascension to 1844. This is the logical result of Mr. Smith's 'demonstration.' The apostle says, Hebrews 7:27 : "This he did once for all, when he offered up himself. Thus the 'demonstration' flatly contradicts the scriptures." G.W. Morton. The law regulating the service of the priests and the temple was changed, Hebrews 7:12. Then certainly it is not carried out in heaven now. Adventists would have the whole Levitical law of the sanctuary service transferred to heaven and carried out there! This is the absurdity of their system. In Hebrews 7:11-28 Paul marks many points of difference between the types and the antitypes. The table of the Lord was in the temple in the Jewish age, Malachi 1:7, but now the Lord's table is

in the church, 1 Corinthians 10:21, 1 Corinthians 11:20. The seven lamps in the temple of heaven "are the seven spirits of God," Revelation 4:4. Then they are not literal lamps. So it is more than probable that none of the things mentioned as being there are literal. In one place it is said that the saints in heaven are "clothed in white robes," Revelation 7:9, but in another place this is explained to be the righteousness of saints, Revelation 10:8. In Revelation 8:3 it is said that the prayers of all saints are offered upon the golden altar. Most evidently this is not to be taken literally, but only as a reference to the Jewish mode of worship. Colossians 2:16-17, says that the meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and Sabbath days were a shadow of Christ. Reasoning as the Adventists do about the early sanctuary, Hebrews 8:5, we would expect to find something in the gospel exactly like them, meats, drinks, yearly feast days, monthly holy days, etc. But where are they? In the gospel there is nothing at all just like these types.

Paul says directly that the place into which Jesus went was "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," Hebrews 9:24. The simple truth of the whole is that the ages of types, object lessons, exact forms, set ceremonies, consecrated places and holy vessels - all this ended at the cross, Colossians 2:17. The answer of Jesus to the woman at the well is exactly to the point. She said: "Our fathers worshipped in the mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus said unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. ... But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth." John 4:20-24. Under the gospel one place is no more holy than another. With the holy places went all the holy vessels, sacrifices, incense, tables of stone, and all. Peter states it all in a word: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 2:5. To the same effect, Ephesians 2:20-22; 1 Corinthians 6:19. Now we are under a new covenant; Hebrews 8:6-13, an high priest of a new order, Hebrews 7:11, we come to God by a new way, Hebrews 10:20, by new ordinances, Mark 15:15-16; ICor. 11:23-26, by a different temple, and a better sacrifice. Hence, there is no need of a temple in heaven just like the old Jewish one. The Adventists idea of the sanctuary in heaven is an absurdity. In Early Writings, pages 114,115, Mrs. White was taken to heaven and shown all about it. She saw the building exactly like the one on earth. In it was the candlestick, the table of show-bread, the altar, the curtains, the ark; and "in the ark were tables of stone containing the Ten Commandments." Think, now; what use for a literal candle in the immediate presence of God whose glory is above the light of the sun. "They need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light." Revelation 22:5. And what use for a literal table of show-bread there? Do the angels or the Lord eat the bread? Then real tables of stone in Heaven! and the Lord sitting on the ark over them! What puerile ideas. Hear Paul veto that idea: "Not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Corinthians 3:3. Then think of the absurdity of having the Almighty God and all the "ten thousand times ten thousand" (one hundred million) angels around his throne, dwelling in a literal building with curtains, lamps, tables, walls, etc. It would need to be larger than a whole State. Let Adventists read this: "Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Acts 7:48.

"But does not Paul say that the Jewish temple was a shadow, figure, a pattern of heavenly things," Hebrews 8:1-13, Hebrews 9:1-28? Yes; and so he says the offerings and holy days of the old

covenant were shadows of Christ, Colossians 2:16-17. But where are our feast days, new moons, meats, etc., under the gospel? Nowhere, in a spiritual sense. So Paul says the earthly temple was only a FIGURE of a "tabernacle not made with hands." Hebrews 9:9-11. How could he say more plainly that the heavenly are not literal? Did Christ minister in a literal temple in heaven from Adam till the cross, four thousand years? No. Did Melchisedec have a temple? No. Genesis 14:18-20. As Christ is a priest after his order, he needs no literal temple. According to the Adventists, the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary was entirely empty and unoccupied from the ascension of Jesus till 1844. Even Christ did not enter it once! Finally, their whole argument on the sanctuary depends upon proving that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9:1-27 are a part of the twenty-three hundred days of Daniel 8:14. But does the Bible say they are? No; nor can they prove it. The very best they can claim is to make it plausible that they are.

02.08. Chapter 8 - Mrs. White and her Revelations

Chapter 8 - Mrs. White and her Revelations

Seventh-day Adventists regard Mrs. White as a prophetess and her writings as inspired. They make long arguments from the Bible to prove that there should be gifts, miracles and prophets in the church. But these are the same arguments used by the Mormons, Shakers, etc., in favor of their churches. They do not touch the case. The question is not, CAN the Lord inspire men and women? but, HAS he so inspired Mrs. White? The New Testament repeatedly warns us against accepting false prophets. "Beware of false prophets," Matthew 7:15. "There shall arise false Christ's and false prophets," Matthew 24:24. "Believe not every spirit...Many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4:1. In every generation many have arisen claiming to be prophets. All have found followers more or less. All they have to do is to firmly believe in themselves and make extravagant claims and they will soon have followers. Let us notice a few prominent ones near our own times.

1. Swedenborg

He was born in Stockholm, Sweden, 1688, and died in 1772. His father was a nobleman of high standing. Hence Swedenborg was highly educated and moved in the highest society. He traveled extensively, and conversed with the most learned men of the age. The king appointed him to a high office, which he filled with great acceptance for over thirty years. He rose to eminence in science and wrote seventy-seven books, covering every branch of science. He was of the purest character and devoutly religious.

Swedenborg's Rules of Life 1. Often to read and meditate on the Word of God.

2. To submit in everything to the will of Divine Providence.

3. To observe in everything a propriety of behavior, and to keep the conscience clear.

4. To discharge with fidelity the functions of my employment, and the duties of my office, and to render myself in all things useful to society. Not a stain rests upon his moral character. At the age of fifty-five he began to have visions of heaven, hell, angels, and the spiritual world. He says: "I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most mercifully appeared to me, his servant, in the year 1743, when he opened my sight into the spiritual world and enabled me to converse with spirits and angels." Exactly like Mrs. White claims. This work he continued for thirty years, and wrote about thirty inspired volumes. He made most remarkable predictions, which were exactly fulfilled, it is claimed.

He founded a new religion based upon his revelations. The Bible is sacredly taught and holy living enjoined. This church has steadily increased, till it has societies in all parts of the world and in the leading languages. They publish three weeklies, five monthly journals, and one quarterly, besides many books. He got the start of Mrs. White just one hundred years. His followers believe in him just as implicitly as hers do in her, and are very zealous in propagating their faith. In many

respects both moves are much alike. The above is condensed from Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopedia.

2. Ann Lee and the Shakers

These are so well known in America that I need say but little about them. Ann Lee, their leader, was born in England, in 1736; died 1784. Like Mrs. White, "she received no education." She joined a society who were having remarkable religious exercises, and soon began "to have visions and make revelations," which, just like Mrs. White, she called "testimonies." "Henceforth she claimed to be directed by revelations and visions." Schaff- Herzog Encyclopedia, article "Ann Lee." She was accepted as leader and as "the second appearing of Christ." Like Mrs. White, she required a "peculiar kind of dress," "opposed war and the use of pork." Johnson's Encyclopedia, article "Shakers." They have no intercourse with other churches; are renowned for their purity and devotion. They number about 8,000. A careful comparison shows many points of similarity between Mrs. Lee and Mrs. White. The main evidence upon which Adventists rely for proof of Mrs. White's inspiration is the purity of her life and the high moral and religious tone of her writings. They say her revelations must either be of God or Satan. If of Satan they would not teach such purity and holiness. The same reasoning will prove Mrs. Lee also a true prophetess, for she exceeds Mrs. White in this line, so that "Shaker" has become a synonym for honesty. Adventists, please note this point.

3. Mrs. Joanna Southcott

She was born in England in 1750, of poor parents, and was wholly uneducated. She worked as a domestic servant till over forty years of age. She joined the Methodists in 1790. In 1792 she announced herself as a prophetess, and "published numerous [over sixty] pamphlets setting forth her revelations." Johnson's Encyclopedia, article "Southcott." She had trances the same as Mrs. White does, and announced the speedy advent of Christ. See Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott." She carried on a lucrative trade in the sale of her books as Mrs. White does. Strange as it may appear, many learned ministers believed in her, and thousands joined her followers, till in a few years they numbered upwards of one hundred thousand! She made many predictions, which her followers claimed were fulfilled. "The faith of her followers, among whom were several clergymen of the established church, rose to enthusiasm." Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott."

She "regarded herself as the bride of the Lamb, and declared herself, when sixty-four years of age, pregnant with the true Messiah, the 'second Shilo,' whom she would bear Oct. 19, 1814... Joanna dies in her self delusion Dec. 27, 1814; but her followers, who at one time numbered a hundred thousand, continued till 1831 to observe the Jewish Sabbath." Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia. "A post mortem examination showed that she had been suffering from dropsy [edema]." Johnson's Cyclopedia. "Death put an end to both her hopes and her fears. With her followers, however, it was otherwise; and, though for a time confounded by her decease, which they could scarcely believe to be real, her speedy resurrection was confidently anticipated. In this persuasion many lived and died, nor is her sect yet extinct." Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott."

Let candid people consider these facts. This movement occurring only thirty years before Mrs. White's work, was in several respects like the present Seventh-day Adventist move. An illiterate woman is the leader. She has visions, writes numerous pamphlets and revelations and predicts the speedy advent of Christ. Her honesty is plainly manifested; her enthusiasm and that of her followers is great. In a short period one hundred thousand accept her "testimonies." The present Seventh-day Adventist move is similar in many respects as has already been seen above. And here notice the terrible tenacity of fanaticism when once started. When Joanna died we would have supposed that all sane persons would have given it up; but they fix it up some way and go right on, and there they are now. So with the followers of Mrs. White. No matter what blunders or failures she makes, they fix them up some way and go right on. They will do it after she is dead and gone.

4. Joseph Smith and the Mormons This prophet and his visions and revelations are so well known that I mention them briefly. Smith was born in 1805, and died in 1844, the year before Mrs. White began her revelations. He came out in a great religious awakening, as Mrs. White did in the Advent move of 1843-4. In 1823 he also began to have "visions" and "revelations" and see angels. The second advent of Christ was at hand, he said, hence the name, "Latter day saints." His mission was to introduce "the new dispensation." They are the "saints," and all the other churches are "heathen," or Gentiles. Mrs. White's followers are all saints; all other churches are "Babylon" and apostate. The proof of their inspiration outstrips Mrs. White. They work many miracles, as they strongly assert, have the gift of tongues, and can show many predictions strikingly fulfilled. I have met them frequently, seen Smith's son, and know them well. They also have a new Bible, a new revelation, have started a new sect, and will have nothing to do with others, but proselyte from all. The Mormons began in 1831, about fifteen years before Seventh-day Adventists did; but they number six hundred thousand, more than five times as many as Adventists. Adventists claim that they must be the true church because they are persecuted; but Mormons have been persecuted a thousand fold more. Smith and others were killed; many have been whipped, tarred and feathered, rotten- egged, stoned, mobbed, run out of town, and outlawed. So they must be the true church? Seventh-day Adventists have suffered no persecution. Not one of them has ever been whipped, or stoned, or egged, or tarred and feathered, or mobbed, or killed. Persecution! They have no idea what it is and never will though they are anxious to pose as great martyrs. The Visions and their Guide

Mrs. E.G. White, wife of the late Elder 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, ironclad resolutions have been unanimously adopted, endorsing her revelations in the strongest manner.

Time and again I have seen these resolutions 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 defending her inspiration.

They point to her and her visions as the sign and proof that they are the only true church. Revelation 12:17. Hence it can be seen that this is a vital subject with them. In my debate with the Adventists at Healdsburg, Cal., Feb. 21-28, 1889, they affirmed this proposition: "The visions of

Mrs. E.G. White are revelations from God." Her writings are called "Testimonies." In Testimony No. 33, just published, she makes this claim for her writings: "In ancient times God spoke to men by the mouth of prophets and apostles. In these days he speaks to them by the Testimonies of his spirit." Page 189. Again: "It is hardly possible for men to offer a greater insult to God than to despise and reject the instrumentalities [her Testimonies] that he has appointed to lead these." Page 208. Notice that her "Testimonies" are to LEAD God's people now. Of her inspiration Smith says: "It comes to us as a divine message; it is a ray of light from the throne; it is instruction by the Holy Spirit." Replies to Elder Canright, page 77. In the Advent Review, July 2, 1889, are laid down these, "RULES: 1. We will not neglect the study of the Bible and the Testimonies." This illustrates the place they assign her writings, viz., an appendix to the Bible. She occupies the same relation to her people that Mrs. Southcott did to hers, Ann Lee to the Shakers, and Joe Smith to the Mormons.

Among themselves they quote her as we do Paul. A text from her writings is an end of all controversy in doctrine and discipline. It is common to hear them say that when they give up her visions they will give up the Bible too, and they often do. Her visions, or "testimonies," as they are called, are so inseparably connected with the whole Seventh-day Adventist doctrine that a person cannot consistently accept the one without accepting the other. Besides, they are so constantly urged upon their people in every possible way, that a person cannot long feel comfortable among them unless he, too accepts them. Any one who rejects or opposes them is branded as a rebel fighting against God. Thus Mrs. White herself says: "If you lessen the confidence of God's people in the testimonies he has sent them, you are rebelling against God as certainly as were Kora, Dathan and Abiram." Testimony No. 31, page 62. She claims that every line she writes, even in a private letter, is directly inspired by God - "the precious rays of light shining from the throne," page 63. Of her own words she says: "It is God, and not an erring mortal, that has spoken." Testimonies, Vol. III, page 257. She states over and over that those who doubt or oppose her are fighting against God, sinning against the Holy Ghost. Thus: "fighting the Spirit of God. Those...who would break down our testimony, I saw, are not fighting against us, but against God," page 260. I could quote scores of passages like these.

These inspired writings now embrace forty bound volumes. Thus they have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons have. They have to read our old Bible in the light of this new Bible. Any interpretation of the Bible found in these "testimonies" settles its meaning beyond further dispute. She says: "I took the precious Bible and surrounded it with several testimonies to the church," Vol. 2, page 605. Exactly; and by the light of these "testimonies" that old Bible must now be read. She continues: "God has, through the testimonies, simplified the great truths already given." Yes, we must now take the Bible as thus simplified by her! Swedenborg, Mrs. Southcott, Ann Lee, Joseph Smith and Mrs. White have each done the same thing - had a new revelation, written inspired books, and started a new sect with a new religion.

There is not a doctrine or a practice of the church, from the observance of the Sabbath to the washing of feet, upon which she has not written. That settles it. No further investigation can be made on any of these matters, only to gather evidence and construe everything to sustain it. How, then, can their ministers or people be free to think and investigate for themselves? They can not, dare not, and do not. How often I have seen some intelligent thought extinguished with this remark: "That contradicts Sister White." This ends the matter. Everything she writes, whether in a

private letter or newspaper article, is inspired. Thus: "God was speaking through clay.... In these letters which I write, in the testimonies I bear, I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision - the precious rays of light shining from the throne." Testimony No. 31, page 63. There you have it simon pure: every word she writes is a ray of light from the throne of God. Reject that, and you are rejected of God.

Thus it will be seen that Mrs. White claims the very highest inspiration, the voice of God speaking directly through her. Her followers contend that she must either be a true prophetess or else a hypocrite; but she is neither. Few are aware of what a powerful influence an excited religious imagination will have over a person. Enthusiasts and fanatics are generally honest people. Mrs. White is simply a religious enthusiast self-deceived. This I shall prove by stubborn facts.

I long studied Mrs. White to determine for myself her real character till her case is clear to my own mind. Naturally religious, young in years, uneducated, sickly, she was carried away in the Millerite excitement of 1840- 44. Her fits she accepted as the power of God. Encouraged and sustained by her husband, this thought grew to be a reality to her. A careful study of her writings shows that each year she has become a little stronger in her claims of inspiration till now she asserts that all her utterances, even in a letter, or in a sermon, are inspired. She claims that her dreams, her impressions of mind are all the voice of God to her. She devotes 38 pages of her Testimony No. 33 to vindicating her own high inspiration. Probably she has some way of fixing up her mistakes, contradictions and deceptions satisfactory to herself. So now anything she can learn in any way, any impression of mind, any thought clear to herself, is the Spirit speaking to her. I have no doubt that she believes it. She is more deceived than her followers, for many of them privately doubt her inspiration while publicly defending it. That she is not inspired is plainly shown by many facts. She has never wrought a single miracle. The old prophets and the apostles wrought miracles freely, to prove that God had sent them. In all these seventy years, in all her forty volumes, not a single prediction has she ever made that has come to pass. This is astonishing, considering that she dwells almost wholly in predictions. It seems as though she ought to have blundered into many things which could afterward be construed into a fulfilled prophecy. But not one can be found. This shows how wild and utterly wrong her theories have been.

She says in "Spiritual Gifts," Vol. II, page 293: "I am just as dependent upon the Spirit of the Lord in relating or writing a vision as in having a vision." Here she claims that the very words in which her visions are recorded are of divine inspiration. But I know that the words in her written "testimonies" are not inspired; for -

1. When writing them out she will often change what she has written, and write it very differently. I have seen her scratch out a whole page, or a line, or a sentence, and write it over differently. If God gave her the words, why did she scratch them out and alter them?

2. I have repeatedly seen her sit with pen in hand and read her manuscript to her husband for hours, while he suggested many changes, which she made. She would scratch out her own words and put in his, sometimes whole sentences. Was he inspired, too?

3. As she is ignorant of grammar, of late years she has employed an accomplished writer to take her manuscript and correct it, improve its wording, polish it up, and put it in popular style, so her

books will sell better. Thousands of words, not her own, are thus put in by these other persons, some of whom are not even Christian. Are their words inspired, too?

4. She often copies her subject matter without credit or sign of quotation, from other authors. Indeed her last book, "Great Controversy," which they laud so highly as her greatest work, is largely a compilation from Andrew's History of the Sabbath, History of the Waldenses by Wylie, Life of Miller by White, Thoughts on Revelation by Smith, and other books. This she pretends was all revealed to her directly from heaven. It is not something she has heard or read or studied out, but it is what God has revealed to her by the Holy Ghost. Stubborn facts show that her claim is utterly false and her book a deception the same as the Book of Mormon, which Smith stole from Spaulding. The Pastor's Union of Healdsburg, Cal., investigated the matter and published many examples out of hundreds where she had copied her matter directly from other authors without anything to show it was copied. They went through several works and scores of pages finding the same thing all through her book. This proves her guilty of stealing her ideas and matter from other authors and putting them off on her followers as a revelation from God!

5. Passages Suppressed. Several important passages in the first edition of her visions have been suppressed in all later ones as they contradict what Adventists now believe. 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 republished her first visions, claiming to give them all and word for word. They say: "No changes from the original work have been made." Preface to Early Writings, page 4. They also say the work was printed "under the authors own eye and with her full approval." Page 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 Jas. White, 1847; also "The Present Truth," August, 1849, containing her original visions. Comparing the present edition with the original, I find seven 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, viz., that no one could be converted after 1844. The suppressed lines are in brackets. 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 wrapped 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 for their salvation is past." Present Truth, page 22, published August, 1849. As Now 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. 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 for their salvation is past." Page 37, edition of 1882.

Now if they mean to be honest and dare publish these suppressed passages, why don't they? They know very well what they are; Mrs. White knows what they are; yet the book is republished

"under her own eye" and all these passages left out when it is states that "no changes from the original work have been made." I have both books before me now and know the statement to be untrue and so do they; yet they keep right on sending it out.

6. In 1885 all her "testimonies" were republished in four volumes, under the eye of her own son and a critical editor. Opening hap-hazard to four different pages in Vol. I., I read and compared them with the original publication which I have. I found an average TWENTY-FOUR CHANGES OF THE WORDS ON EACH PAGE! Her words were thrown out and other words put in and other changes made, in some cases so many that it was difficult to read the two together. At the same rate in the four volumes, there would be 63,720 changes.

Taking, then, the words which were put in by her husband, by her copyist, by her son, by her editors, and those copied from other authors, probably they comprise from one-tenth to one quarter of all her books. Fine inspiration that is! The common reader knows nothing about these damaging facts, but I could not avoid knowing them, for I have been where I saw it myself.

I could fill a volume with proof of her mistakes, for all of her books are full of them. I will select but a few. THE SHUT DOOR. For several years after 1844, Mrs. White had visions saying that probation ended in that year, that there was no more salvation for sinners. Of course she has to deny this now, but the proof is overwhelmingly against her.

1. Seventh-day Adventists are compelled to admit that for some time after 1844 Adventists did hold that probation was ended. Even Mrs. White admits it. She says: "After the passing of the time of expectation, in 1844, Adventists still believed the Saviour’s coming to be very near; they held that...the work of Christ as man’s intercessor before God had ceased. Having given the warning of the judgment near, they felt that their work for the world was done, and they lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners.... All this confirmed them in the belief that probation had ended, or, as they then expressed it, ’the door of mercy was shut.'" Great Controversy, page 268. This statement of Mrs. White herself is enough to settle the point that the Adventists believed "the door of mercy was shut" in 1844. Notice here that the "shut door" means the end of probation, the close of mercy for sinners.

Mr. Miller for a while advocated the shut door in 1844. He says: "We have done our work in warning sinners and in trying to awake a formal church. God in his providence has SHUT THE DOOR; we can only stir one another up to be patient." Advent Herald, Dec. 11, 1844.

Then in the Voice of Truth, Feb. 19, 1845, he says: "I have not seen a genuine conversion since."

Elder G.I. Butler, in the Review and Herald, March 3, 1885, says: "As the time passed there was a general feeling among all the earnest believers that their work for the world was done." "There can be no question that for months after the time passed it was the general sentiment that their work of warning the world was over." "Their burden was gone, and they thought their work was done." Yes; that is just what they did believe, probation was ended.

2. I have conversed with several individuals who affirm positively that they heard her teach this repeatedly. There are many now living who will swear that they heard her teach it.

3. Written testimony. 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." The True Sabbath, by Miles Grant, page 70. Mrs. L.S. Burdick, San Francisco, California, was well acquainted with Mrs. White. She writes: "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." L.S. Burdick, "True Sabbath," page 72. O.R.L. Crosier kept the Sabbath with them in 1848. He writes: "Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 1, 1887. Yes, I KNOW that Ellen G. Harmon, now Mrs. White, held the shut door theory at that date." Then he gives the proof. These persons knew the facts and have put their testimony on record.

4. The Present Truth. James White, editor, Oswego, N.Y., May, 1850, has an article by the editor on the "Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and the Shut Door." Elder 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.... He [Jesus] is still merciful to his saints, and ever will be; and Jesus is still THEIR advocate and priest; but the sinner, to whom Jesus had stretched out his arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offers of salvation, was LEFT WITHOUT AN ADVOCATE when Jesus passed from the holy place and shut that door in 1844." Any honest man can see that the shut door meant no salvation for sinners, and this is what Elder White taught in 1850. In a report of labor in the Advent Review, May 15, 1850, Elder White, in noticing the death of a sister Hastings, says: "She embraced the Sabbath in 1846, and has ever believed that the work of warning the world closed in 1844."

Again: "Many will point us to one who is said to be converted, for positive proof that the door is not shut, thus yielding the word of God for the feelings of an individual." Present Truth, Dec. 1849. This shows that they held to the shut door idea for years after 1844. What a fanatical and abominable doctrine that was for Christians to teach! Mrs. White was right with them and in full harmony with them on this all these years. She had revelations almost daily. If they were of God, why did she not correct them in this fearful error? Even if she had said nothing confirming this delusion, yet the simple fact that she had no revelation contradicting it all during these years, is enough to destroy her claim to inspiration. But the fact is, she taught this error as strongly in her visions as the brethren did in their arguments.

Here are her own words: "March 24, 1849.... 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 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 wrapped 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 for their salvation is past." Present Truth, pages 21-22, published August, 1849.

Here you have the shut door and no mercy for sinners just as clear as language can make it. Every candid reader knows what it teaches. It is pitiable to see the shifts and turns, evasions, dodges, quibbles, if not something worse, resorted to on this passage to save Mrs. White's visions. But there it stands, to mock at all their efforts. Here is another passage teaching the same doctrine: "it was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the city, as all the wicked world which God had rejected." 'A Word to the Little Flock,' page 14, published in 1847. At this time, then, God had rejected the wicked world - shut door, you see.

Here is another vision in which she teaches the doctrine of the shut door in its very worst form, that is that after 1844 not one ray of light comes from Jesus to the wicked but they are all turned over to the devil to whom they now pray instead of to God. After Jesus left the holy place she says: "I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after he arose and they were left in perfect darkness.... 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; then Satan would breathe upon them an unholy influence." Early Writings, pages 46-47. Not one ray of light comes to sinners since 1844 but all are left to the Devil! What is the use of their denying that she taught this doctrine? She certainly did and she knows it. This fact and the bold denial of it now, brand her as a false teacher.

I will briefly notice some other mistakes she had made, enough to show that she is wholly unreliable.

1. For over forty years she, herself, has been constantly expecting the end of the world, and it has not come yet. This alone ought to open the eyes of all to see that she has no knowledge of the future.

2. Slaves. In 1849 she foretold what would happen when Jesus comes, and said: "I saw the pious slave rise in triumph and victory and shake off the chains that bound him, while his wicked master was in confusion." Early Writings, page 28. But now there are no slaves. She had not then dreamed of the abolition of slavery.

3. Nations angry. "The nations are NOW getting angry." Early Writings, page 29. That was thirty-eight years ago. It takes a long time for them to get fighting mad!

4. Another mistake. "Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord." Page 49. That was thirty-eight years ago, and no Adventist then looked for time to last ten years.

5. Another blunder. "The time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished." Page 49. Jesus went there in 1844. Hence, he had then been there six years. She saw that the time for him to be there was nearly finished, but it has continued sixty years since. A false prediction, as any one can see.

6. A few months only in 1849. "Now time is almost finished, and what we have been [six] years learning, they [new converts] will have to learn in a few months." Page 57. But instead of a few months, they have had sixty years!

7. She broke the Sabbath for eleven years. Though she had vision after vision about the Sabbath, yet for eleven years they all began it at six P.M. instead of at sunset as the law requires. Leviticus 23:32. When they found their mistake, she saw it, too, in vision. She says: "I acquired why it has been thus that at this late date we must change." Testimony No. 1, page 13. A poor leader she.

8. Her predictions about the rebellion a failure. "Jan. 4, 1862, I was shown some things in regard to our nation." Testimonies, Vol. I, page 253. All will remember the great anxiety and uncertainty of those days. How would the war end? Specially were her people anxious, as they were non-combatants and liable to the draft. Here was an inspired prophetess right in their midst, having abundant revelations about the length of women's dresses, what people should eat, etc. What relief to all would have been a few short words from heaven about the results of the war. The pressure upon her for light was so great that she had to say something. So she took her pen and scribbled away through thirty-two long pages about the war. At this date it is amusing to read it. This "revelation" alone is enough to show that she knows absolutely nothing of the future. All she wrote was merely a restatement of the popular view of the matter at the time. I shall quote a few sentences as samples. "The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion." Was slavery left to stir up another rebellion? Now we know that statement was utterly untrue.

Again: "It seemed impossible to have the war conducted successfully," page 256. Another failure, for it was conducted successfully. All can see that her ideas were just those generally rife at the time. I have long watched and studied her carefully, till I have become satisfied that this is always true of her prophesyings - they are wholly moulded by the sentiment around her at the time. Here is another: "This nation will yet be humbled into the dust," page 259. Was it? No. Again: "When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war," page 259. Did anything of this kind happen? No; but it is just what all then expected. Once more: "Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided, it MUST FALL," page 260. How it did fall! "I was shown distress and perplexity and famine in the land," page 260. Just what all expected then; but where was the famine? "It looked to me like an impossibility now for slavery to be done away," page 266. Of course it did, for that was just the way it looked to all others then. But did it look that way to God? That was the question. Was he telling her?

She claims that what she writes is not merely her own ideas but the mind of God himself. Thus: "I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision." Testimony, No. 31, page 63. This, then, was the way the thing looked to God at that time! Again: "Blood has been poured out like water, and for naught." Testimony for the Church, Vol. I, page 367. Was it for naught, ye brave soldiers? Ye liberated slaves? Ye freed nation? I could give scores of such quotations all through her writings, showing how they have failed always and everywhere. The Reform Dress

One of the worst blunders Mrs. White ever made, one which plainly showed her fanaticism and that God had nothing to do with her work, was the move she made on dress. First she wrote: "God would not have his people adopt the so-called reform dress," Testimonies, Vol. I, page 421. "If women would wear their dresses so as to clear the filth of the streets an inch or two," it would be in harmony with their faith, page 424. Four years pass, and she again writes: "God would now have

his people adopt the reform dress," page 525. "Nine inches as nearly accords my views of the matter as I am able to express it in inches," page 521. Here are two revelations exactly opposite as to the style of dress and the length, an inch or two, then nine inches, from the ground is the length. What occasioned this change in the mind of the Lord? The answer is easy: In the time between the two revelations Mrs. White had spent some time at Dr. Jackson's "Home," Dansville, N.Y. Here a short dress with pants was worn, and she fell in with the idea and soon had a vision requiring its adoption as above. That is the whole of it. But the dress was a shame and a disgrace and an utter failure. Think of a modest woman on the streets with pants on, and her dress cut half way up to the knees! But for eight years Mrs. White pushed that dress with all her power, put it on herself as an example, till most of the sisters put it on. But it created a terrible commotion. Husbands swore, brothers refused to walk with their sisters, men sneered and boys hooted. Some of the sisters argued, some cried, some rebelled, but most submitted. I know, for my own wife wore it for eight years - had to. Finally, Mrs. White quietly dropped it off herself, and now no one wears it. Here they are all living in direct violation of a plain revelation from God! Common sense came out ahead of fanaticism.

If God ever spoke through Mrs. White about anything, he did about the dress, requiring the woman to wear it. I was there and know how she urged it, heard her many times. Her Testimonies at the time were full of it. She said: "I have done my duty; I have bourne my testimony, and those who have heard me and read that which I have written, must now bear the responsibility of receiving or rejecting the light given. If they choose to venture to be forgetful hearers, and not doers of the work, they run their own risk, and will be accountable to God!" Testimonies, Vol. I, page 525. Yet they have all run the risk and laid off the dress, Mrs. White with the rest. How does she get out of it? By all sorts of dodges, by blaming everybody but herself. It has been a great stumbling block to them. Her Revelations Influenced by Others

Mrs. White originates nothing. In her visions she always sees just what she and her friends at the time happen to believe and be interested in. Her husband and other leading men first accept or study out a theory and talk it till her mind is full of it. Then when she is in her trance that is just what she sees. One who has been all through the Advent work and well knows, says: "The visions have brought out no points of faith held by Seventh-day Adventists."

Mrs. White herself confesses that she is influenced by others in writing her "Testimonies." Thus: pages 138-139. "What appeared in Testimony No. 11, concerning the Health Institute should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it.... I yielded my judgment to that of others and wrote what appeared in No. 11.... In this I did wrong." Testimonies, Vol. I, page 563. She here "lets the cat out of the bag." She made such a blunder that she was compelled to blame some one else for it and so to tell the truth that she was influenced by others to do it! Fine inspiration.

Elder White was well aware of how she was influenced by others to see and write as they impressed her to do. Hence he was very jealous of having leading men talk anything to her alone opposing his views, for he feared she would then have a revelation favoring them and opposing him as indeed she did towards the last. Thus he wrote: "The pressure has been terribly hard on my poor wife. She has been impressed very much by Elders Butler and Haskell." Again: "I think my wife has been more severe than the Lord really required her to be in some cases. Satan has taken

great advantage.... Elders Butler and Haskell have had an influence over her that I hope to see broken. It has nearly ruined her. These men must not be supported by our people to do as they have done." James White, Battle Creek, May 25, 1881. That shows the confidence which her own husband had in her revelations. The Philosophy of Mrs. White's Visions The proof is abundant that Mrs. White's visions are merely the result of nervous disease, a complication of hysteria, catalepsy and ecstasy. That she honestly believes in them herself, I do not doubt. I have personally known four other women, all Seventh-day Adventists, who likewise had visions. All were sincere Christians, and fully believed in their own visions. But all were sickly, nervous females, and hysterical. Not being encouraged in them, but opposed by their ministers, they finally gave them up. In every age such cases have been numerous, of whom a few, like Mrs. Southcott, Mrs. Ann Lee and Mrs. White, have become noted for awhile.

Medical books and cyclopedias, under the words "hysteria," "catalepsy" and "ecstasy," give a complete description of Mrs. White's case, as stated by herself and husband. This anyone may see by one day's study. My space will allow me to give but a few points.

1. The sex - a female. "The vast preponderance of hysteria in the female sex has given rise to its name." Raynold's System of Medicine, article, Hysteria. So say all the authorities. This fits Mrs. White, a female.

2. The age. "Hysteria is infinitely more common among females, beginning usually from fifteen to eighteen or twenty years of age." Theory and Practice of Medicine, by Roberts, page 399. "In the female sex, hysteria usually commences at or about the time of puberty, i.e., between twelve and eighteen years of age." Raynold's System of Medicine, article, Hysteria. Here again it exactly fits the case of Mrs. White. She had her first vision at the age of seventeen. See Testimonies, Vol. I, page 62. "Notwithstanding this mode of life, their health does not materially deteriorate." Johnson's Cyclopedia, article, Hysteria. So with Mrs. White. She has gradually improved in health and her visions have as gradually ceased. At first she had visions almost daily, but they have grown less frequent as she grew older and healthier, till after about forty-five years of age, since which time she has not averaged one in five years, and even these are short and light, till now she has ceased entirely to have them. Now read this: "Hysteria generally attacks women from the age of puberty to the decline of the peculiar functions of her sex." Johnson's Cyclopedia, article, Hysteria. Mrs. White's case again, exactly.

3. The cause. Hysteria, catalepsy, epilepsy and ecstasy are all nervous diseases, which sometimes co-exist or alternate or blend together so it is difficult to distinguish them. The causes noted are: "1. Mental disturbance, especially emotional; for example, a sudden fright, prolonged grief or anxiety. 2. Physical influences affecting the brain, as a BLOW OR FALL ON THE HEAD." Theory and Practice of Medicine, by Roberts, page 393. "In ten of my cases the disease was due to reflex causes, which consisted in six cases of injuries to the head." Fundamental Nervous Disease, Putzel, page 66. This is Mrs. White again, exactly. At the age of nine she received a terrible blow on the face, which broke her nose and nearly killed her. She was unconscious for three weeks. See her life in Testimony, Vol. I, pages 9-10. This shock to her nervous system was the real cause of all the visions she afterwards had.

4. Always weakly and sickly. "Most hysterical persons are out of health." Theory and Practice of Medicine, by Roberts, page 404. "Fainting fits, palpitation of the heart appear very frequently and

are sometimes so severe that persons affected with them seem to be dying." Encyclopedia Americana, article, Hysteria. Now read the life of Mrs. White, and she tells it over and over, times without number, about fainting frequently, pain at the heart, and about being so sick that she expected to die. And it is remarkable that most of her visions were immediately preceded by one of these fainting death spells. This shows plainly that they are the result of nervous weakness. She says: "My feelings were unusually sensitive." Testimonies Vol. I, page 12. Now read this: "Woman...whose nervous system is extremely sensitive, are the most subject to hysterical affections," Encyclopedia Americana, article, Hysteria. An exact fit.

Mrs. White's Physical Condition as Written by Herself in Testimony, Vol. I When nine years old a girl hit her on the nose with a stone, broke her nose, and nearly killed her. Page 9. "I lay in a stupor for three weeks." Page 10. "I was reduced almost to a skeleton." Page 11. "My health seemed to be hopelessly impaired." Page 12. "My nervous system was prostrated." Page 13. Here was the origin of her hysteria of after years. In this condition she "listened to the startling announcement that Christ was coming in 1843." Page 14. "These words kept ringing in my ears; 'the great day of the Lord is at hand.'" Page 15. "I frequently attended the meetings and believed that Jesus was soon to come." Page 22. Of her impression of hell she says: "My imagination would be so wrought upon that the perspiration would start." Page 24. "I feared that I would lose my reason." Page 25. At one time she did become insane for two weeks as she writes herself. Spiritual Gifts, Vol. II, page 51. She continues: "My health was very poor." Testimonies, Vol. I, page 55. It was thought that she could live but a few days. Then it was that she had her first vision, really a fit. Page 58. "I was but seventeen years of age, small and frail." Page 62. "My strength was taken away," and angels talk with her. Page 64. "My friends thought I could not live.... Immediately taken off in vision." Page 67. Notice that her visions happen when she is very sick! This tells the story; they are the result of her physical weakness. If it was the power of the Holy Ghost, why didn't God send it when she was well? Why not?

"I often fainted like one dead." The next day she was well and "rode thirty-eight miles." Page 80. This is characteristic of hysterical females, as all know who have seen them. They are just dying one hour and all well the next. Mrs. White has gone through that a thousand times. She is just dying, is prayed for, is healed by God, and all well in a few minutes. In a few days she goes right over it again. But if God heals her, why doesn't she stay healed? This used to bother me. When Jesus healed a man, did he have to go back and be healed over again every few days? She goes on: "I fainted under the burden. Some feared I was dying.... I was soon lost to earthly things" - had a vision. Page 86. Again: "I fainted. Prayer was offered for me and I was blessed and taken off in vision." Page 88. There you have it, the same old story. It is simply her hysterical imagination, nothing more. Next page. "I fainted...taken off in vision." So she goes on all through her book. Says the Encyclopedia Americana, article, Hysteria: "Fainting fits, palpitation of the heart appear very frequently and are sometimes so severe that persons afflicted with them seem to be dying." Mrs. White exactly. On page after page the same story is repeated by herself. In the account of her last vision, Jan. 3, 1875, she was very sick till it ended in a vision. Testimonies, Vol. III, page 570. Dreadful sick, almost dead, then a vision - this is the story, times without number, from her own pen. That tells the story. The vision is the result of her physical weakness.

5. Visions in public. "As a rule a fit of hysteria occurs when other persons are present, and never comes on during sleep." Theory and Practice of Medicine, by Roberts, page 401. Most of her

visions occur in public, and generally while she is very sick, or when praying or speaking earnestly. This was the case with her first vision. Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, page 30. So, again, on pages 37, 48, 51, 62, 83, and many more, she has her visions in the presence of many. I do not know that she ever had a vision alone.

6. Inclination to Exaggerate and Deceive. All medical books state that hysterical persons are given to exaggeration and deception. The inclination is irresistible. Nothing can break them of it. Gurnsey's Obstetrics, article Hysteria, says: "Such persons entertain their hearers with marvelous tales of the greatness and exploits of their past lives.... These accounts are uttered with an air of sincerity well calculated to deceive the honest listener, and such unbridled license of the imagination and total obliviousness in regard to the truth, which are vulgarly attributed to an entire want of principle and the most inordinate vanity, are in reality due to that morbid condition of the female organism which is designed by the comprehensive term hysteria."

Mrs. White is always telling what great things she has done. The deception which she so often practices, and which I have witnessed in her myself, is here accounted for on principles which do not impeach the moral character, and I am glad to accept the explanation.

7. Does not breathe. "Stoppage of respiration usually complete." "Generally appears to hold his breath." Robert's Theory and Practice of Medicine, page 393-394. Elder White, describing her condition in vision says: "She does not breathe." Life Incidents, page 272. They always refer to this fact with great confidence as proof of the supernatural in her visions; but it will be seen that it is common in these diseases.

8. Importance of self. "There is a prevailing belief in the importance of self, and the patient thinks that she differs from every other human being." Raynold's System of Medicine, article, Hysteria. Mrs. White to a hair. Hear her laud herself: "It is God, and not an erring mortal, who has spoken." "God has laid upon my husband and myself a special work." "God has appointed us to a more trying work than he has others." Testimonies, Vol. III, pages 257, 258, 160. I have known her nearly thirty years, and I never knew her to make confession of a single sin or evil in all that time, not she. Seventh-day Adventists ridicule the Pope's claim to infallibility but they themselves are bowing to the authority of a woman who makes higher claims to infallibility than ever pope or prophet did. Space will not allow me to fill out every particular of her experience by quotations from medical works compared with her own statements; but even these given above are sufficient to show the nature and philosophy of her attacks. They are the result of nervous disease, precisely the same as has been often seen in the case of thousands of other sickly females.

9. Testimony of Three Physicians. Dr. Fairfield was brought up a Seventh-day Adventist; was for years a physician in their Sanitarium at Battle Creek. He has had the best opportunity to observe Mrs. White. He writes: "Battle Creek, Mich., Dec. 28, 1887. Dear Sir: You are undoubtedly right in ascribing Mrs. E.G. White's so-called visions to disease. It has been my opportunity to observe her case a good deal, covering quite a period of years, which, with a full knowledge of her history from the beginning, gave me no chance to doubt her ("divine") attacks to be simply hysterical trances. Age itself has almost cured her. W.J. Fairfield, M.D."

Dr. Wm. Russell, long a Seventh-day Adventist, and a chief physician in the Sanitarium, wrote July 12th, 1869, that he had made up his mind some time in the past, "that Mrs. White's visions were

the result of a diseased organization or condition of the brain or nervous system." "When giving to a conference at Pilot Grove, Iowa, 1865, an account of her visit at Dr. Jackson's health institute, she stated that the doctor, upon a medical examination, pronounced her a subject of hysteria." Mrs. White's Claims Examined, page 76.

Here is the testimony of three physicians, who have personally examined Mrs. White. She joined the Millerites in their great excitement of 1843-44. In their meetings she often fainted from excitement. In the enthusiasm and fanaticism of the time many had various "gifts," visions, trances, etc. She drank deeply of their spirit. The grief and disappointment of the passing of the set time were too much for her feeble condition. Says Dr. Roberts: "The exciting cause of the first hysterical fit is generally some powerful sudden emotional disturbance." "Sometimes the attack is preceded by disappointment, fear, violent, exciting or even religious emotions." Library of Universal Knowledge, article, Catalepsy. Just her case in 1844, in the great excitement and disappointment she then met. Has Visions of Heaven, Angels, Etc.

Dr. George B. Wood's "Practice of Medicine," page 721 of Vol. II, in treating of mental disorders, and explaining the cause and phenomena of trances, says: "Ecstasy is an affection in which, with a loss of consciousness of existing circumstances, and insensibility to impression from without, there is an apparent exaltation of the intellectual or emotional functions, as if the individual were raised into a different nature, or different sphere of existence. The patient appears wrapped up in some engrossing thought or feeling, with an expression upon his countenance as of lofty contemplations or ineffable delight.... Upon recovering from the spell, the patient generally remembers his thoughts and feelings more or less accurately, and sometimes tells of wonderful visions that he has seen, of visits to the regions of the blessed, of ravishing harmony and splendor, of inexpressible enjoyment of the senses or affections." A person perfectly familiar with Mrs. White could not have described her visions more accurately. Another high medical authority, in describing ecstasy and catalepsy, says: "It often happens that the two diseases alternate or co-exist. In ecstasy the limbs are motionless, but not rigid. The eyes are open, the pupils fixed, the livid lips parted in smiles, and the arms extended to embrace the beloved vision. The body is erect and raised to its utmost height, or else is extended at full length in recumbent posture. A peculiar radiant smile illuminates the countenance, and the whole aspect and attitude is that of intense mental exaltation. Sometimes the patient is silent, the mind being apparently absorbed in meditation, or in the contemplation of some beatific vision. Sometimes there is mystical speaking or prophesying, or singing, or the lips may be moved without any sound escaping.... Usually there is complete insensibility to external impressions. Ecstasy is often associated with religious monomania. It was formerly quite common among the inmates of convents, and is now not infrequently met with at camp-meetings and other gatherings of a similar nature. Many truly devout people are extatics." G. Durant, M.D., Ph.D., member of American Medical Association, Fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine, etc., etc., recipient of several medals, etc. This is Mrs. White's case very clearly. Hundreds of similar ones have occurred in every age, and are constantly occurring now. The sad part of it is that so many honest souls are deluded into receiving all this as a divine revelation.

Much in many ways:

1. It is an error and a deception.

2. She deceives herself and others.

3. She teaches false doctrines.

4. She has a harsh, uncharitable spirit, and begets this in all her followers.

5. She builds up an isolated sect, and thus destroys all their influence for good.

6. Her teachings make her people narrow, bigoted, and gloomy. Thus she blasts the peace of thousands of souls.

7. It leads her advocates to deceive. Being afraid that it will hurt them in new places, if it is known in what light they really hold her visions, they keep them back as long as they can and then they deny that it is a matter of importance with them. This is false and deceptive, for they hold faith in her visions to be as important as keeping the Sabbath, and they hold her visions to be as sacred as the Bible.

8. To defend her mistakes and errors, both she and her apologists have to deny the plainest facts and resort to arguments very questionable.

9. To defend her errors, they compare them to supposed errors in the Bible, and thus destroy faith in that book.

10. She rules her whole people with a rod of iron, and dictates to them in everything, even the smallest and most private affairs of family life. She boasts that her work "is to come down to the minutiae of life." Testimonies, Vol. II, page 608. With this idea she meddles with everything public and private, and all the affairs of families, till it becomes, to a man of spirit, an intolerable bore. She meddles between husband and wife, parents and children, breaks up marriage engagements which do not suit her, dictates to all her followers what they shall eat, how, and when; the cut and color of their dress; their business, the disposition of their means, etc., etc. In proof of this let a person read any of her "Testimonies," for they are full of it.

11. Her severity and harshness have driven many to despair, others to back- slide, and others out of the church. I can name many individuals and families whose happiness she has blasted. She broke the heart and darkened the life of my first wife by her cruel words to her. Any one who dares to get in her way must either succumb, be crushed, or driven out. The effort to bind her visions as inspired upon the faith and consciences of the whole denomination has produced continual wrangling, division, and much bitter feeling, right among themselves for the last sixty years. Families, churches and conferences have been divided over them, while hundreds, yes, thousands, have been driven from them because they would not accept Mrs. White’s visions as inspired.

12. They produce doubts and infidelity. When those who have been led to firmly believe them finally come to see that they have been deceived, then they are in danger of losing faith in everything and so becoming out and out infidels, or at least skeptical. Large numbers have gone to ruin that way whom I have personally known. Some have gone to the Spiritualists, some to the Free Thinkers, some to the Shakers, some to the Mormons, and some to the world. They have nearly driven Mrs. White herself into infidelity. Here are her own words: "In the night I have awakened my husband, saying, ’I am afraid that I shall become an infidel.’" Testimonies, Vol. I,

page 597. How unlike the apostles that sounds.

Mrs. White Becomes Rich

There is no example in the Bible where a prophet took advantage of his inspiration to enrich himself. They generally worked hard, had little, and died poor. But Mrs. White began poverty poor. She says: "We entered upon our work penniless." Testimonies, Vol. I, page 75. But as soon as they became leaders, they managed to supply themselves well. Since I knew them, thirty years ago, they have had an abundance, and have used means for themselves lavishly. They would always have the best and plenty of it. Everywhere they went they required to be waited upon in the most slavish manner. Mrs. White dresses very richly, often is furnished women to wait on her, and all their time and expenses are paid by the conference. When Elder White died he left a large fortune. He was a sharp business man, and took advantage of his position to benefit himself and his family, and she aided him in it by her revelations. How different from Mr. Moody! Mrs. White is eighty years old, is worth thousands, has a large income, has not a single soul dependent upon her, says that time is about to end, urges all to cut down their possessions, yet takes large royalty on all her numerous books and seems as eager for money as others. How is this? The last year I was with them she received $18 per week, was furnished two women to wait upon her and all traveling expenses paid. The same year they sold 20,000 copies of Great Controversy on which she received a royalty of $2,500 besides and income from all her other works. Her inspiration has paid her well financially.

Take an example or two of how she used her revelations to make money: In 1868 Elder White had on hand several thousand dollars' worth of old books which were dead property, as they were not selling and were growing out of date. He hit on a plan to raise a "book fund" for the free distribution of books and tracts. This fund he used to buy out his and her old books! When the money did not come fast enough, she had a revelation about it thus: "Why do not our brethren send in their pledges on the book and tract fund more liberally? And why do not our ministers take hold of this work in earnest? ...We shall not hold our peace upon this subject. Our people will come up to the work. The means will come. And we would say to those who are poor and want books, send in your orders.... We will send you a package of books containing four volumes of Spiritual Gifts, How to Live, Appeal to Youth, Appeal to Mothers, Sabbath Readings and the two large charts, with key of explanation,... and charge the fund four dollars." Testimonies, Vol. I, page 689. Every one of these books was their own. The money came and they pocketed it all. I was there and know.

Mrs. White now has forty inspired books. To sell these, every possible effort is made through every channel. She is constantly urging it by all her inspired authority. Hear her: "The volumes of Spirit of Prophecy and also the Testimonies should be introduced into every Sabbath keeping family.... Let them be worn out in being read by all the neighbors.... Prevail upon them to buy copies.... Light so precious, coming from the throne of God, is hid under a bushel. God will make his people responsible for this neglect." Testimonies, Vol. IV, pages 390, 391. So, of course, her books must be pushed and sold while she makes money. It pays to be inspired!

Why I Once Believed Mrs. White Inspired

1. I once accepted Mrs. White's claim to inspiration for the same reason that most of her followers do. I first accepted the Sabbath and then the other points of the faith till I came to believe it all.

2. Once among and of them I found all stating in strong terms that Mrs. White was inspired of God. I supposed they knew, and so took their word for it; and that is what all the others do as they come in, deny it as they may.

3. I soon found that her revelations were so connected with the whole history and belief of that church that I could not consistently separate them any more than a person could be a Mormon and not believe in Joseph Smith. I believed the other doctrines so firmly that I swallowed the visions with the rest, and that is what all do.

4. When I began to have suspicions about the visions I found the pressure so strong that I feared to express them, or even to admit them to myself. All said such doubts were of the Devil and would lead to a rejection of the truth and then to ruin. So I dared not entertain them nor investigate the matter; and this is the way it is with others.

5. I saw that all who expressed any doubts about the visions were immediately branded as "rebels," as "in the dark," "led by Satan," "infidels," etc.

6. Having no faith in any other doctrine or people, I did not know what to do nor where to go. So I tried to believe the visions and go along just as thousands of them do when really they are in doubt about them all the time. Her last Testimony just out reveals the fact that there is a wide-spread effort among her people to modify her high claims. She protests vehemently and warns them to keep their hands off. Sooner or later there must be a revolt against her claims. The following from Chamber's Encyclopedia, article, Southcott, is also applicable to Mrs. White and her followers: "The history of Joanna Southcott herself has not much in it that is marvelous; but the influence which she exercised over others may well be deemed so, and the infatuation of her followers is hard to be understood, particularly when it is considered that some of them were men of some intelligence and of cultivated mind. Probably the secret of her influence lay in the fact that the poor creature was in earnest about her delusions. So few people in the world are really so that they are always liable to be enslaved by others who have convictions of any kind, however grotesque. On her death-bed Joanna said: 'If I have been misled, it has been by some spirit, good or evil.' Poor Joanna never suspected that the spirit which played such vagaries was her own."

Just so of Mrs. White. It is marvelous that with all the proof of her failures intelligent men are still led by her. But the case of Joanna, of Ann Lee, and others, helps us to solve this one. All have earnestly believed in their own inspiration, and this alone has convinced others. The Adventists' Addition to the Bible

"The Bible and the Bible Only, as a Rule of Faith and Practice," is the Protestant watchword for which saints have fought and martyrs died. The Catholic church has the Bible and - and - something else - an infallible Pope to interpret it. The Swedenborg church has the Bible and - and - something else - Swedenborg's revelation to interpret it. The Shakers have the Bible and - and - something else - Mother Ann Lee's revelation to interpret it. The Mormons have the Bible and - and - something else - Joe Smith's revelations to interpret it.

Christian Scientists have the Bible and - and - something else - Mrs. Eddy's Science and Health to tell what it means.

Seventh-day Adventists have the Bible and - and - something else - Mrs. White’s revelations to interpret it.

Each of the above churches has done exactly the same thing, namely, has put right along with the good old Bible another interpreter to tell what that old Bible really means. Whatever these new interpreters say it means, all their members must accept as true without further question. Dare a Catholic dispute the Pope’s interpretation, or a Mormon dispute Smith’s, or an Adventist dispute Mrs. White’s interpretation? No indeed.

02.09. Chapter 9 - The Nature of the Sabbath Commandment

Chapter 9 - The Nature of the Sabbath Commandment

That the Sabbath of the decalogue was partly moral and partly ceremonial, or positive, in its nature has been the doctrine of the church as taught by its best theologians in all ages. Take a few examples out of scores that could be given. Watson's Theological Institutes, the great Methodist standard, says: "But as the command is partly positive and partly moral, it may have circumstances which are capable of being altered in perfect obedience with the moral principles on which it rests." Vol. II, page 511. So Scott's Commentary on Exodus 20:8-10 says: "The separation of a portion of our time to the immediate service of God is doubtless of moral obligation.... But the exact proportion, as well as the particular day, may be considered as a positive institution." The moral basis of the Sabbath is readily manifest. That man should devote some part of his time to the special service and worship of God is reasonable, and we would naturally expect that the Lord would, in some way, designate such time, just as he did do in the Sabbath precept.

Experience proves that man's physical nature requires a day of rest about as often as one in seven. Many experiments have been tried and careful observations made, all showing that both men and beasts will accomplish more work in a given time, do it in a better manner and preserve better health by resting every seventh day than they will by laboring continuously. This is the testimony of business men and of eminent physicians. Hence the Sabbath rest had its foundation in nature itself. The mind also requires a day of rest as regularly as the body. Constant thought and mental application is ruinous to the mind. This has been proved in the case of students, lawyers, business men, etc. Socially and religiously, the weekly rest day is of the utmost importance to man's highest good. All other means combined can hardly equal the observance of the Lord's day for the purpose.

Then as to the influence of the church and its power for good, its hold upon its own members and upon community, its opportunity to teach and preach the gospel, the regular weekly rest day is its strong hold as all well know. Hence, if ever a law of God had a moral basis, the Sabbath commandment has. "The Sabbath was made for man" because he needed it physically, mentally, socially, morally and religiously. Mr. Gladstone say: "Sunday is a necessity for the retention of man's mind and of a man's frame in a condition to discharge his duties."

All experience shows that a Sabbathless community is a godless, immoral, and, generally, a thriftless community. Hence he is an enemy of society and of religion who would break down the restraints of such a weekly rest in the community. So we say that the Sabbath law rested upon a moral basis in providing a weekly Sabbath for the nation of Israel. The Ceremonial Side of the Sabbath But when we come to the definite day, which it shall be, nature does not indicate that. All the benefits above mentioned would be secured by keeping one day as well as another. There would not be a particle of difference whichever day was selected. Suppose that all the churches would change in one week and keep Saturday instead of Sunday, what practical difference would it make? None at all. Physical rest, mental rest, social and religious privileges, a quiet day, - all

that can be secured by one day can by another, so far as the day is concerned. But to secure the greatest good from the day, all should rest the same day. Where this is not done confusion and evil follows. Exodus 20:8-11.

God has marked no difference in the nature of days in themselves. All nature goes right on just the same every day alike. We see nothing in one day of the week which differs from another, and there is no difference. No day is holy in and of itself and by its own nature. The learned Dr. Edwards says: "No identical period of duration is, in itself, intrinsically holy." Sabbath Manual, page 92. In every case God had to make the day holy by a special appointment. The same appointment of some other day would have made it just as holy. Nor does nature indicate clearly just the proportion of time to be used. Hence God's example of six days' work and the seventh of rest was doubtless given as a model to follow. To this the Lord pointed in giving the Sabbath law. Exodus 20. And this divine model all Christians now following in resting on the Lord's day after six day's work.

Another fact which Sabbatarians overlook is that God's act of resting on the day did not confer any holiness upon it. Genesis 2:3, says: "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because that in it HE HAD RESTED. So Exodus 20:11. He "rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." First, God rested on the day, but that did not make it holy. After that he blessed it but still it was not holy time. Third, he hallowed it, made it holy. So the day was not holy in itself nor did God's resting on it make it holy. The Lord has made other days holy, days on which he never rested. The day of atonement was as holy as the weekly Sabbath. Thus: "It shall be an holy convocation unto you.... And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. Ye shall do no manner of work.... It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest." Leviticus 23:27-32. So there were seven of these yearly holy days. Elder Smith, Adventist, says: "The word SABBATH means REST. That is the one sole idea it conveys, first, last, and all the way between, - cessation from labor, rest. Here were seven annual days on which there was to be an entire suspension of labor, Were these days Sabbath, or were they not? If they were not, can any one tell us why they were not?" What Was Nailed to the Cross, page 11.

So, then, according to the Bible and the arguments of the Adventists themselves, different days may become holy Sabbath days without the Lord's resting on them or even blessing them, for he did neither to these days. Further, a day which was once a holy Sabbath day, so holy that it was death to work on it, as in the case of the day of atonement, Leviticus 23:27-32, may cease to be so and become a common working day. See Colossians 2:16. Even Adventists do not keep these old holy days. So, then, holiness can be put upon a day, taken from it, or changed to another day. It is not necessarily a permanent, unchangeable affair. Let Sabbatarians meditate here awhile. More still: A day once appointed, and made a holy Sabbath day by God himself, may cease to be such and become even hateful to God. Thus: Isaiah 1:13-14, "The new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; IT IS iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear THEM." All these holy days God himself had appointed, but see how he hates them now. Is it any proof, then, that a particular day is holy now because it was once holy? None whatever.

Notice also how many other things were made holy by God’s appointment. Under the LAW we read of "the holy temple," "the holy hill," "the holy ark," "the holy instruments," "the holy vessels," "the holy water," "the holy perfume," "The holy altar," "the holy veil," "the holy linen coat," "the holy ointment," "the holy nation," "the holy Sabbath," etc. Those pertained to the worship and service of God in his HOLY TEMPLE, which was "only a shadow," "figure" or "type of the TRUE temple" - the "spiritual house" of Christ, "his body, the church." While they stood as TYPES they were "holy," and no longer. They had no inherent holiness, but were made holy by the command of God. Law and Gospel, page 43, by S.C. Adams.

Like all the above holy things, the seventh day had no holiness in itself. It had to be "made" so. Mark 2:27. But moral duties are not made. They exist in the very nature of things. For instance, it is morally wrong to murder. It would have been wrong even if God had given no command against it. But it never would have been wrong to work on the seventh day unless God had given a commandment to keep it. So, then, the sanctity of the day does not rest upon the nature of the day itself, but like a hundred other hallowed things, simply upon God’s appointment, which may be altered any time at his will.

All must admit that this commandment does differ from those which are admitted to be wholly moral. No one could all his lifetime live in open violation of the commandments against idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, stealing, etc., and yet have the least hope of heaven. Yet the most zealous Sabbatarian will admit that millions of devout Christians have lived holy lives who never kept the seventh day, but rested on Sunday instead. And Sunday-keepers will admit that those who keep Saturday instead of Sunday are Christian people. Now, certainly, one or the other of these classes does not keep the Sabbath commandment, if the essential thing is to keep the particular day. Would any seventh-day man recognize as a Christian any person who would every week violate the letter of any other commandment? No, nor would he excuse him on any plea of ignorance either. Yet they will freely admit that thousands right around them who do not keep the Sabbath commandment as they read it, are yet good people and Christians. So, they themselves being judges, this commandment does differ from the others in some way.

What is a Ceremony?

Adventists claim that there was nothing ceremonial in the decalogue or about the Sabbath. But let us consider what a ’ceremony’ is. Webster says: "Ceremony. Outward rite; external form in religion." That is exactly what the observance of the Sabbath was in Jewish worship. Do not Adventists class the keeping of all the other holy days as ceremonial? Yes; but they were all "holy convocations." Leviticus 23:2, like the seventh day. Read Elder Smith’s own arguments on this point. he says: "Were these other days which were EXACTLY LIKE THAT, - days of rest and convocation, - were these days also Sabbaths, or were they not?" What Was Nailed to the Cross, page 11. Then he argues that they were all Sabbaths like the seventh day. Well, then if the keeping of these was a ceremony, and a part of the "ceremonial" law, then the same is true of the seventh day. The observance of the Sabbath on a particular day was a ceremonial service, the very first and chief of all their "outward rites and external forms." Thus, Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible, article, Law of Moses, under the term "Ceremonial Law," says: "(3). Holiness of Times. (a) The Sabbath. Exodus 20:8-11. (b) The Sabbatical Year. (c) Year of Jubilee. (d) The Passover. (e) The Feast of Weeks. (f) Feast of Tabernacles. (g) Feast of Trumpets. (h) Day of Atonement." Thus

the Sabbath stands at the head of all the ceremonial seasons. God himself so places it. Leviticus 23:1-44. "These are my feasts: Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath." Then follow in order all the holy days of the year, the Sabbath standing first. It is arranged that way time and again, showing it is so designed. Again, Dr. Smith says: "The Sabbath was the keynote to a scale of Sabbatical observance consisting of itself, the seventh month, the seventh year, and the Year of Jubilee."

Adventists argue that the decalogue covers all sins. The greater embraces the lesser, they say. The sixth command prohibits murder, the highest crime of the kind, and that embraces and so forbids all lesser sins of the kind, as anger, quarreling, malice, hatred, etc. Well, now, let them try that on the fourth command and they will hit a truth which ought to open their eyes, viz.: the weekly Sabbath, as chief and head of all holy seasons and ceremonials, was placed there to represent all that class in the Jewish law. Rev. Dr. Potts, Methodist, says: "The law under the Mosaic dispensation was formulated into nine moral precepts, with a Sabbath commandment added." The Lord’s Day our Sabbath, page 10. The Sabbath on a Round Earth In their very nature all purely moral laws are universal and eternal in their application, are binding in heaven, in Eden, on Jews or Gentiles, saints or sinners, now or hereafter. Test the particular seventh day, Saturday, by that rule, and it fails everywhere. Go to Venus, where the days are about twenty-three hours long, to Jupiter, where they are only about ten hours long; to Saturn, where they are about twelve hours long, or to some of the larger planets, where their days are much longer than ours. How could the inhabitants of those worlds keep our seventh day? They could keep "a" seventh day, their own, but that would not be of the same length of ours, nor come at the same time of ours. Their seventh day would not be our Saturday, nor would the seventh day of any two planets be alike, nor come at the same time. All the universe can keep a seventh part of time, but no the same seventh part. Not knowing this, see what a blunder Mrs. White made. She says: "I saw that the Sabbath would never be done away, but the redeemed saints, AND ALL THE ANGELIC HOST, will observe it in honor of the great Creator to all eternity." Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, page 113. Elder U. Smith, Biblical Institute, page 145, says: "We infer that the higher orders of his intelligences keep the Sabbath also.... The Sabbath of each of his creatures will be the Sabbath of all the rest, so that all will observe THE SAME PERIOD TOGETHER for the same purpose."

Here you have your definite seventh-day theory with a vengeance. Look at the utter absurdity and impossibility of the theory. All intelligent beings in heaven and earth and on all the planets, keep "THE SAME PERIOD TOGETHER." So the Sabbath day on this little planet of ours regulates the Sabbath days of all the planets in the universe! I wonder how they manage it in Jupiter, where their days are only ten hours long, or in Venus, where they are twenty- three hours long, or in some of the planets where they are as long as several of our days? As the Sabbath must be kept from sunset to sunset (Leviticus 23:32), I wonder how they find out, on all those planets, just when it is sunset down here! The stubborn facts nearer home show that God’s children do not, and cannot, all observe "THE SAME PERIOD TOGETHER." Everybody knows that it is Saturday in India some twelve hours sooner than it is here, and that it is Saturday here twelve hours after it has ceased to be Saturday there. In Australia the day begins eighteen hours sooner than it does in California. So the Seventh- day brethren in California are working nearly the whole time that their brethren in Australia are keeping Sabbath! Come even nearer home than that. The sun sets about three hours later in California than it does in Maine. So when the Seventh-day Adventists in Maine begin to

keep the Sabbath at sunset Friday evening, their own brethren in California, where the sun is yet three hours high, will still be at work for three hours! So, very few of them on this earth, observe "THE SAME PERIOD TOGETHER." While some of them are keeping Sabbath on one part of the earth, others of them are at work on another part of the earth. How much less, then, do all the heavenly hosts keep the same period with men on earth.

Now, if, as Mrs. White and Bro. Smith say, the angels keep our Sabbath, the question is, with which party do they keep it? With those in Australia, or those in America? If the angels keep the Sabbath at the same time the Sabbatarians keep it in Australia, then the Sabbatarians in America are working while the angels keep Sabbath, and so, of course, the angels work while those here rest. So we see how absolutely false and absurd is the theory that all can keep the Sabbath at the same time.

I have to confess that for many years I was so stupid as to suppose that the Lord himself kept the Sabbath at the same time I did here. I supposed that when the sun set Friday evening and I began keeping the Sabbath, the Lord and the angels began keeping it too. But now I see how utterly impossible that is; for if the Lord keeps the Sabbath at the same time I do here, then he does not keep it with the brethren on the other side of the globe, because they begin the Sabbath at least twelve hours earlier than we do here. In fact, it takes just forty-eight hours, or the time of two whole days, from the time any one day begins in the extreme east till it ends at the furthest place in the west. Will the reader stop and think carefully, sharply, on this point, for it is an important one? It takes twenty-four hours for the FIRST END of a day to go clear around the earth. Then, as the LAST END of the day is twenty-four hours behind the FIRST END, it must also have twenty-four hours more to go clear around the earth, and that makes forty-eight hours in all that each day is on the earth somewhere.

I am quite certain that the average Sabbatarian feels he keeps the seventh day that he is now keeping holy time with the Lord himself, and with the angels, and with all his brethren. I used to feel that way I know, and the above quotations from Mrs. White and Elder Smith show plainly that even they think so, too. But it will be seen that this cannot be so unless the Lord keeps the time of two whole days each week. And in that case, those on this side of the earth would be working while the Lord was keeping the Sabbath with those on the other side of the earth. Then those on the opposite of the earth would be working while the Lord kept Sabbath with those on this side. And so none of them would keep the Sabbath with the Lord after all! In fact, taking it all around the earth, there is not a single hour in the whole week, when there is not some Sabbatarian at work on some part of the earth!

But, further, does the Lord keep our seventh day with us, or does he keep the seventh day with the people on other planets? Our days and weeks are not at all in harmony with theirs, nor can one of them be like another. Now, if the Lord rests only on our Saturday, then he could not rest on the seventh day of Venus or Mars or Jupiter, etc., as the seventh day of each planet differs in length and comes at a different time, from that of our earth or any planet. How, then, could God rest on all these days? If he did he must keep Sabbath all the time, and then nobody, angels or men, could keep the Sabbath with the Lord if they worked at all!

What, then, becomes of Mrs. White’s statement that "ALL THE ANGELIC HOST" keep our Sabbath? or Elder Smith’s hypothesis that all the universe will observe "THE SAME PERIOD

TOGETHER?" Both are utterly absurd. The same definite seventh day cannot be kept by all the universe; even on this earth alone it cannot be kept by all at the same time; but all can keep a seventh part of the time. This principle upon which the fourth commandment was based, may be of universal application in earth and in heaven, in time or eternity. But just which day that shall be, is a matter of minor consequence to be determined by the circumstances in the case, which may and must differ at different times and different places. To the Jewish people it certainly was the seventh day, or Saturday, and no other day would have met the commandment. All the rigorous limitations and exactions of the Sabbath day, as under the Jewish law, could be carried out by a small people in a limited territory where the church bore rule. A particular day, the seventh, Deuteronomy 5:12-13; definite hours, sunset to sunset, Leviticus 23:32; no fires in all their houses, Exodus 35:3; stoning to death for picking up a stick, Numbers 15:32-36 - this was the Jewish law. But we are not Jews nor under the Jewish law. Under the new dispensation of the gospel, other circumstances have arisen plainly and grandly marking another day as the all important day in Christian memory - the resurrection day. When the gospel was to go to all nations, to all climates, and around the earth, the Christian rest day was necessarily and wisely left upon a far different basis. Where Shall We Begin the Day?

If a man’s salvation depends upon keeping the same day to a minute that God kept at creation, then it is infinitely important that we know exactly to a rod where his day began so as to begin ours there too. But the Lord has not said a word about it nor given the least clue as to where to begin the day. Nor do Sabbatarians KNOW anything about it, but have to guess at the whole thing. The day is now generally reckoned to begin at a certain line 180 degrees west from Greenwich, England. It runs north and south through the Pacific Ocean about 4,000 miles west of America. I wrote Prof. E.E. Holden of Lick Observatory asking, "1. Have we the date when the day line was established there? 2. Who did it, and why? 3. When? 4. Has it been reckoned from other places than Greenwich?"

He answered: "1. There was no one date. 2. No one. For convenience. 3. During the last hundred years. 4. Yes. Canary Islands, Tenereffe, Ferro, Paris, Berlin, Jerusalem, Washington, etc." So we see: 1. It is only within the last hundred years that the day line has been fixed where it is now. 2. This was done merely for convenience, not because there was anything in nature requiring it. 3. At different times the day line has been counted from at least seven different places, from Jerusalem in the east to Washington in the west, about 8,000 miles difference, or one-third the way around the earth. Hence, the beginning of the seventh day has varied that much at different dates. 4. In another century it may be changed again. 5. There is just as much authority for one place as the other, and no divine authority for one place as the other, and no divine authority for either, as it is all man’s work and done at hap-hazard. 6. Hence, so far as duty to God is concerned, any nation, church or society is at liberty to begin the day wherever they please. One place will be just as apt to be in harmony with God’s day line as another.

Sabbatarians in America can fix their day line in the Atlantic instead of in the Pacific and then our Sunday will be Saturday, and they will be all right and convert a nation in a day! Could any one prove that this would not be in harmony with Hod’s day line at creation? Certainly not. It would be just as apt to be right as the present day line. Then why not do it? Indeed, this is exactly parallel to what Seventh-day Adventists have done within the past few years in the case of a whole colony in the Pacific Ocean. Pitcairn Island, in the Pacific, was settled one hundred years ago by persons

who brought their reckoning eastward from Asia. But it happens to be on the American side of the present day line; hence their Sunday was our Saturday, and they all kept it one hundred years as Sunday. According to Adventists, this was an awful thing, for Sunday is the Pope's Sabbath, the mark of the beast. So, a few years ago, Adventists went there and converted them all to keeping Saturday. How? They simply induced them to change their reckoning of the day line a few miles and lo! their Sunday was Saturday! Now they are all pious Sabbath- keepers while before they were all keeping Sunday, the mark of the beast! And yet they are keeping exactly the same day they always kept! If this is not hair-splitting, tell me what is. It illustrates the childishness of the whole Sabbatarian business. Now let the Adventists just shift their day line a little further east to include America and they can keep our day with us.

If the day began in the traditional place where Eden is said to have been located, then the day line would be away west of the present location some 7,000 miles, west even of Australia; and then the Seventh-day people in Australia are not keeping the Sabbath at all. In that case the Sunday-keepers of New Zealand and Australia are now actually keeping the original seventh day, and Sabbatarians there are keeping the sixth day! Do they know, and can they prove, that this is not so? No; they simply have to take the reckoning just as it happened to be, right or wrong, without knowing which it is. And yet, at great expense, they have sent missionaries there to convert the people over to keep another day, when actually they do not know but what those people are really keeping the seventh day, and they themselves are wrong! None, not even themselves, pretend to know where God began to reckon that day; yet they draw the line to a hair, and say that all will be damned who do not toe that line and count from that spot! Does the salvation of a man's soul depend upon such mathematical niceties and such uncertainties as these? If it does, we may well despair of heaven. The very fact that God has never revealed just where the true day line is, or where the seventh day began, shows that it is of no consequence for us to know. Alaska, the northwest point of America, was settled by Russians ages ago, before the present day line existed. Of course they brought their reckoning with them and hence their Sunday was on Saturday. In 1867 we bought Alaska and it became a part of the United States. The day we took possession our laws changed their Sunday to Saturday, all by human authority. Did that change the Edenic Sabbath for that people? Again, in going around the earth one way we lose a day and going the other way we gain a day. Hence, in one case we must add a day and in the other drop a day. All have to do this to keep in harmony with the world. Adventists do this, but by what authority, and where? The Bible says keep the seventh day and from sunset to sunset. Exodus 20:8-11; Leviticus 23:32. Let two Adventists start from Chicago, one going east, the other west, around the earth. Each keeps carefully the seventh day as the sun sets. When they meet again at Chicago they will be two days apart! One will be keeping Sunday and the other Friday. How do they manage it? Each gives up his seventh day and both take that of the world. So they have a worldly day after all!

Look at the difficulty in crossing this supposed day line in the Pacific Ocean. I have personally conversed with Sabbatarians who have crossed this line both ways, east and west. Going west, a day is ADDED, going east it is DROPPED and this is done at NOON of the day which finds them nearest the supposed line. On the vessel, a man going west sits down to dinner 11:50 A.M. Friday. While he is eating the time is changed and he rises from dinner Saturday noon! Then he has only six hours of Sabbath till sunset; or coming east, he sits down to dinner Saturday noon and rises

from dinner Friday noon! He has kept eighteen hours Sabbath; then it is gone in a second at high noon, and he has six hours to work till sunset. Now he must begin Sabbath once more and keep it over again - twenty-four hours! In one case he only kept six hours Sabbath, and in the other case he kept forty-two hours!

These stubborn facts demonstrate the utter absurdity of the Sabbatarian view. They claim that these things do not bother them any; but I know that they do, and badly, too. They have written much on it, devised all sorts of diagrams, illustrations and arguments to meet the difficulty; but none are satisfactory, even to themselves. Hence new methods are constantly being devised to dodge the difficulty. The latest discovery is that adopted by the Seventh-day Adventist ministers of the New York conference. It is that the earth is absolutely FLAT and STATIONARY, with sun, moon and stars much smaller than the earth and revolving around it! "The sun, he do move," the old darkey said, and they say, Amen. The Sabbath at the North Pole

Now test the definite Seventh-day theory in the frozen regions of the north. The day must be kept from sunset to sunset. Leviticus 23:32. But in the winter there are months when the sun is not seen there at all, so they have no sunset. And again, in summer there are months when the sun is above the horizon all the time, when there is no sunset. Here the theory breaks down entirely, and the day must be reckoned by artificial means. They can keep one-seventh of the time, and that is absolutely all that can be done. Seventh-day Adventists have argued that there was no real difficulty here; it was all imaginary. They try to bluff it off with a laugh; but that does not answer the facts. I know that they themselves have got into serious trouble right here. So great was their difficulty, even in northern Sweden and Norway, that in 1886 it was seriously discussed as to whether they must not change and reckon the day not from sunset as now, but from 6 P.M. Mrs. White and son were there and favored the change. I was on a committee of the General Conference to investigate the matter. We decided against the change and it was abandoned. What endless and needless difficulties people get themselves into trying to keep a law which was only designed for the Jews in a limited locality. How contrary to the freedom and simplicity of the gospel! In reply to all these facts, which cannot be denied, Seventh-day people say: Is not the first day of the week, or Sunday, just as definite a day as the seventh day, or Saturday? Is it not just as difficult to keep Sunday all around the world as it is to keep Saturday? Do you not claim that you should keep the first day in honor of the resurrection? The answer to these questions is not hard to give. The essential idea is that we should devote one day in seven to religious duties. To secure the highest good, all should unite in observing the same day. From the days of the apostles the Christian church has, with one consent, observed the day on which Jesus rose from the dead, the first day of the week, or Sunday. But it is not claimed that it is absolutely essential that exactly the same minutes and hours, or even the same definite day, must be kept anyway and under all circumstances, whether or no. That would be legalism, and contrary to the very nature and freedom of the gospel. Suppose the Jewish day on which Jesus arose was reckoned from sunset to sunset, as doubtless it was, must we also reckon it that way? As it is found more convenient to reckon the day from midnight to midnight, and as all are united in doing so, it is for the best interests of religion to conform to this custom. If, in traveling around the world, men should mistake their longitude, as in case of Alaska and Pitcairn’s Island, and call Saturday Sunday, it is not material. They had better all unite on that than to quarrel over it.

If, in the long period of darkness at the north pole, men should lose the time, and then select some other period than that which exactly corresponds to our Sunday, hour for hour, the difference would not be material. Or, if in locating the day line from which to reckon the beginning of the day, that line had happened to be located 5,000 miles further east or 10,000 further west, it would not have made a particle of difference. And as to whether we now begin the day just where God did in Eden or not, is a matter of no consequence. And whether our brethren in China rest at the same time we do or not, is of little account. And whether the Sabbath of Jupiter and Mars and Neptune, and of heaven itself, comes when ours does or not, is of little interest to us. It will be time enough to settle that matter when we go to live with them. So, while traveling around the earth, east or west, or crossing the day line, whether or not we are able to keep exactly the same time, or even exactly one- seventh part of time to a minute, is of little importance. We do the best we can under the circumstances, and conform to the time as reckoned by those where we go. To "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel," is not a good practice in any cause. But with the strict Sabbatarian all this is entirely different. A certain day, beginning at precisely such a line to a hair, and at such a minute to a second, is holy time. If you don’t hit that exact time just right, you might as well keep no day at all! That may do for Judaism, but it certainly is not according to the spirit and freedom of the gospel.

I believe this is a fair statement of the position held by the great body of the intelligent observers of Sunday. It harmonizes exactly with the statement of our Savior, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Mark 2:27. Man and his highest good are first; the Sabbath is secondary and subservient to these. Practically, the Sabbatarian exactly reverses this order. The Sabbath is the all-important thing, a rigid, iron rule, unbending and inflexible. Man and his necessities and his good are of little or no account in comparison with the supremely great duty to keep the Sabbath. "Man was made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man," would much better express their idea of the relative importance of the two. It is well for the people and the world that such pharisaical ideas have found few advocates in the church of Christ.

Lost Time The how do Sabbatarians know that our Saturday is the exact seventh day from creation down? Says Rev. J.H. Potts, D.D., editor of the Michigan (Methodist) Christian Advocate: "That in selecting the Jewish Sabbath day, Moses selected the regular successive seventh day of human time from Adam down cannot be proved by any authority, human or divine." The Lord’s Day our Sabbath, page 12. This is endorsed by Bishop Harris and several other eminent divines. So Rev. Geo. Elliott, in his "Abiding Sabbath," says: "There is no possible means of fixing the day of the original Sabbath." So say all unbiased writers.

During the long period before the flood; during the patriarchal age when they had no records; during their slavery in Egypt when even traditional knowledge was largely lost; during the anarchy under the judges, and all down the ages since, are they sure that no mistake has been made, not even of one day? Of course they are not. The only possible way they can tell is by human tradition. In answer to my inquiry upon the point, Rabbi Isaac M. Wise, Cincinnati, O., the most learned Jew of the land, wrote me: "The Jewish Sabbath is, in point of the particular time, a matter of tradition." So after all, their Sabbath-keeping rests upon tradition of men, the very thing Adventists condemn. But it is said that if the day had been lost, God knew which it was and would have pointed it out at the giving of the manna. Or if it had been lost before Christ’s time, he would have known it and would have corrected them. But this assumes the very thing to be proved, viz.: that God cares as

much about special hours and minutes as they do. This they can not prove. Evidently from the slight importance which he attached to keeping the Jewish Sabbath Jesus would have kept any day which he found observed by the nation.

02.10. Chapter 10 - Why Christians Keep Sunday

Chapter 10 - Why Christians Keep Sunday

Almost universally Christians regard Sunday as a sacred day. Do they offer for this any adequate reasons? Yes, indeed, and those which have been satisfactory to all the best and ablest Christians the church has ever had. After keeping the seventh day and extensively advocating it for over a quarter of a century, I became satisfied that it was an error, and that the blessing of God did not go with the keeping of it. Like thousands of others, when I embraced the Seventh-day Sabbath I thought the argument was all on one side, so plain that one hour's reading ought to settle it, so clear that no man could reject the Sabbath and be honest. The only marvel to me was that everybody did not see and embrace it. But after keeping it twenty-eight years; 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 very best of my ability, every text, line and word in the 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 having written several works in favor of the Seventh-day, which were satisfactory to my brethren; after having debated the question for more than a dozen times; after seeing the fruits of keeping it, and weighing all the evidence in the fear of God, I am fully settled in my own mind and conscience that the evidence is against the keeping of the Seventh-day.

Those who observe Sunday say that they do it in honor of the resurrection of Christ upon that day, and that this practice was derived from the apostles and has been continued in the church ever since. Let us see. "The Lord's Day" is a term now commonly applied to the first day of the week in honor of the Lord's resurrection on that day. Thus: "We believe the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's day." Baptist Church Directory, page 171. Excepting a few Sabbatarians of late date, all christendom, numbering four hundred and sixteen million people, of all sects and all nations, regard Sunday as a sacred day and agree in applying the term "Lord's Day" to Sunday. So every dictionary, lexicon and cyclopedia applies that term to the first day. Here is a grand, undeniable fact of today. When did this stream begin? Let us trace it up to its head through all the centuries.

18th century, A.D. 1760. Rev A.H. Lewis, D.D., Seventh-day Baptist, is the author of "Critical History of Sunday Legislation." From page 181 I quote: "The profanation of the Lord's Day is highly offensive to Almighty God." Laws of Massachusetts, A.D. 1760.

17th century, A.D. 1676. The Laws of Charles II of England say: "For the better observation and keeping holy the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, be it enacted," etc. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 108.

16th century, A.D. 1536. Going back over 300 years ago to the reformers, we find all Christians calling Sunday the "Lord's Day." Calvin, voicing the universal sentiment of his time, says: "The ancients have, not without sufficient reason, substituted what we call the Lord's Day in the room of the Sabbath." Calvin's Institute, Book 2, chapter VIII, section 34. Luther, Zwingle, Beza, Bucer, Cranmer, Tyndale, etc., likewise speak of the Lord's Day as the first day of the week. Here is another great fact as to the Lord's Day. It was in existence and universally observed 300 years ago.

15th century, A.D. 1409. "He that playeth at unlawful games on Sundays...shall be six days imprisoned." Statute of Henry IV of England. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 90.

14th century, A.D. 1359. "It is provided by sanctions of law and canon that all Lord's Days be venerably observed." Archbishop of Canterbury. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 82.

13th century, A.D. 1281. "The obligation to observe the legal Sabbath according to the form of the Old Testament is at an end...to which in the New Testament hath succeeded the custom of spending the Lord's Day...in the worship of God." Archbishop of Canterbury. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 81.

12th century, A.D. 1174. "We do ordain that these days following be exempt from labor:...All Sundays in the year," etc. Emperor of Constantinople. History of Sabbath and Sunday, page 191.

11th century, A.D. 1025. "Sunday marketing we also strictly forbid." Laws of Denmark. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 77.

10th century, A.D. 975. "Sunday is very solemnly to be reverenced." Saxon Laws. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 75.

9th century, A.D. 813. "All Lord's Days shall be observed with all due veneration and all servile work shall be abstained from." Council of Mayence.

8th century. In the year 747, an English council said: "It is ordered that the Lord's Day be celebrated with due veneration, and wholly devoted to the worship of God." Andrew's History of the Sabbath, page 377.

7th century, A.D. 695. "If a slave work on Sunday by his lord's command, let him be free." Saxon Laws. Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 71.

6th century, A.D. 578. "On the Lord's Day it is not permitted to yoke oxen or to perform any other work except for appointed reasons." Council of Auxerre.

5th century. Passing back to about A.D. 450, we come to the history of the church written by Sozomen. In book 2, Chapter VIII, page 22, of Constantine, he says: "He honored the Lord's Day, because on it he arose from the dead." This shows what was meant by Lord's Day in those early times.

Stepping back once more to about A.D. 400, we reach the great theologian of the early church, St. Augustine. He says: "The day now known as the Lord's Day, the eighth, namely, which is also the first day of the week." Letters of St. Augustine, letter 55, Chapter XIII. He says the first day of the week was known as the Lord's Day in his times.

4th century. In A.D. 386, the Emperor of Rome decreed as follows: "On the day of the sun, properly called the Lord's Day, by our ancestors, let there be a cessation of lawsuits, business, and indictments." Critical History of Sunday Legislation, page 36. Even the civil law at that early date recognized Sunday as the Lord's Day.

Going back again to the era of Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor, we reach Eusebius, the "Father of Church History," A.D. 324. He constantly and familiarly uses the term "Lord's Day" for the first day of the week. One passage: "They (the Jewish Christians) also observe the Sabbath, and other discipline of the Jews, just like them; but, on the other hand, they also celebrate the Lord's Days very much like us in commemoration of his resurrection." Eccl. History, book 3, Chapter XXVII. Here Lord's Day is distinguished from the Jewish Sabbath, and is said to be kept on account of the resurrection. This brings us to the era of the Early Christian Fathers. I quote them as translated in the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

A.D. 306. Peter, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt: "But the Lord's Day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it, he rose again." Canon 15.

3rd century, A.D. 270. Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, in Asia Minor: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day will lead us to celebrate it." Chapter X.

About A.D. 250. The Apostolic Constitution: "On the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's Day, meet more diligently." Book 2, sec. 7.

A.D. 250, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in Africa: "The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath and the Lord's Day." Epistle 58, section 4.

A.D. 200. Tertullian in Africa: "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradiction to those who call this day their Sabbath." Apology, Chapter XVI. "We however, just as we have received, only on the day of the Lord's resurrection, ought to guard not only against kneeling, but even posture and office of solicitude, deferring even our business." On Prayer, Chapter XXIII.

2nd century, A.D. 194. Clement of Alexandria, Egypt: "He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's Day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself." Book 7, Chapter XII.

A.D. 180. Bardesanes, Edessa, Asia: "On one day the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together." Book of the Laws of Countries.

A.D. 140. Justin Martyr: "But Sunday is the day which we all hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead." Apology, Chapter LXVII.

A.D. 120. Barnabas. "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day on which Jesus rose again from the dead." Chapter XVII.

A.D. 96. St. John on Patmos: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Revelation 1:10.

A.D. 60. Luke, Asia Minor: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Acts 20:7.

Thus we have traced the Lord's Day or Sunday as a sacred day among Christians from our time back through all the centuries up to the New Testament itself. Who can fail to see that the "Lord's Day" and the "first day of the week" are spoken of in the same manner both by the apostles and down through all the fathers and reformers to our day? To every unbiased mind the evidence must be conclusive that the Lord's Day of Revelation 1:10, written A.D. 96, is the resurrection day the same as it is in every instance where it is used by all the Christian fathers immediately following John. Mark this fact: IN NOT ONE SINGLE INSTANCE EITHER IN THE BIBLE OR IN ALL HISTORY can a passage be found where the term the LORD'S DAY IS APPLIED TO the seventh day, the JEWISH SABBATH. This fact should be and is decisive as to the meaning in Revelation 1:10. Even Sabbatarians themselves do not call the seventh day the Lord's Day, but always say "Sabbath day."

Testimony of Lexicons and Cyclopedias Webster: "Sunday, the first day of the week; the Christian Sabbath; the Lord's Day."

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible: "Lord's Day. The first day of the week, or Sunday, of every age of the church."

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia: "Lord's Day, the oldest and best designation of the Christian Sabbath, first used by St. John." Revelation 1:10.

Buck's Theological Dictionary, article Sabbath. "It (the first day of the week) is called the Lord's Day." Revelation 1:10.

Johnson's New Universal Cyclopedia: "Lord's Day, a name for the first day of the week, derived from Revelation 1:10" The Greek words rendered "Lord's Day," [Revelation 1:10] and Kuriake hemera. Kuriake, the adjective, is from the noun kurious, and is thus defined:

"Kuriakos" - Of, or pertaining to the Lord, i.e., the Messiah; the Lord's. 1 Corinthians 11:20; Revelation 1:10." Greenfield.

"Kuriakos - Pertaining to the Lord, to the Lord Jesus Christ: e.g., kuriakos deipnon, the Lord's supper. [1 Corinthians 11:20;] kuriake hemera, the Lord's Day [Revelation 1:10]." Robinson.

"Kurikos - Of, belonging to, concerning a lord or master, especially belonging to the Lord (Christ); hence kuriake hemera, the Lord's Day." Liddell & Scott.

"This is the usual name of Sunday with the subsequent Greek fathers." Parkhurst.

"Kuriakos - Pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ; the Lord [1 Corinthians 11:20; Revelation 1:10."] Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. So we might go through all the lexicons, finding the same definitions in all. Not a single one refers this term to God the Father, but without an exception all refer it to the Lord Jesus. There must be some good reason for this universal agreement. So the commentators. "The Lord's Day. The first day of the week." Dr. Clark on Revelation 1:10.

"On the Lord's Day, which can be meant of no other than the day on which the Lord Jesus arose from the dead, even the first day of the week." Scott on Revelation 1:10.

Dr. Barnes says: "This was a day particularly devoted to the Lord Jesus, for (a) that is the natural meaning of the word Lord as used in the New Testament; and (b) if the Jewish Sabbath was

intended to be designated, the word Sabbath would have been used."

Prof. Hacket, in his comments on Acts 1:24, says: "Kuriakos, when taken absolutely in the New Testament, refers generally to Christ."

"Lord's Day, namely, the first day of the week." Burkett's Notes on the N.T.

"The Lord's Days, the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week." Eclectic Commentary on Revelation 1:10.

"The Lord's Day. The first day of the week, commemorating the Lord's resurrection." Family Bible with notes, on Revelation 1:10. Go through the whole list of commentaries, and all say the same thing. Have they no ground for this? Yes, good enough to be conclusive.

1. In all the Bible, the seventh day is never once called the Lord's Day.

2. "The Sabbath" was the term invariably used for the Jewish seventh day. John himself always used that term when speaking of the seventh day. See John 5:9-10; John 5:16; John 5:18; John 7:22-23; John 9:14; John 9:16; John 19:31. Had he meant that day in Revelation 1:10, he certainly would have said "Sabbath Day," not Lord's Day.

3. The Greek word kuriakos, is a new word originating in the New Testament and found only in one other place, 1 Corinthians 11:20, "the Lord's supper." Beyond dispute it here applies to the Lord Jesus. "The adjective kuriake was 'formed by the apostles themselves.' [Winer, N.T. Gram., page 226.] To the same effect testify Liddell and Scott. Of the mode of dealing with words in their lexicons, they say: 'We have always sought to give the earliest authority for its use first. Then, if no change was introduced by later writers, we have left it with that early authority alone.' (Pref. page 20) When we turn to the word kuriakos, they give as their first citation, and therefore, as its earliest authority, the New Testament. The question now arises why form a new word to express a sacred institution, if the institution itself be not new? Winer says: 'Entirely new words and phrases were constructed mainly by composition, and for the most part to meet some sensible want.' (Gram. page 25) What conceivable sensible want respecting the Sabbath did the Old Testament leave unexpressed? Clearly the new want arose from a new institution. This position receives additional strength from the fact that the only other New Testament use of kuriakos is found in 1 Corinthians 11:20, designating 'the Lord's supper,' which is certainly a new institution." Peter Vogel in debate with Waggoner, page 110. This is a strong point and should be decisive.

4. As the gospel was a new institution, it necessitated the use of new terms. So we have "Christians," Acts 11:26, as the new name for God's people; "apostles," "evangelists," and "deacons" as the officers of the new church; "baptism" as the initiatory rite into the church, the "Lord's supper," 1 Corinthians 11:20, and the "Lord's Day," as institutions of that church. Revelation 1:10. The new relations as originated by the gospel could not be expressed by the old terms of the law; hence new words and new terms had to be used. For 1,500 years "Sabbath" had been the established name of the weekly rest day of the law and was still used by all for the seventh day. Hence if Christians were to have a new weekly rest day commemorating gospel facts, they must find a new term for it. Hence we have "Lord's Day."

There is a good reason why in the gospel the "Lord's Day" is Christ's day. Officially and emphatically he is the one Lord in this dispensation. The term Lord applies to Christ about four

hundred and fifty times in the New Testament. Hence in the gospel all things are commonly spoken of as belonging to Jesus as, "the disciples of the Lord," etc. Acts 9:1. Now read together "The Lord's body," 1 Corinthians 11:29, "this cup of the Lord," "blood of the Lord," 1 Corinthians 11:27, "Lord's death," 1 Corinthians 11:26, "the Lord's table," 1 Corinthians 10:21. "The Lord's supper," 1 Corinthians 11:20; "the Lord's Day," Revelation 1:10. Do not all refer to the same Lord? Of course they do, and who can fail to admit it? Under the official jurisdiction of Jesus the Lord, come of necessity all the institutions now obligatory. Hence Lord's Day is Christ's Day, and that is the way it is always used in the early fathers as we have seen.

Objections answered: The seventh day is called the "Sabbath of the Lord," Exodus 20:10; "my holy day," Isaiah 58:13; and Jesus says he was "Lord of the Sabbath day," Mark 2:28. Isn't that the Lord's Day? No; for: 1) The word Sabbath is used in each of these three texts but is not in Revelation 1:10. 2) All three texts were spoken before the cross and under the law, but Revelation 1:10, is under the gospel. 3) The Jewish Sabbath was abolished at the cross, Colossians 2:16; Romans 14:5; Galatians 4:10, sixty years before John wrote on Patmos, hence that could not have been the Lord's day when John wrote. 5) The fact that the term "Lord's day" immediately after the time of John, whenever used by the early church, was always applied to Sunday, and never to the Sabbath, settles its meaning in Revelation 1:10. But it is objected that John and all the other evangelists in the gospels call Sunday simply "the first day of the week," instead of the Lord's day. Hence if John, in Revelation 1:10, had meant that day he would have said "the first day of the week," as he did in the gospel. The answer is easy. Jesus predicted that he would be put to death and rise the third day. Each evangelist is careful to show that the prediction was fulfilled. Hence they were particular to give the names of those three days as they were called by Jews; that is, "preparation day," "Sabbath day," and "first day of the week." This is a sufficient answer. Moreover, it is probable that the resurrection day was not immediately called the Lord's day; but by the time John wrote the Revelation, A.D. 96, it had come to be the well known name for that day, as we have shown.

Why is it Fitting that the First Day of the Week Should be the Memorial Day of the Gospel

Why do people keep any day? Always because of what occurred on that day. Why were the Sabbath, the passover, and others days kept? Because of what occurred on those days. Why do we observe the 4th of July, Christmas, the days of our birth, marriage, etc? It is important, then to inquire if anything occurred on Sunday to make it worthy of being observed by Christians. Of all things used to commemorate past events, a memorial day is the best. A monument, a statue, a college, and the like are local and only seen by the few; but a day comes to all and regularly. Hence with what enthusiasm every nation celebrates its memorial days, as our own 4th of July. So religion has consecrated memorial days, as the Sabbath, the Passover, Pentecost, and others of the Jewish age. And shall the grandest of all institutions, the gospel, have no memorial day? If so it would be the one only exception among all the religions of the world and a great loss to the church. If the material creation merited a memorial day, how much more the spiritual redemption of the race? But why theorize? It is the grandest and best known fact in all the earth today that the Christian church has a memorial day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, the Lord's day. It is regularly observed in every nation under Heaven. We have already shown how this day has always from the very days of the apostles, been regarded as a memorial day. It only remains to inquire, if it was the one day best adapted to this purpose. Study the life of Jesus, scan every

noted day in it, in the year, in the month, in the week, and it must be admitted by all that no other than the resurrection day could be thought of for a moment. Think over the days of the week. How meager are the events of any other day compared with those of the resurrection day. Monday what? Tuesday? Wednesday? Thursday his betrayal; Friday his death; Saturday in the grave. Would we select any of these days as a memorial day for a rejoicing church? Surely not.

"On the Jewish Sabbath the Saviour lay under the power of death. It was to his disciples a day of restlessness and gloom. The remembrance of that day would always be to them grievous. The thought of the agony, the cross, the bitter cry, the expiring groan, and the mournful sepulcher could only create a feeling of sorrow. Forevermore the Jewish Sabbath day was despoiled of its gladness to the Christian heart." The Lord’s Day Our Sabbath, page 21.

It was the resurrection day on which every thing turned. Jesus might have lived the pure life he did, might have wrought all the miracles he did, might have died on the cross as he did, might have been buried as he was, yet all this would not have saved a soul if he had not risen from the dead. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Corinthians 15:17-18. The resurrection completed the work which made Jesus the Saviour of the world. Jesus himself when asked for the evidence of his authority, pointed to the resurrection on the third day as the proof of it. John 2:18-21; Matthew 12:38-40; Matthew 16:21. This test of his divinity was well known to all, for the Pharisees said to Pilate, "Sir, we remember what that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again." Matthew 27:63. When Jesus died, the hope of his disciples was buried with him, Luke 24:17; Luke 24:21, and the holy women were heartbroken. But the wicked Jews rejoiced and Satan triumphed while the angels mourned. If ever the devil had hope it was while Jesus was dead during that Sabbath day. But as Sunday begins to dawn, a mighty angel like lightening descends, the earth quakes, the grave opens and Christ arises a conqueror over Death, Hell and the Grave. Matthew 28:1-4. Satan’s last hope is gone; the wicked Jews are dismayed; the holy women are glad; the hope of a world is secured; the sufferings and humiliation of the Son of God are ended; and he walks forth the Almighty Saviour, the Lord of all. Never such a morning dawned on this lost world before. No wonder it became the memorial day of the church. It was impossible to be otherwise.

Paul says that Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," Romans 1:4. It was this that proved his divinity. So that there will be a day of Judgment God "hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised them from the dead." Acts 17:31. 1. On Sunday Jesus rose from the dead. Mark 16:9. 2. On this day he first appeared to his disciples. 3. On this day he met them at different places and repeatedly. Mark 16:9-11; Matthew 28:8-10; Luke 24:34; Mark 16:12-13; John 20:19-23. 4. On this day Jesus blessed them. John 20:19. 5. On this day he imparted to them the gift of the Holy Ghost. John 20:22. 6. Here he first commissioned them to preach the gospel to all the world. John 20:21; with Mark 16:9 to Mark 15:7. Here he gave his apostles authority to legislate for and guide his church. John 20:23. 8. Peter says God "hath begotten us again unto a lovely hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." 1 Peter 1:3. 9. On this day Jesus ascended to his father, was seated at his right hand and made head over all. John 20:17; Eph. 1:20. 10. On that day many of the dead saints arose from the grave. Matt. 27:52-53. 11. Here this day became the day of joy and rejoicing to the disciples. "Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord." John 20:20. "While they yet believed not for joy." Luke 24:41. 12. On that day the gospel of a risen

Christ was first preached, saying: "The lord is risen indeed." Luke 24:34. 13. On that Sunday Jesus himself set the example of preaching the gospel of his resurrection by explaining all the scriptures on that subject and by opening the minds of the disciples to understand it. "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Luke 24:27; Luke 24:45. 14. Finally on this day the purchase of our redemption was completed. With all these thrilling events of gospel facts crowded into that one resurrection day, making it memorable above all days in the history of the world, how could it but become the great day in the memory of the church? The facts of that one day became the theme of the church ever since. The great battle between the apostles and the unbelieving Jews was concerning the events of that day; did Jesus rise, or did he not? The Jews "gave large money" to disprove it, Matthew 28:12, while the apostles built the church and staked their lives upon it. Thus in God's own providence, the Jewish Sabbath was thrown into the shade, while all the hopes and thoughts and arguments and songs of the new church were necessarily turned to another day, the resurrection day.

Memorable day, one that should stir the heart of every Christian and move sinners to repentance as indeed it has done every week from that day on. "The Lord's Day," how appropriate the title for that grand day on which our Lord triumphed over all and laid deep and secure the foundation of the Christian church. Most appropriately, then, has it become the one memorial day of the gospel, the day of gladness and rejoicing. Shall we, then, call it a pagan day? the pope's day? the mark of the beast? a day hateful to God and an abomination to Christ? God forbid. It was said of Jesus, "What evil hath he done?" So we ask, "What evil has the observance of the Lord's Day ever done?" What man, church, or nation, has ever been made worse by it? Nay, verily, this is not its character nor its record. The Eighth Day of John 20:26

I have become satisfied myself that the meeting of Christ with his disciples "after eight days," John 20:26, was on Sunday. He had met with them the previous Sunday evening. John 20:19. Here "after eight days" he meets them again. Sabbatarians count up and satisfy themselves that this occurred on Monday or Tuesday. But compare this with the expression "after three days." The number of the day after his death on which Christ was to rise is given in three ways. 1. "In three days," Matthew 26:61, Matthew 27:40. 2. "The third day," Matthew 16:21, Matthew 20:19. 3. "After three days," Mark 8:31. All these expressions mean the same. He died Friday and rose Sunday; hence Sunday was "three days," "the third day" and "after three days" in their common way of speaking. In the same way, "In eight days," "on the eighth day" and "after eight days" would all be the same, that is the next Sunday, or eighth day.

What strengthens this position is the well known fact that the term, "the eighth day," became a common term for the resurrection day among all the early Christian fathers. Thus Eld. Andrews, the seventh-day historian, writing of Dionysius, A.D. 170, says of Sunday, "Every writer who precedes Dionysius calls it first day of the week, 'eighth day,' or Sunday." Testimony of the Fathers, page 52. Thus Barnabas, A.D. 120 says: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead." Epistle of Barnabas, Chapter XV. Justin Martyr, A.D. 140 says: "The first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all days, is called however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and [yet] remains the first." Dialogue with Trypho, Chapter XLI. And Cyprian, A.D. 250, says "the eighth, that is the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day." Epistle 58, Section 4. Where did the early church get the idea that the eighth day was the Lord's day, if not from the apostles? Evidently, then, the

meeting in John 20:26, was on Sunday. The only visits of Jesus with his disciples which the Holy Spirit saw fit to date carefully are those occurring on Sunday.

Pentecost, Acts 2:1-47 That the day of Pentecost, Acts 2:1-47, fell on Sunday has been believed and maintained by Christians in all ages. 1. The time of the Pentecost was thus stated: "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven Sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days." Leviticus 23:15-16. The day after the seventh Sabbath would certainly be the first day of the week.

2. The Karaite Jews held that Pentecost according to the law must always be on Sunday.

3. 'Pentecost' means 'fiftieth,' the fiftieth day after the first Sabbath where they began to count, hence it must fall on the first day of the week.

4. Dr. Scott's commentary says: "As Jesus arose on the first day of the week, so the Holy Spirit descended on the same, seven weeks, or on the fiftieth day afterwards." On Acts 2:1.

5. So plain is the point that even the Seventh-day Adventists themselves have admitted it. Thus Elder U. Smith: "The sheaf of the first fruits was waved on the sixteenth day of the first month. This met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord, the first fruits of them that slept, the sixteenth of the first month.... The feast of weeks, or Pentecost, occurred on the fiftieth day from the offering of the first fruits. The antitype of this feast, the Pentecost of Acts 2:1-47, was fulfilled on that very day, fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples." The Sanctuary, page 283, 284. Fifty days from the resurrection of Christ would be on the first day of the week. This is just what God directed; it was to be on the morrow after the seventh Sabbath and on the fiftieth day. Leviticus 23:15-16.

6. So the Eclectic Commentary: "It happened on the first day of the week." On Acts 2:1-47.

7. "Pentecost in that year must have fallen on the first day of the week." The Bible Commentary on Acts 2:1-47.

8. "That the day of Pentecost fell on Sunday is undeniable, because the resurrection of Christ was upon a Sunday, and Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the resurrection." Bramhall's Works, V. 51.

9. "It consequently occurred in the year in which Christ died on the first day of the week, or our Sunday." Lange on Acts 2:1.

10. "The Pentecost day was Sunday." Wheadon's Commentary on Acts 2:1.

Notice now the importance of that day. Jesus told the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem till endued with power from on high. Luke 24:49. They must begin their preaching there. Luke 24:47. On that Pentecost they were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Acts 1:5. In the last days of Judah and Jerusalem the law was to go forth out of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem while all nations were gathered to it. Isaiah 2:1-4. All this was fulfilled on Pentecost. The Holy Ghost came on the disciples in mighty power; then they began preaching the gospel and thousands were converted. This was only the first fruits of what has occurred, in fact, on succeeding Sundays ever since. It has been the great day of power and of conversions in the church from that day on. Thus

God signally honored Sunday at the very opening of the gospel as he has continued to do ever since.

Acts 20:6-7

All agree that the disciples had some regular day for meetings. Paul said: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." Hebrews 10:25. This implies a regular time and a stated place for meetings. Reproving them for making the Lord's supper a feast, Paul says: "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper," but rather to feast, 1 Corinthians 11:20. This indicates that they had a place and a time to come together for the supper. There is not the slightest evidence that the Christians ever had the Lord's supper or held distinctively Christian worship on the Jewish Sabbath. In every case where meetings on the Sabbath are mentioned it is in connection with the regular Jewish worship. There is no record that Christians ever met alone for worship on that day. They certainly could not have had the Lord's supper in the synagogues on the Sabbath with the Jews. Nor is there the least intimation that it was ever tried. They must, therefore, have met by themselves in some other place than the synagogue and on some other day. Turning to Acts 20:6-7, we read: "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow."

Here they met by themselves, and in an upper room, for the Lord's supper. The time is the first day of the week. The incidental manner in which it is mentioned shows that what they did was a well understood custom among them - "WHEN they came together to break bread upon the first day of the week." Three things are mentioned: 1) They came together. It is mentioned as though all knew it was common for them to do this. 2) To break bread. This again is stated as though all knew that this, too, was a common practice with Christians. 3) Upon the first day of the week. Like the other two items, this is mentioned as a well understood practice among them; hence no explanation is given of it. It is said that the disciples "came together" or assembled themselves together, a common phrase for their church meetings. Thus Peter "went in and found many that were come together." Acts 10:27 "Ye come together not for the better.... When ye come together in the church." 1 Corinthians 11:17-18. "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place." "When ye come together every one of you hath a psalm." 1 Corinthians 14:23; 1 Corinthians 14:26. "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together." Hebrews 10:25. This indicates, therefore, their customary meeting.

Notice the further fact, verse 6, that Paul was there seven days, yet no notice whatever is taken of the Sabbath Day, not even to name it, while the first day is prominently noticed. The breaking of bread and the assembling on the first day of the week, it will be noticed, are connected together. Notice further, that though Paul was there a whole week and over the Jewish Sabbath, yet the Lord's supper is not administered until Sunday. This shows that for some reason Sunday was regarded by them as the only proper day for it. "It shows further, that Paul tarried there several days waiting for the regular day of worship to come, the first day of the week." "And the reason assigned for their coming together was to BREAK BREAD, and not because Paul was there.

Sabbatarians argue that this meeting at Troas was on Saturday evening and hence Paul went on his journey Sunday morning. Even if this were so, it would not prove that Paul did not regard

Sunday, for, hastening if possible to be at Jerusalem on Pentecost, verse 16, he had to go when the vessel went whether he liked to or not, for he was only a passenger. See verse 13, and Acts 21:1-2. But it is more probable that Luke reckoned time after the Roman method, from midnight to midnight, as John did in John 20:19. "The same day at evening, being the first day of the week." Here Sunday evening is reckoned as belonging to the first day. Luke wrote for the Gentiles, was a learned man himself, and wrote Acts long after the resurrection, when Roman ways were coming more to be adopted. Moreover the meeting at Troas was on the first day of the week and they departed "on the morrow," John 20:7, which surely could not have been the same day.

Prof. A. Rauschenbush, of Rochester Theological Seminary, says: "These events did not occur in the time of the Old Testament, but of the New; not in Palestine, but upon the west coast of Asia Minor, nearly a thousand miles away. Furthermore, this was the time of Roman rule, and upon every land and people that the Romans conquered they imposed, not only their laws, but also their mode of reckoning time. Now, from their earliest history, the Romans began the day at midnight. At this visit of Paul to Troas the west coast of Asia Minor had been in their possession for one hundred and eighty years." Saturday or Sunday, page 14. Prof. Hachett, on Acts 20:7, says: "As Luke had mingled so much with foreign nations and was writing for Gentile readers, he would be very apt to designate the time in accordance with their practice; so that his evening or night of the first day of the week would be the end of the Christian Sabbath and the morning of his departure that of Monday." This is rendered almost certain by the fact that Acts is addressed to "Theophilus," who was not a Jew, but a Roman living in Italy. That the early Christians partook of the Lord's supper ever Sunday, is acknowledged on all hands.

Dr. Scott, on Acts 20:7, says: "This ordinance seems to have been constantly administered every Lord's Day."

Shaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Art. "Lord's Supper" says: "Originally the communion was administered every day, then every Sunday."

"It is well known that the primitive Christians administered the Eucharist every Lord's Day." Doddridge.

"In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's supper every Lord's Day." Matthew Henry.

"Every first day of the week." Carson.

"All antiquity concurs in evincing that, for the first three centuries, all the churches broke bread once a week." Alex Campbell, in "Christian System," page 325. Dr. Albert Barnes on this verse says: "It is probable that the apostles and early Christians celebrated the Lord's supper on every Lord's Day." The Apostolic Constitutions, about A.D. 250, says that on "the Lord's Day meet more diligently...[partaking of] the oblation the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food." Book II, section 7, paragraph 55. Again, "We solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's Day." Book VII, section 2, paragraph 36.

Fabian, bishop of Rome, A.D. 250: "On each Lord's Day the oblation of the altar should be made by all men and women in bread and wine." Decrees of Fabian, book V, chapter 7.

These testimonies throw great light upon the passages in the New Testament where the first day of the week, the Lord’s Day, is referred to. They show that a weekly celebration of that day was established in all churches by the apostles themselves. If Adventists could find anywhere after the resurrection a gathering of Christians only for worship on the Sabbath, it would be used by them as evidence of a custom in favor of Saturday. Let them make the same deduction now in favor of Sunday.

1 Corinthians 16:1-2 With Acts 20:1-38 let us read 1 Corinthians 16:1-2 : "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." What Paul here directs the Corinthians to do he had also established among the churches at Galatia, 1 Corinthians 16:1. And this letter is addressed to "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." 1 Corinthians 1:2. He also says that what he writes must be received as "the commandments of the Lord." 1 Corinthians 14:37. Here, then, is an inspired commandment of the Lord Jesus touching the first day of the week and it is to all that call upon his name. This requires a definite act of religious duty to be performed regularly upon each recurring Sunday, for this did not relate to simply one first day, but to each one as it came. They are to lay apart on that day a portion for the poor out of what God gives them. This implies that it would be with them a day of leisure and devotion when they would be at home, have the time, and be in a proper frame of mind to do this benevolent act - an act of worship, "a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." Php 4:18. Of old God had said none "shall appear before the Lord empty." Deuteronomy 16:16. On 1 Corinthians 16:1-2, Dr. Clark remarks: "The apostle follows here the rule of the synagogue; it was the regular custom among the Jews to make their collections for the poor on the Sabbath day." For this purpose they had ’the purse of the alms,’ or what we would term the poor’s box. This is what the apostle seems to mean when he says, let him lay by him in store; let him put it in the alms purse or in the poor’s box." On this text Dr. Barnes truthfully remarks: "There can have been no reason why this day should have been designated except that it was a day set apart to religion and therefore deemed a proper day for the exercise of benevolence towards others." Why did Paul name Sunday rather than any other day in the week if it was not a religious day?

Adventists say that this does not imply any meeting that day. They were only to lay by at home. But this would defeat the very object Paul had in view. Paul said he hasted to be at Jerusalem. He could not be delayed to gather up collections when he came. So they were to have them all collected and ready when he came. But if these gifts were all at their homes then the collection would have to be made after he came, just the thing he commanded to avoid, "that there be no collections when I come." 1 Corinthians 16:2. Dr. Machnight renders it: "On the first day of every week, let each of you lay somewhat by itself according as he may be prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come, there may be no collections."

We have found four things which the disciples did on Sunday.

1. They assembled together. 2. They had a sermon. 3. They had the Lord’s supper. 4. They gave for the poor. Opening to the very first of the early Christian fathers we find it was the custom of all Christians to do just these things every Sunday. Thus Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, in his Apology, Chapter LXVII, says: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather

together in one place, and the memories of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read,...bread and wine are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgiving, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows." This shows that our conclusion from the above texts was correct. Thus as we see on opening to the early apostolic fathers immediately following the apostles, we find all Christians of all sects in all parts of the world holding their meetings on Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection, just as we do now. This shows beyond all reasonable doubt that the custom was established by the apostles themselves, and that by the authority of Christ. John 20:21-23.

Consider this important fact witnessed the world over today. We have five abiding witnesses that Christ lived, all mentioned in the New Testament. 1st - The Church. "I will build my church." Matthew 16:18. 2nd - New Testament. John "wrote these things." John 21:24. 3rd - Baptism. "Go baptizing them." Matthew 28:19. 4th - Lord's Supper. 1 Corinthians 11:20; "eat the Lord's Supper." 5th - Lord's Day. "On the Lord's Day." Revelation 1:10.

There are now about 500,000,000 people professing faith in Christ, scattered among all nations differing in doctrine almost endlessly. This difference extends back almost to the days of the apostles. Yet all these differing sects hold in common these five memorials of Christ's life - the Church, the New Testament, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's Day. The Eastern Church, the Armenian, Syrian, Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Lutheran, Methodist, Baptist, and hundreds more, all hold sacredly these five things in some form. All agree that all five began back with the apostles and came from their hands. There is perfect agreement on this, viz., that one is as old as the other, that all have come down hand in hand together. These 500,000,000 all firmly believe and teach this. This unanimous agreement must be accounted for in some reasonable way. It cannot be ignored nor bluffed off lightly. There can be only one truthful answer - all must have started together at the beginning and have kept together till this day. And all history confirms it.

02.11. Chapter 11 - Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?

Chapter 11 - Did the Pope Change the Sabbath? The one great point in the Sabbath question upon which Seventh-day Adventists stake the most, upon which they insist the strongest, which they repeat the most frequently and the most confidently, is that the pope of Rome did change the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day. They assert that this is all the authority Sunday-keepers have for observing that day. Sunday is the pope's Sabbath, and Sunday-keeping is the mark of the beast, Revelation 14:9-12, a terrible sin in the sight of God. See almost any work on the Sabbath published by them.

They claim that Sunday keeping came from the pagans through the pope into the church. Thus: "The name, origin, authority, and sacredness of the Sunday institution are altogether and only pagan." Replies to Elder Canright, page 133. Then the pope changed the Sabbath into the Sunday. Mrs. White says: "The pope had changed it [the Sabbath] from the seventh day to the first day of the week." Again: "The pope had changed the day of rest from the seventh to first day." Early Writings, pages 26, 55. Again: "Here we find the mark of the beast. The very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, on the part of the Catholic church, without any authority from the Bible." The Mark of the Beast, page 23. "Sunday keeping must be the 'mark of the beast.'" The Marvel of Nations, by U. Smith, page 183. To this claim Mrs. White has set the seal of divine inspiration. She says: "The change of the Sabbath is the sign or mark of the authority of the Romish church." "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark." Great Controversy, Vol. 4, page 281. This settles it with every Seventh-day Adventist. My experience is that a belief of this as a fact induces more persons to give up Sunday for Saturday than all other arguments made by the seventh-day people. Convince a man that Sunday-keeping is only a Catholic institution, a rival to the Lord's Sabbath and hateful to God, and of course, if he has any conscience, he will keep it no longer. Every one of them accepts this as a historical fact in fulfillment of Daniel 7:25. Indeed, this is the one main pillar in their whole system, upon which all the rest depends. If their position upon this point is false, then their whole system is also false, as they will readily admit. On this Elder Waggoner says: "Elder Canright did not exaggerate when he said that we consider this a material question. We do indeed so consider it." Replies to Elder Canright, page 165. Then they should be able to prove the point very plainly. They claim to be raised up to preach against this change of the Sabbath by the pope. The unmingled wrath of God is soon to be poured out upon all who continue to keep Sunday, the Pope's Sabbath. It would seem that such a radical position should be supported by the clearest evidence. They claim that it is a historical fact that somewhere during the first five centuries after Christ, the pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday. If this be so, they should be able to produce reliable historical proof for it, giving the TIME, MANNER, PLACE, PERSONS, FACTS and REASONS for so remarkable an occurrence. I have before me two books written expressly to prove this assertion. They are: "Who Changed the Sabbath?" 24 pages, and "Marvel of Nations," 282 pages. But the only direct proof offered is simply quotations from Catholic Catechisms, which claim that their church made the change! And is this all the historical (?) proof they can present on this point? Yes, for all that the Sabbatarian writers and scholars for the last

200 years have been able to find is just this and nothing more. Not one single historian in all the annals of the world has ever stated that the pope changed the Sabbath. For twenty-eight years I myself quoted these catechisms as proof positive on that subject.

Goaded by my call for proof on this point, the Adventists selected Elder Waggoner to answer it, to find some author who says that the pope changed the Sabbath. The elder made a desperate attempt, covering forty-nine closely printed pages. He searched the libraries of America and Europe. What did he find? If he had a passage to the point, he could have quoted it in a few lines. But he had none. Not a single author did he quote saying that the pope changed the Sabbath. So it rests merely on the claim of just these Catholic Catechisms. Then if we admit on their mere assertion the boastful claim of the Catholics that they changed the Sabbath, why not also admit their claim that the pope is infallible, that he has the keys of St. Peter, the chair of the apostle, the only true apostolic succession, etc.? Seventh-day people quickly repudiate all these other claims of the Catholics, but eagerly admit their claim that they changed the Sabbath, simply because this suits their theory, for which they can find no other proof. They denounce Catholic writers as forgers, cheats, deceivers and liars, then, when it suits their purpose, turn around and quote their mere assertions as unquestionable truth!

Moreover, even the claims of the Catechism are misrepresented. The theory is that some hundreds of years after Christ the pope, by his own authority, changed the Sabbath, and the Catechisms are explained to teach this idea. But not one of them make such a claim or anything like it. Every one of these Catholic quotations states distinctly that the change in the Sabbath was made, not by the pope, but "by the church" in the days of Christ and the apostles, not several hundred years afterward. Thus: "Question: What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy? "Answer: 1. The Sunday, or our Lord’s day, which we observe by apostolic tradition, instead of the Sabbath." Catholic Christian Instructed, page 209. From the same work, we take the following: "Question: What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?" "Answer: We have for it the authority of the Catholic church, and apostolic tradition."

Catholics claim that their "church" originated in the days of the apostles, and any change made by the apostolic church was made by the Catholic church. Hence they claim that the "Catholic church" changed the Sabbath in the days of the apostles. Adventists in using these quotations from the Cathechisms explain them as saying that the change was made by the apostate popes hundreds of years after the apostles. But the Catechisms claim no such thing, as is seen in the above quotations. Thus even the Catechisms, when fairly read, teach that Sunday observance originated with the Christian church in the days of the apostles, just the truth exactly. That Adventists do misrepresent the teachings of the Catholics is shown by the following testimony of a Catholic Priest: "Having lived for years among the Seventh-day Adventists, I am familiar with their claims that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week. Such assertions are wholly unfounded. Catholics claim no such thing; but maintain that the apostles themselves established the observance of Sunday and that we received it by tradition from them. The councils and popes afterwards simply confirmed the keeping of the day as received from the apostles. John Meiler, Rector of St. John’s Church, Headlsburg, Cal." The "Catholic Dictionary," by Addis and Arnold, after quoting Revelation 1:10; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2 says: These texts "seem to indicate that Sunday was already a sacred day on which deeds

of love were specially suitable. Hebrews 10:25 shows this much: that the Christians, when the epistle was written, had regular days of assembly. The scriptural references given above show that the observance of Sunday had begun in the apostolic age; but even were Scripture silent tradition would put this point beyond all doubt."

John Ankatell, A.M., priest of the diocese of New York, writing in the Outlook, July, 1889, says of Sunday, the Lord's Day: "We think it was given by our Lord to the apostles during the great forty days after his resurrection, but we cannot prove this." He states the Catholic doctrine exactly, viz: That the change was made by Christ and the apostles, but that the scriptures are not plain enough on this point to prove it; hence we have to rely upon Catholic authority which says it was made in New Testament times. All Catholics and all their catechisms say the same. But this is entirely different from saying that the pope made the change several hundred years after Christ. This is a sample of how Adventists pervert the testimony they use. (See Appendix E)

We will now present historical evidence, proving that the observance of the first day of the week as a day of worship was universal among Christians in the days immediately following the apostles. If Sunday worship originated here, then it did not originate with the papacy, which came up several hundred years later.

Pliny's Letter, A.D. 107.

Pliny was the governor of Bithynia, Asia Minor, A.D. 106-108. He wrote A.D. 107 to Trajan, the emperor, concerning the Christians, thus: "They were wont to meet together, on a STATED DAY before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as God....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." Horne's Introduction, Vol. 1, chapter 3, section 2, page 84. That this was Sunday is evident. 1) They came together to worship Christ. 2) They assembled to eat a meal together, the Lord's supper. We have already proved that the "stated day" for this was Sunday. "Upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread." Acts 20:7. This is exactly parallel to Pliny.

Eusebius, the historian, A.D. 324, says: "I think that he [the psalmist] describes the morning assemblies in which we are accustomed to assemble throughout the world." "By this is prophetically signified the service which is performed very early and every morning of the resurrection day throughout the whole world." Sabbath Manual, page 125. This is exactly what Pliny says: They met together "on a stated day before it was light," they assembled to eat together a meal. Eusebius says it was the custom of all Christians "to meet very early and every morning of the resurrection day." This ought to settle it and does. Pliny's stated day was Sunday. This was in the very region where the apostles labored, and only ELEVEN years after St. John died. Elder Andrews, Sabbatarian, says: "This testimony of Pliny was written a few years subsequent to the time of the apostles. It relates to a church which probably had been founded by the apostle Peter." Hist. Sab., page 237. It shows that the apostles taught Sunday keeping.

Barnabas, A.D. 120. This epistle was highly prized in the earliest churches, read in some of them as part of scripture, and is found in the oldest manuscript of the scriptures, NAMELY THE SINAITIC. That it was written by a pious man of learning and influence cannot be doubted. Elder Andrews, Seventh-day Adventists, admits that the epistle of Barnabas "was in existence as early

as the middle of the second century, and, like the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' is of value to us in that it gives some clue to the opinions which prevailed in the region where the writer lived." Testimony of the Fathers, page 21. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "The epistle was probably written in Alexandria at the beginning of the second century and by a Gentile Christian." The Encyclopedia Britannica, the highest critical authority, says: "This work is unanimously ascribed to Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul, by early Christian writers.... But the great majority of critics assign it to the reign of Hadrian sometime between 119 and 126 A.D." Smith's Dictionary of the Bible says: "The epistle is believed to have been written early in the second century." Johnson's New Universal Cyclopedia says: It "is supposed by Hefele to have been written between 107-120 A.D.... It is frequently cited by the Fathers, and was by many regarded as being of authority in the church; some even claiming for it a place in the sacred canon." This is a summary of the best modern criticism as to the date, character and authority of the epistle of Barnabas. Read and reverenced in the church as early as A.D. 120, or within twenty-four years of the death of St. John, it shows what Christians believed and practiced immediately after the apostles. In this epistle we read: "Incense is a vain abomination unto me, and your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot endure. He has, therefore, abolished these things." Chapter II. Elder Andrews admits that "he presently asserts the abolition of the Sabbath of the Lord." "Testimony," etc., page 22. Coming to the first day of the week, Barnabas says: "Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day, also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead." Chapter 15.

What does Elder Andrews say to this testimony? He admits that it teaches the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath and the keeping of Sunday. But he argues that such a doctrine is contrary to the Bible; that is, to HIS idea of the Bible. While I was yet a firm believer in the seventh day, when reading this book, I was struck with the fact that Elder Andrews, all through his book had to oppose and combat the teachings of all these early fathers! The reason is manifest: he held one doctrine and they held another. He believed in the seventh day, and they believed in the first day. Some of them lived early enough to have conversed with the apostles themselves, while he lived eighteen hundred years later! Which would be apt to know best? In his "History of the Sabbath," page 308, he says: "The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they had no special light on the subject by reason of living in the first centuries, which we in this latter age do not possess." What a confession that is from the ablest historian the seventh day ever had! He admits that "the early fathers" "in the first centuries" neglected "the observance of the Sabbath." What further need have we for witness to prove that the seventh day was not observed in the first centuries? But how does this harmonize with the theory that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope several hundred years afterwards? Suppose those early fathers were not good theologians, nor able reasoners; could they not testify to a simple FACT? Could they not state whether they did or did not keep Saturday? Surely that knew enough for that, and this is all we wish to ask.

We do not quote these fathers to prove a doctrine; for that we go only to the Bible. We quote them to prove a simple, historical FACT, viz: that the early Christians did keep Sunday, hence it could not have started with the popes centuries later. The Teaching of the Apostles, A.D. 125. This was not written by the apostles; yet its date is very early. Some place it as early as A.D. 80. Professor Harnack, of Berlin, says many place it between A.D. 90, and A.D. 120. This is the date most favored. It can not be much later. The New York Independent says of it: "By all odds the most

important writing exterior to the New Testament." Professor D.R. Dungan, President of Drake University, says: "It is evident that it is not far on this side of the death of the apostle John." The noted scholar, Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, in his Sabbath for Man, page 383, says: It was "written, as the best scholars almost unanimously agree, not later than forty years after the death of the last of the apostles, and during the lifetime of many who heard John's teaching." In the preface to this important document, the editors, Profs. Hitchcock and Brown in the Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., say: "The genuineness of the document can hardly be doubted." "The document belongs undoubtedly to the second century; possibly as far back as 120 A.D.; hardly later than 160." Introduction.

Chapter fourteen of the Teaching of the Apostles says: "But every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving," etc. This testimony is clear and decisive that the Lord's day was the established day of worship, at that early day.

Justin Martyr, A.D. 140.

I quote from "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers," by Elder Andrews: "Justin's 'Apology' was written at Rome about the year 140," "and this at a distance of only forty-four years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos." "It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt." Page 33. This is the confession which even the historian of the Seventh-day Adventists is compelled to make. The Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded by Christians within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle. And this is proven by the testimony of a man who lived right there.

Hear Elder A. again: "We must, therefore, pronounce Justin a man who held to the abrogation of the ten commandments, and that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution which was unknown before Moses, and of no authority since Christ. He held Sunday to be the most suitable day for public worship." Page 44. This is the doctrine that the early church and fathers held. Justin in his "Apology" for them to the emperor fairly represented what Christians generally held then, just as he should have done. Elder Andrews conveys the impression that Justin represented only a small party of apostate Christians at Rome and that he is quite unreliable. But the facts are just the reverse. He was a Greek, born in Palestine and held his "Dialogue with Trypho," at Ephesus, Asia Minor, in the church where St. John lived and died, the very center of the Eastern church, and only forty-four years after John's death. Of Justin the Encyclopedia Americana says: "One of the earliest and most learned writers of the Christian church.... He was also equally zealous in opposing alleged heretics." Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "In these works Justin professes to present the system of doctrine held by all Christians and seeks to be orthodox on all points. The only difference he knows of as existing between Christians concerned the millennium. Thus Justin is an incontrovertible witness for the unity of the faith in the church of his day, and to the fact that the Gentile type of Christianity prevailed."

"Eusebius says that he overshadowed all the great men who illuminated the second century by the splendor of his name." His writings are "the most important that have come to us from the second century." McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, Article Justin Martyr.

Dr. Schaff says of him: "After his conversion Justin devoted himself wholly to the vindication of the Christian religion, as an itinerant evangelist, with no fixed abode." Church History, Vol. 1, page 482. Not only were his books accepted without dispute as expressing the practice of the church, but his itinerant life, now in Palestine, then in Rome, Greece, Ephesus, enabled him to know this practice, and stamps his testimony with a force equal to demonstration. So, then, Justin is an unimpeachable witness for the faith and practice of Christians generally a few years after the death of the apostles.

Now hear what Justin says about the first day of the week: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." The First Apology of Justin, Chapter 67. Does Elder Andrews question the genuineness of this document? No, indeed. What answer does he make to it? Simply that Justin does not call Sunday the Sabbath nor the Lord’s day! This is readily answered by the fact that Justin was writing to a heathen emperor who would have been wholly ignorant of the meaning of either of those terms, but who was familiar with the term "Sunday." So Justin of necessity used that term. But there the naked facts stand, clear, positive and undeniable, that within forty-four years after the book of Revelation was written Christians did not keep the seventh day, but did hold their assemblies on Sunday. And Justin says that Jesus taught these things to the apostles. With these undeniable facts before him, it is a marvel how any man can say that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday three or four hundred years after this by the apostate popes. For myself I became fully satisfied that such statements are contrary to all the plainest facts of history, as may be seen by the above unquestioned statement of Justin Martyr.

It is impossible that Sunday-keeping could have thus been universally introduced into all churches without a word of objection, unless it had started at the fountain-head, with the apostles themselves. Consider well the force of this fact: From the very earliest days, reaching almost back to the apostles themselves, the church was divided into opposing sects, and controversy between them was often very strong. Yet all agreed in keeping Sunday. So today: go to any part of the globe and wherever you find Christians of any sect or nation, there you find them keeping Sunday. A few Sabbatarians of late origin are the only exceptions to this. How did this universal custom

come about if not started at the very foundation of the church by the apostles themselves?

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth in Greece, A.D. 170. But we will hear further from these fathers themselves as to whether they kept Sunday. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, the church which Paul raised up and to which he gave the command about Sunday collections, 1 Corinthians 16:1-2, says: "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." Eusebius, Eccl. History, Book 4, Chapter 23. That the Lord's day is the resurrection day we have seen. This term is never applied to any other than the first day. Notice that this witness is from Greece, not Rome. So the resurrection day was a "holy" day, A.D. 170.

Bardesanes of Edessa, Syria, A.D. 180.

Coming down only ten years we have the testimony of the heretic Bardesanes, the Syrian, who flourished about A.D. 180. He belonged to the Gnostic sect. He says: "On one day, the first day of the week, we assembled ourselves together, and on the days of the readings we abstain from [taking] sustenance." Book of the Laws of Countries. Says Elder A.: "This shows that the Gnostics used Sunday as the day for religious assemblies." Testimony, etc., page 53. Here is another good testimony for Sunday, and another good confession from Elder A. All parties, orthodox and heretic, kept Sunday as early as A.D. 180. How, then, is it that Constantine and the pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday two to four hundred years later? Elder A's own words utterly refute such an idea.

Notice here also a refutation of the idea so strongly urged by Sabbatarians, that Sunday-keeping originated at Rome, and was for a long time confined there. Elder Andrews has to admit that the Gnostics at this date used Sunday as a day of worship. But, 1) The Gnostics were emphatically an eastern sect, originating in Syria, and were most numerous in Alexandria, Asia Minor, and the East. Rome never had any influence over them. Bardesanes himself lived at Edessa, in Mesopotamia, 1,500 miles east of Rome, on another continent, under another nation. 2) This sect was numerous in the East as early as A.D. 150, or 55 years after the death of John. So we have Sunday-keeping not only at Rome but all over the east as early as A.D. 150, hundreds of years before the pope had a particle of influence there.

Clement of Alexandria, Egypt, A.D. 194.

Clement was one of the most celebrated of the Christian fathers. He wrote about A.D. 194. He says: "He, in fulfillment of the precept, keeps the Lord's day when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumed that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself." Book 7, Chapter XII. The Lord's day, it will be seen here and all along, is the resurrection day. Clement lived, not at Rome, but in Egypt. So Sunday-keeping was not simply a Roman usage as Adventists claim.

Tertullian of Africa, A.D. 200.

Tertullian was one of the most noted of the early fathers. Was born A.D. 160. He was highly educated, bred to the law, and very talented. Brought up a pagan, he was converted to Christ and vehemently opposed heathenism ever after. Radically severe in his principles, opposed to all conformity to the world, the laxity of the Roman church drove him to withdraw from it, which he ever after hotly opposed. So he was not a Romanist, nor did Rome have a particle of influence

over him only to drive him the other way. He was strictly orthodox in faith and a lover of the scriptures. Hence if it were true that Sunday keeping, as a heathen institution, was being introduced into the church by Rome, Tertullian is just the man who would have opposed and fearlessly condemned it.

Johnson's Cyclopedia says of him: "One of the greatest men of the early church." He "joined the Puritanic sect of the Montanists. They were orthodox in doctrine, but stern in spirit and discipline." "He remained true to the faith of the Catholics, but fought them vehemently on matters of morality and discipline. He was also a representative of the African opposition to Rome." The Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia says of him: "One of the grandest and most original characters of the ancient church." "Greek philosophy he despised." Of his great book they say: "One of the magnificent monuments of the ancient church." Anton's Classical Dictionary says of him: "He informs us more correctly than any other writer respecting the Christian doctrines of his time.... Tertullian was held in very high esteem by the subsequent fathers of the church." Neander says: "Tertullian is a writer of peculiar importance." Rose's Neander, page 424.

Here then is a competent and unimpeachable witness to the doctrines and practices of the universal church, A.D. 200, or only 104 years after John. Time and again he argues that the Sabbath was abolished, that Christians do not keep it, but do keep Sunday, the Lord's Day. Of the abolition of the Sabbath he says: "Let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed... teach us that for the past time righteous men kept the Sabbath." "God originated Adam uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath." So he says Abel, Noah, Enoch, etc., were "inobservant of the Sabbath." Answer to the Jews, chapter 2. Again: "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." Chapter 4. "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day their Sabbath, and devote it to ease and eating, deviating from the old Jewish customs, which they are now very ignorant of." Tertullian's Apology, chapter 16. Tertullian again declares that his brethren did not observe the days held sacred by the Jews: "We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor in their sacred days." "We, however, (just as we have received), 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." Tertullian on Prayer, chapter 23. Sunday, then, was observed by Christians at that early date, but Saturday was not.

Origen, A.D. 225.

Origen (about A.D. 225) was a man of immense learning, and his writings are numerous. "Origen may well be pronounced one of the ablest and worthiest of the church fathers." McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia. He says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as, for example, the Lord's Day, the preparation, the passover, or pentecost." Origen against Celsus, book 8, chapter 22. This plainly shows that he did observe the Lord's Day. Origen's home was in Egypt, but he traveled all over the East and died at Tyre. Notice that witnesses for Sunday came from all parts of the world, not one from Rome. The Apostolic Constitutions, A.D. 250. Of the "Apostolic Constitutions" (A.D. 250) Elder Andrews says: "The so- called 'Apostolic Constitutions' were not the work of the apostles, but they were in existence as early as the third century, and were then very generally believed to express the

doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important historical testimony to the practice of the church at that time. Mosheim, in his 'Historical Commentaries,' Cent. 1, section 51, speaks thus of these 'constitutions': 'The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed among the Christians of the second and third centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions.'" Testimony, etc., page 13. Notice again that this work was the product of the eastern church and hence shows the custom of the church in the east instead of that at Rome.

These, then, will be good witnesses to the practice of the church about A.D. 250. In section 7, paragraph 59, we read: "And on the Lord's Day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus and sent him to us." "Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection." In book 7, section 2, paragraph 30, he says: "On the day of the resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord's Day, assemble yourselves together, without fail, giving thanks to God," etc. In the same paragraph, in speaking of the resurrection of Christ, the writer says: "On which account we solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's Day," etc.

These testimonies are decisive, and do show beyond a doubt that the Christians of those early days used Sunday just as it is now used for religious worship. Did they, then, have "the mark of the beast" at least 250 years before the beast had arisen, according to the Seventh-day Adventists' theory? These unquestionable facts of history, taken from their own published works and admitted by them to be true, show the utter absurdity of their position that Sunday-keeping is the mark of the beast.

Anatolius, A.D. 270, Bishop of Laodicea, Asia.

He was bishop of Laodicea, Asia Minor. Not a Roman, but a Greek. This church was raised up by Paul himself, and must have been well acquainted with the apostle's doctrine. In his seventh canon Anatolius says: "The obligation of the Lord's resurrection binds us to keep the paschal festival on the Lord's Day." In his tenth canon he uses this language: "The solemn festival of the resurrection of the Lord can be celebrated only on the Lord's Day." In his sixteenth canon he says: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day will lead us to celebrate it on the same principle." See how all these early Christians call the resurrection day "the Lord's Day" and how they honor it. How entirely different from our Sabbatarians who can hardly find terms enough by which to express their contempt for Sunday! Why is this difference and what does it show?

Victorinus, Bishop of Petau, A.D. 300.

"On the former day [the sixth] we are accustomed to fast rigorously that on the Lord's Day we may go forth to our bread with givings of thanks. And let the parasceve become a rigorous fast lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews which Christ himself, the Lord of the Sabbath, says by his prophets that his soul hateth which Sabbath he in his body abolished." Creation of the World, section 4.

Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 306.

"But the Lord's day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it he rose again, on which day we have received it for a custom not even to bow the knee." Canon 15. He gives the same reason 1581 years ago for keeping the Lord's day that Christians give now. This was more than 200 years before the pope came into power. Notice that these witnesses for Sunday are from all parts of the world, from Africa, Asia and Europe, not simply from Rome, as Seventh-day Adventists untruthfully say. These show that Sunday-keeping was as widespread as the Christian Church itself, and that from the earliest days.

Eusebius, A.D. 324.

Eusebius was born in Palestine, the very home of Christ and the apostles and the cradle of the early church. He was bishop of Cesarea where Paul abode two years. Acts 23:33; Acts 24:27. He studied at Antioch where Paul labored for years. Acts 15:1. He traveled to Egypt and over Asia Minor. He was one of the most noted men of his age. He wrote the first history of the Christian church and bears the title of "Father of Church History." The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "As a repertory of facts and documents, his work is invaluable." Johnson's Cyclopedia says: "He was very eminent for learning, as well as talents." Horne's Introductions says: "A man of extraordinary learning, diligence and judgment, and singularly studious in the scriptures.... His chief work in his Ecclesiastical History, in which he records the history of Christianity from its commencement to his own time.... He has delivered, not his own private opinion, but the opinion of the church, the sum of what he had found in the writings of the primitive Christians." Vol. 1, Chapter 11, Section 2, page 42.

He had every possible opportunity to know what Christians did throughout the world. Of him Justin Edwards, D.D., says: "He lived in the third century, was a man of vast reading, and was as well acquainted with the history of the church from the days of the apostles as any man of his day." At Cesarea was "a very extensive library, to which Eusebius had constant access. He was a learned and accurate historian and had the aid of the best helps for acquiring information upon all subjects connected with the Christian church." Sabbath Manual, pages 124-125. He lived right there, knew just what Christians did, and wrote about fifty years before the council of Laodicea where Adventists say the Sabbath was changed to Sunday. Hear him: Speaking of the patriarchs before the flood, he says: "They did not, therefore, regard circumcision, NOR OBSERVE THE SABBATH, NEITHER DO WE;... because such things as these do not belong to Christians." Eccl. Hist., Book 1, Chapter 4. This is decisive. A.D. 324, Christians did not keep the Sabbath.

True, there was a small heretical sect who kept the Sabbath as Judaizers do now. Of them he says: They are "those who cherish low and mean opinions of Christ.... With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary [just like Seventh-day Adventists] as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ as a corresponding life.... They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them, but on the other hand they also celebrate the Lord's Day very much like us in commemoration of his resurrection." Eccl. Hist., pages 112-113. Even these Judaizers kept Sunday. On the Ninety-second Psalm he says: "The word by the new covenant translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light and gave us the true rest, viz., the saving Lord's Day." "On this day which is the first of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths, even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, and do those things according to the spiritual law which

were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath." Again: "And all things whatsoever that it was the duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's Day as more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath." Quoted in Justin Edward's Sabbath Manual, pages 126-127. This testimony of the great historian of the early church is decisive. It puts beyond doubt that Christians in all the world did then keep Sunday, the Lord's Day, and did not keep the Jewish Sabbath. It is a desperate cause which has to deny such testimony as this.

Summary of Testimony from Cyclopedias. As a fair, impartial and clear statement of the teachings of the early Christian fathers concerning the observance of Sunday, we refer the reader to the following from Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, article "Lord's Day." Here is a book easy of access to all anywhere, unsectarian, embodying the results of the most thorough and scholarly examination of every passage in all the fathers having any bearing upon the Sunday question. Any one who has read the fathers must confess that its statements are fair and truthful. I have only room for one short quotation: "The results of our examination of the principle writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John, are as follows: 'The Lord's day existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of Scriptural Christianity. It was never defended; for it was never impugned, or at least only impugned as were other things received from the apostles. It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it.... It was not an institution of severe Sabbatical character, but a day of joy and cheerfulness, rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the holy eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for alms-giving; and though being an institution under the law of liberty, work does not appear to have been formally interdicted, or rest formally enjoined. Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's day and the Sabbath, in no passage that has come down to us is the fourth commandment appealed to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's day.'" So Johnson's New Universal Cyclopedia, Art. Sabbath, says: "For a time the Jewish converts observed both the seventh day, to which the name Sabbath continued to be given exclusively, and the first day, which came to be called the Lord's day.... Within a century after the death of the last of the apostles we find the observance of the first day of the week, under the name of the Lord's day, established as a universal custom of the church.... It was regarded not as a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath (which was denounced together with circumcision and other Jewish and anti-Christian practices), but rather as a substitute for it, and naturally its observance was based on the resurrection of Christ rather than on the creation rest day, or the Sabbath of the Decalogue." No higher authority than this could be quoted. It states the truth exactly. So the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Art. Sunday, says: "In the second century its observance was universal.... The Jewish Christians ceased to observe the Sabbath after the destruction of Jerusalem."

Dr. Schaff, than whom there is no higher living authority, says: "The universal and uncontradicted Sunday observance in the second century can only be explained by the fact that it had its root in apostolic practice." History of the Christian church, Vol. I, page 478. The man who will shut his eyes to all this mass of testimony and still insist that Sunday-keeping is only an institution of popes of later ages, is simply held by a theory which he is bound to maintain anyway. I have had a sad experience in this matter, and know just how a seventh-day man feels in reading these historical facts. I read some of them twenty years ago. They perplexed me some, but I got over this by my

strong faith in our doctrines and by believing them to be mostly forgeries. Afterwards as I read more, I saw these testimonies were reliable and very decidedly against our theory of the pope's Sunday. This disturbed me quite a little, but still I got over them by simply ceasing to think of them at all, and by dwelling upon other arguments in which I had perfect confidence. In debate I was always anxious to shut these out of the discussion. I know that Seventh-day Adventist ministers generally feel as I did, for we often referred to these testimonies of the fathers and the effect they had in debate. Of course, the great body of the members never read these things, and are in blissful ignorance concerning them. Or, if they do read them, it is in their own books where they are all explained away. Their unbounded faith in "the message" and in their leaders carries them right over these facts as matters of no consequence. For myself, when once I decided to look these historical facts squarely in the face and give them whatever force they fairly deserved, I soon saw the utter falsity of the claim that the "pope changed the Sabbath." The old feeling of uneasiness on this point is entirely gone. I feel that so far as the evidence of history is concerned, my feet stand on solid ground.

02.12. Chapter 12 - Sabbatarian Positions on the History of Sunday Refuted

Chapter 12 - Sabbatarian Positions on the History of Sunday Refuted What answer do Sabbatarians make to all the preceding testimony? This:

1. "The Bible, the Bible only, is our rule. We don't go by history." Reply: Why then do they themselves appeal to history? No people depend so much upon history, none refer to it so often, none make so great claims from it as Seventh-day Adventists. Thus Andrew's book on the Sabbath contains 512 pages. Of these 192 are on the Bible and 320 on history. Yet they don't go by history! Wherever they can find a scrap in their favor they make the most of it. Of their reliance on history Elder Smith says: "One of the grandest facts we have to present is that God has always had witnesses to his holy Sabbath from the days of Adam till now." Replies to Canright, pages 41-42. Mark: One of the grandest facts they have to present in favor of Saturday is what? Bible testimony? No, but witness from history. Yet, they don't go by history! The fact is they quote history whenever they possibly can. Why, then, cry out against history when we follow them there? Because it is against them.

2. They say that "the early fathers are unreliable, fools, apostates, forgers and frauds." Listen to them: Of one of the fathers Elder Smith says: "A fraud, an impostor, a forger.... An old forger of the second century who wrote things too silly to be repeated and too shameful to quote." Replies to Elder Canright, page 39. Hear Elder Waggoner: "Surely insanity could not produce any more driveling nonsense than this." "Such childish nonsense is seldom seen under the heading of reason." "It would have been a blessing to the world if they had all been lost." Fathers of the Catholic Church, pages 206, 209, 217. This is the way they dispose of all the Christian fathers who said a word in favor of Sunday. No doubt it would have been better for those who keep the Jewish Sabbath if all the Christian fathers had been lost and, better still, if the New Testament also had been lost, for both these are against them. Why this effort to break down the testimony of these early Christian writers? Because they are against them and Sabbatarians know it. Whatever crude notions those fathers might have had, they could state a simple fact of their own days as to whether they did, or did not, keep Sunday. They all agree that they did and their testimony is decisive. But how much is there to their charge of fraud, forgery, etc.? Just this: In those days the author's name was not always signed to his book; hence it sometimes happened that a book was attributed to the wrong author by mistake. No fraud or forgery was designed or practiced by any one. Look at Hebrews. No name is signed to it. It is still a disputed point as to who wrote it, Paul, Barnabas, or some other apostle. Shall we, therefore, call it a "fraud" and throw it out of the Bible? No. So of the epistle of Barnabas for instance. No name was signed to it, yet it was generally attributed to the apostle Barnabas and was read in all the churches as authority as early as A.D. 120. Some attributed it to others; but all agree that it was written as early as A.D. 120 by some Christian and gave the opinion and customs of the church at that time. "Fraud, fraud," cry the Sabbatarians, "Barnabas never wrote it." Well, what of it? Some Christian wrote it within

twenty-five years of John’s death and it says that Christians then kept Sunday.

3. "None of the fathers call Sunday the Sabbath." So say the Sabbatarians. That is about right. The early church said with Paul, Colossians 2:16, that the Sabbath was abolished with other Jewish rites. The first day was not the Sabbath, but "the Lord’s Day," "the eighth day," "resurrection day," etc.

4. Sabbatarians say that Christians worked on Sunday during the first century or longer. Their evidence for this is very questionable as we will soon see. Yet possibly at first the day may not have been observed as strictly as later on; but still it was the day on which all Christians met for their worship according to the custom of the apostles. This is what we claim and have abundantly proved.

5. Sabbatarians say: "The Christians kept the Sabbath for centuries after Christ." Reply: All history abundantly shows that the Jewish Christians observed the Sabbath, circumcision, Passover, etc., for a long time. In some churches where the Jewish element predominated, the Gentiles may have also kept the Sabbath, but all parties kept Sunday at the same time. These are the facts about Sabbath-keeping in the early church as proved above.

6. Seventh-day Adventists quote so-called "eminent historians" to prove their assertions. With these authors they deceive the people and deceive themselves. They quote them as "reliable historians," "high authorities," "eminent divines," "all friends of Sunday," etc. But who are they? Look at Andrews’ History of the Sabbath, their standard work. All others relating to the history of the Sabbath are only a re-hash of this. It is served up on all occasion and his authors are quoted over and over by writers and preachers. But the great bulk of his quotations are from such men as Heylyn, Domville, Morer, Cox, Brerewood, White, etc., Episcopal clergymen of England who were bitter opposers of Sunday sacredness.

-1. Brerewood, in the seventeenth century, was only a college professor, not of note enough to be even named in any cyclopedia I have seen, and I have consulted many. He was a fiery erratic, and argued that the Sabbath law was given only to the master. See The Sabbath by Gilfillin, pages 122-123.

-2. Coleman, an American writer of our own times, scarcely mentioned in any cyclopedia.

-3. Dr. Cox, a Scottish anti-Sunday writer last century, not even named in any cyclopedia. See Gilfillin, page 168. Yet Andrews quotes him TWENTY-TWO TIMES, long quotations, as a friend of Sunday! He might as well quote one of his own party. In proof of this read the following from Dr. Lewis, Seventh- day Baptist, in his "History of Sabbath and Sunday": "A pastor of the Mill Yard Seventh-day Baptist Church in London, Robert Cornthwaite, published five works upon the Sabbath question." Of the last book Lewis says: "Robert Cox quotes largely from this work." Pages 337-339. Exactly; then Andrews calls this man a friend of Sunday!!

-4. Domville, another anti-Sunday writer of the nineteenth century, not in any cyclopedia. He denies that there was any authority in the Bible for observing Sunday, even as a day for meetings. Gilfillin, page 143. Yet Andrews quotes him THIRTEEN TIMES as a standard Sunday authority!

-5. Heylyn was the friend of the infamous Laud of England. In 1618 Charles I of England issued a "Book of Sports" for Sunday, allowing of dancing, wrestling and various games on Sunday. See

Gilfillin, page 85. Pious people opposed the declaration as a desecration of Sunday. Laud, by the Kings command, hired this Heylyn and Dr. White to write against Sunday sacredness, and in favor of the King's book. In four months a large volume was written, printed and delivered according to order, to prove what was wanted against Sunday. The Cyclopedia of Universal Knowledge says of Heylyn: "He was a very voluminous controversial writer, but his works are of no value now." From this man Andrews makes THIRTY-SIX quotations, many of them long, as his chief evidence on his main points!

-6. White, the man associated with Heylyn, as the hireling of Laud in writing the above book, is quoted ELEVEN TIMES by Andrews as a reliable DEFENDER of Sunday! He might as well quote Elder Waggoner as a defender of Sunday.

-7. Morer is a writer of the eighteenth century, mentioned in no cyclopedia. He wrote to disprove the divine origin of Sunday observance. See Gilfillin, page 142. Of one of his statements, which happened to favor Sunday, Elder Waggoner says: "Dishonest as it manifestly is," etc. Replies to Elder Canright, page 146. From this "dishonest" man Elder Andrews makes no less than FORTY-SEVEN QUOTATIONS, many of them long!

-8. Jeremy Taylor, of the seventeenth century, the friend and chaplain of the villainous Laud, wrote against the divine authority of Sunday, and yet is quoted by Andrews as the friend of Sunday!

These are samples of his authors. Most of them were members of the Church of England, and that, too, during the worst period of that church; a church which permits the widest range in theological opinions, such as Unitarianism, Universalism, future probation, annihilation, rationalism, high church, low church, etc. How much then does it signify as to the soundness of one's opinion to state that he is a minister of that church?

Take from the historical part of Andrew's history his quotations and arguments from the above authors and you would hardly have a skeleton left. And even quotations from these are one-sided. Waggoner, Smith, Butler, and all the lesser lights among Seventh-day Adventists who have come after Andrews simply use these quotations which he gathered for them. But they might as well quote Ingersoll and Tom Paine as "friends of the Bible" as to quote these men as "friends of the Sunday Sabbath." Each of them wrote on purpose to refute the claims of Sunday as a Sabbath of divine authority. Thousands of readers ignorant of history are misled, as I was once, by these quotations used by the Adventists. If they had the truth they would not be compelled to rely upon such authors. The Pagan Romans Never Kept Sunday

Seventh-day Adventists affirm that keeping Sunday was adopted from the pagan Romans by the Catholics and from the Catholics by the Protestants. This idea they industriously teach everywhere. They say that these pagans kept Sunday in worship of the sun. See Andrews' History of the Sabbath, pages 258-2664. Such statements are utterly false. Each day of the week was named after some god and, in a certain sense, was devoted to the worship of that god, as Monday to the moon, Saturday to Saturn, Sunday to the sun, etc. But did they cease work on these days? No; if they had they would have kept every day in the week. Did they observe Sunday by ceasing to work? No, indeed. No such thing was taught or practiced by the Romans. They had no weekly rest day.

Prof. A. Rauschinbusch of Rochester Theological Seminary quotes Lotz thus: "'It is a vain thing to attempt to prove that the Greeks and Romans had anything resembling the Sabbath. Such opinion is refuted even by this, that the Roman writers ridicule the Sabbath as something peculiar to the Jews.' In proof he cites many passages from the Roman poets, and one from Tacitus. Seneca also condemned the Sabbath observance of the Jews as a waste of time by which a seventh part of life was lost." Saturday or Sunday? Page 83. Herzog says: "No special religious celebration of any one day of the week can be pointed out in any one of the pagan religions." Article Sabbath. This fact is accidentally confessed by Elder Waggoner. Of Constantine's law, A.D. 321, he says: "Though the venerable day of the sun had long - very long - been venerated by them and their heathen ancestors, THE IDEA OF REST FROM WORLDLY LABOR IN ITS WORSHIP WAS ENTIRELY NEW." Replies to Elder Canright, page 130. Mark this confession for it gives up the main pillar of their argument in their effort to prove that Sunday-keeping was taken from the pagans. THE PAGASN NEVER KEPT SUNDAY. It was a common work day like other days of the week. The idea and the custom of keeping Sunday as a day of rest from work originated with the Christians, not with pagans. So much for that falsehood. Again: Saturday was sacred to Saturn as Sunday was to the sun. So Adventists are keeping a heathen day the same as Sunday-keepers are!

Constantine Did Not Change the Sabbath

It has been common for Sabbatarians to point to the law of Constantine as a chief factor in changing the Sabbath to Sunday. There never was any truth in the charge; but Elder Waggoner now owns it all up and confesses that it has nothing whatever to do in changing the Sabbath. "Constantine, in his decrees, said not one word either for or against keeping the Sabbath of the Bible." "It is safe to affirm that there was nothing done in the time of Constantine, either by himself or any other, that has the least appearance of changing the Sabbath." Replies to Elder Canright, page 150. That is the truth and a good confession, though it contradicts all that they have said heretofore. Now let them revise their old books to harmonize with this truth and they will be much smaller.

Constantine's Sunday Law and Its Object A.D. 321, Constantine, the first Christian emperor of Rome, issued the following edict:

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun, but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty, attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven." The simple facts about this law are these: Christians from the days of the apostles had kept the first day of the week; but there was no civil law to protect or aid them in it. By this time they had become very numerous in the empire and their influence was rapidly gaining. The old pagan religion was falling before them. Constantine, to say the least, was favorable to Christianity. His parents were Christians. He was shrewd enough to see that it was for his interest to favor this new and rising religion. Hence, as soon as he publicly professed Christianity, he issued several edicts favoring it in various ways, this one concerning Sunday among the rest. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia well says: "He was no doubt convinced of the superior claims of Christianity as the rising religion; but his conversion was a change of policy, rather than of moral character. He knew

Christianity well, but only as a power in the Roman Empire and he protected it as a wise and far-seeking statesman... His first edict concerning the Christians (Rome, 312) is lost. By the second (Milan, 313) he granted them, not only free religious worship and the recognition of the state, but also reparation of previously incurred losses... A series of edicts of 315, 316, 319, 321, and 323, completed the revolution. Christians were admitted to the offices of the state... An edict of 321 ordered Sunday to be celebrated by cessation of all work in public."

It will be seen that this edict was only one of seven issued to favor Christians. 1.) It was not made to please or favor the pagans, for, as seen above, they did not keep Sunday. 2.) As we have proved, the Christians did all keep Sunday, hence this law would favor and please them. 3.) The edict was not addressed to Christians for they needed no such law for themselves as they kept that day voluntarily. 4.) It was not worded in Christian terms, "Lord's Day," as it was addressed to pagans. 5.) It was couched in pagan terms, "day of the sun," that pagans might understand it and that it might offend them less. This law, then, made no change in the observance of Sunday on the part of Christians; but it did secure to that day a better observance by requiring everyone, pagans and all, to cease work that day. But it is said that this law of Constantine, A.D. 321, was the first law ever made prohibiting work on Sunday. Very true, but why? Because none but Christians believed it wrong to work that day; and up to that date Constantine had no power to make laws and hence could not have made a law for keeping Sunday if they had desired to. It is noticeable that the first emperor who favored Christianity made, among other laws favoring Christians, a civil law prohibiting work on Sunday. That this law was made at the request of Christians is now admitted by Adventists. Thus Elder A.T. Jones in the Battle Creek Journal, December 11, 1888, says: "It is demonstrated that the first Sunday law that ever was enacted was at the request of the church; it was in behalf of the church, and it was expressly to help the church." Exactly, and this proves that the church kept Sunday before that law was made. It is an absurdity to say that the pagans had always kept Sunday and yet had never made a law concerning it. As Adventists all agree, the first Sunday law was made to favor Christians. This shows that Sunday observance was then regarded as an essential part of Christianity. Of this law Mosheim says: "The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of the Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been." Mosheim, century 4, part 2, chapter 4, section 5. This law, addressed to pagans who had always worked on Sunday, required the cessation of business on that day and so secured to Christians a better observance of Sunday than before. The ecclesiastical historian, Sozomen, writing of Constantine, says: "He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's Day... He honored the Lord's Day because on it Christ rose from the dead." Ecc. Hist., page 22. It was, then, in behalf of Sunday as a Christian day, not as a pagan festival, that this law was made.

Found At Last - The Exact Time and Place the Pope Changed the Sabbath!

I pressed the Adventists to name the time and place when and where the Sabbath was changed by the pope, and to name the pope and the facts about such a change if it ever occurred. Nettled by this, Elder Waggoner undertook the Herculean task. A worse sample of assumption and perversion of facts it would be hard to find. At last he settles on the council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, as the place and time when and where the Sabbath was changed. The 29th canon of that council read thus: "Christians ought not to Judaize and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day; but

preferring the Lord’s Day, should rest, if possible, as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ." On this the Elder says: "Now, if any one can imagine what would be changing the Sabbath, if this is not, I would be extremely happy to learn what it could be." "Now I claim that I have completely met this demand; I have shown the time, the place, and the power that changed the Sabbath." Replied to Canright, pages 141, 151. He claims that this was "a Catholic council" and that "historians early and late have made much mention" of this council. Now let us examine his position.

1. If the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope right here, as he affirms, then certainly it was not changed before nor after at any other place. So if this fails their whole cause is lost. Let the reader mark the importance of this fact.

2. He admits what every scholar knows, that till after the time of Constantine the bishop of Rome had no "authority whatever above the other bishops" and so could not have changed the Sabbath before that time. He says: "It was Constantine himself that laid the foundation of the papacy." Replies to Elder Canright, page 148. Surely the papacy did not exist before its foundation was laid.

3. He admits, as above, that Constantine did nothing to change the Sabbath.

4. But we have abundantly proved in preceding pages that all Christians long before this date were unanimous in observing the Lord’s Day. This one simple facts proves the utter absurdity of the claim that it was changed at Laodicea, A.D. 364, or by the papacy at any time.

5. In the year 324, or just 40 years before the council of Laodicea, Eusebius, bishop of Cesarea, Palestine, wrote his celebrated history of Christianity. He had every possible opportunity to know what Christians did throughout the world. He says: "And all things whatsoever that it was the duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord’s Day as more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath." Quoted in Sabbath Manual, page 127. That is the way the Sabbath and Sunday stood in the church 40 years before Laodicea. They did not keep the Sabbath, but did keep the Lord’s Day, had transferred all things to it. How much truth, then, can there be in the position that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope 40 years later? Shame on such brazen attempts to pervert the truth. But let us look at the real facts about the council at Laodicea. Seventh-day Adventists claim two things, viz: that the Sabbath was changed by the Roman church, and that it was done by the authority of the pope. Then they select Laodicea as the place and time, but,

1. Laodicea is not Rome. It is situated in Asia Minor over 1,000 miles east of Rome. It was in Asia not in Europe. It was an Eastern, not a Western town, an oriental, not a Latin city.

2. It was a Greek, not a Roman city.

3. The pope of Rome did not attend this council at Laodicea, A.D. 364. Does Waggoner claim that he did? No, he does not dare to.

4. The pope did not attend, nor did he send a legate or a delegate or any one to represent him. In fact, neither the Roman Catholic church nor the pope had anything to do with the council in any way, shape or manner. It was held without even their knowledge or consent.

5. At this early date, A.D. 364, the popes, or rather bishops of Rome, had no authority over other bishops. It was 200 years later before they were invested with authority over Western churches.

Even their authority was stoutly resisted for centuries in the East where this council was held. See Bower's History of the Popes, or any church history. Speaking of Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 314 to 336, only 28 years before this council at Laodicea, Elder Waggoner says: "The bishop of Rome had not then yet attained to any authority whatever above the other bishops." Replies to Canright, page 143. This is true. Did they in the next twenty-eight years gain authority to change the keeping of the Sabbath from one day to another throughout the whole world? Preposterous!

6. Liberius was bishop of Rome at the time of this council of Laodicea. He was degraded from his office, banished, and treated with the utmost contempt. Bowers says that in order to end his exile, Liberius "wrote in a most submissive and cringing style to the eastern bishops." History of the Popes, Vol. I, page 64. And this was the pope who changed the Sabbath at a council of these same eastern bishops, 1,000 miles away, which he never attended!

7. The council of Laodicea was only a local council, a small, unimportant affair and not a general council at all. Elder Waggoner magnifies it into a great "Catholic [general] council," a claim which is utterly false. The general councils are: 1.) That at Nice, A.D. 325. 2.) That at Constantinople, A.D. 381. 3.) That at Ephesus, A.D. 431, etc. See the list in Johnson's Cyclopedia, or any history. Bower in his extensive work, the "History of the Popes," gives an account of all the general councils, the important local councils, and all with which Rome or the popes had to do, but does not even mention this one at Laodicea. He mentions many councils held about that time, but not this one. He says: "Several other councils were held from the year 363 to 368, of which we have no particular account." Vol. I, page 79. I have searched through a number of cyclopedias and church histories and can find no mention at all of the council at Laodicea, in most of them, and only a few lines in any. Rev. W. Armstrong, a scholar of Canton, Pa., says: "This council is not even mentioned by Mosheim, Milner, Ruter, Reeves, Socrates, Sozomen, nor by four other historians on my table." McClintock and Strong_s Cyclopedia says: "Thirty-two bishops were present from different provinces in Asia." All bishops of the Eastern church, not one from the Roman church! And yet this was the time and place when and where the Roman church and the pope changed the Sabbath!

8. Now think of it: this little local council of thirty-two bishops revolutionizes the whole world on the keeping of the Sabbath!

9. The fact is that this council simply regulated in this locality an already long established institution, the Lord's Day, just the same as council after council did afterwards. If this changed the Sabbath to Sunday, then it has been changed a hundred times since! Sabbatarians point to these different regulations as so many acts in changing the Sabbath, when they have not the remotest relation to such a thing any more than have the resolutions with regard to keeping Sunday which are passed year by year now in all religious assemblies. Elder Waggoner makes this truthful statement: "The decrees of councils have not as a general thing been arbitrary laws telling what MUST BE, so much so they have been the formulation of the opinions and practices largely prevalent at the time... Infallibility had been attributed to the pope hundreds of years before it became a dogma of the church." Fathers of the Catholic Church, page 333, Exactly, and just so the Lord's Day had been kept by the church hundreds of years before the council of Laodicea mentioned it.

10. The church of Laodicea where this council was held was raised up by Paul himself, Colossians 4:13; Colossians 4:16; 1 Timothy 6 : to close of the epistle. It was one of the seven churches to which John wrote. Revelation 3:14. Hence it is certain it was well instructed and grounded in the doctrines of the apostles. Between Paul and this council, that is A.D. 270, Anatolius was a bishop of Laodicea. He wrote: "Our regard for the Lord’s resurrection, which took place on the Lord’s Day, will lead us to celebrate it on the same principle." Canon 16. Here we have that church keeping Sunday one hundred years before this council.

11. Finally, if the council of Laodicea changed the Sabbath, as Adventists say, then it was changed by the Greek church instead of the Roman church; changed by the eastern churches over which Rome had no authority; changed before the papacy was established, before the pope had any authority over the east, by a small local council which neither the pope nor any of his servants attended. The absurdity of this claim is manifest without further argument. 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, but it then took me years to learn the real facts in the case and free myself from the superstition which bound me. 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. The assertion that the pope changed the Sabbath is a fair sample of the rest.

02.13. Chapter 13 - The Sabbath in the Old Testament

Chapter 13 - The Sabbath in the Old Testament

The Sabbath in Genesis The Sabbath is not mentioned by name in the book of Genesis, nor till the time of Moses. Genesis 2:1-3 states that God finished creation in six days and rested on the seventh day; and that he blessed and sanctified the seventh day "because that in it he had rested." On this we remark: 1.) The day was not holy in itself. 2.) God's rest upon that day did not make it holy. 3.) God sanctified or made holy the seventh day because that in it he HAD rested. His rest was over and passed before he blessed the day. 4.) As to just WHEN God blessed the day the record does not clearly state. Some contend that he sanctified the day then and there in Eden. Others argue that this was not done till the exodus. Plausible arguments are used on both sides; but the simple fact that the most godly and learned men have always disagreed about the institution of the Sabbath in Eden should teach us caution how we build a theory upon a disputed text so meager in statement and so far away in time. In all fairness it must be owned that the definite time when the Sabbath was sanctified can not certainly be determined from this text.

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible truthfully says: "It is in Exodus 16:23-29 that we find the first incontrovertible institution of the day." Art. Sabbath. Of the argument on Genesis 2:1-3 for the institution of the Sabbath in Eden it says: "The whole argument is very precarious." There is no command in Genesis 2 to keep the Sabbath. We must look elsewhere for that. The sanctification of the seventh day there mentioned is claimed by some to have been by anticipation. As Moses wrote his books after he came to Sinai, after the Sabbath had been given in the wilderness, he here mentions one reason why God thus gave them the seventh day, viz.: because God himself had set the example at creation; had worked six days and rested the seventh. Such use of language is common. We say Gen. Grant was born at such a time. We do not mean that he was a general then, but we mention it by anticipation, using a title which he afterwards bore. So in Genesis 3:20, "Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." Here is a future fact stated as though it had already occurred. So 1 Samuel 4:1, the Jews "pitched beside Eben-ezer." But the place was not named Eben-ezer till years after. 1 Samuel 7:12. "Judas Iscariot, which was also the traitor." Luke 6:16. Here a future fact with regard to Judas is mentioned when he is first spoken of, though the act of betrayal did not take place till years later. Just so when the seventh day is first mentioned its sanctification is referred to, though it did not occur till afterwards. We must admit that this may have been so.

Exodus 20:8 says: "Remember the Sabbath day," etc. Sabbatarians claim that this shows that the Sabbath existed from creation. It does not prove it, because the Sabbath had been given some weeks before the decalogue was given. So this may refer back only to Exodus 16, when the Sabbath is first named. Or, which is evidently the real truth about it, it may refer to keeping the Sabbath as it comes week by week. "Remember," don't forget, to keep the Sabbath day.

Then it is now generally held by able Christian scholars that the days of creation were indefinite periods of time. There is much to sustain this idea. Sabbatarians themselves admit this. Thus Rev.

A.H. Lewis, D.D., Seventh-day Baptist, editor and author of several critical works on the Sabbath, says: "We apprehend that the creation week was infinitely longer than our week of seven days of twenty-four hours." Sabbath and Sunday, page 8. But this fact is fatal to his definite seventh-day theory; for if God's days were not twenty- four hour days like ours, then we do not and can not rest on the same definite day He did. Hence, we can only use God's week as a model - six days work, the seventh rest.

Sabbatarians think that the fourth commandment designates the identical day on which God himself rested. But this is not as clear as they claim. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Exodus 20:10. That is, the rest day of the Lord; hence it must be the day on which he himself rested, they say. But this does not necessarily follow. The language simply claims that day as belonging to God. Take the day of the passover: "The fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord." Numbers 28:16. Did the Lord keep the passover that day? Hardly. Again: "These are the feasts of the Lord." Leviticus 23:4. Did the Lord feast on those days? Surely not. The language simply claims those days as sacred to God and that is all that Exodus 20:10 claims for the seventh day. The revised version gives the idea clearly: "The seventh day is a Sabbath UNTO THE LORD thy God."

Away back there in the dim past, where the events of an age are covered by one line in the Bible, it is impossible now to determine exactly how it all was. Those ages before Christ are compared to shadows, Colossians 2:17, and to the light of the moon, Revelation 12:1, while the gospel is compared to the sun. Revelation 12:1. Is it not the safest for us to walk in the light of the sun instead of groping our way in the moonlight and shadows of the past? But the main reliance of Sabbatarians is upon arguments drawn from those remote times of darkness, while in the New Testament they find little to support their theories, but much to explain away.

There is no statement that any of they patriarchs kept the Sabbath or knew anything about it. Sabbatarians say the record is so brief that it was omitted. Their proof then is WHAT WAS LEFT OUT!

Though the record from Adam to Moses covers a period of 2500 years; though we appear to have a full account of the religious customs and worship of the patriarchs, such as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, etc.; though we are told about circumcision, the altar, the sacrifices, the priests, the tithe, the oath, marriage, feast days, etc.; yet never a word is said about any one keeping the Sabbath. This does not prove positively that they did not keep it, but it does show a strong probability against it. This is the sum of what can be fairly said about the Sabbath in Genesis. When men go back in Genesis to find their principal argument for the Sabbath, is it not going a long ways and finding little upon which to establish a Christian duty? Would it not be wiser and safer to build our faith upon the plain requirements of the New Testament?

Testimony of Eminent Men

Justin Martyr, who wrote only 44 years after the death of St. John, and who was well acquainted with the doctrine of the apostles, denied that the Sabbath originated at creation. Thus after name Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot and Melchizedek, he says: "Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God." Dialogue with Trypho, chapter 19.

Irenaeus says: "Abraham believed God without circumcision and the Sabbath." Adv. Hoeres, lib 4, c. 30.

Tertullian, A.D. 200, said: "Let them show me that Adam Sabbatized, or that Abel in presenting his holy offering to God pleased him by Sabbath observance, or that Enoch who was translated was an observer of the Sabbath." Against the Jews, section 4.

Eusebius, A.D. 324, the father of church history, says: "They (the patriarchs) did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, nor do we." Eccl. Hist., book 1, chapter 4. From this it will be seen that the early church did not believe that the Sabbath originated at creation. The same doctrine has been maintained by such eminent men as Paley, Hessey, Bishop Bramhall, etc. Paley says: "Now, in my opinion, the transactions in the wilderness above recited were the first actual institution of the Sabbath." Quoted in Watson's Institutes, Vol. II, page 515. The great John Milton says: "Whether its institution was ever made known to Adam, or whether any commandment relative to its observance was given previous to the delivery of the law on Mt. Sinai, much less whether any such was given before the fall of man, can not be ascertained." A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, Vol. I, page 299.

John Bunyan says: "Now as to the imposing of the seventh day Sabbath upon men from Adam to Moses, of that we find nothing in holy writ, either from precept or example." Complete Works, page 892. So many of the best minds have not been able to find clear proof that the Sabbath was kept before Moses. Others, as Clarke, Barnes, Scott, Lange, etc., think it was. We best leave it as an unsettled question.

Granting that the Sabbath was given to Adam in Eden, it does not follow that all men now must keep it. Look at what Adam was to do: 1st. Adam was only allowed to eat the fruit of trees and plants. Genesis 1:29. The first permission to eat flesh was given to Noah. Genesis 9:3. 2nd. Adam was to tend garden. Gen. 2:15. 3rd. He was forbidden the tree of knowledge. Genesis 2:17. 4th. He was given access to the tree of life. Genesis 2:16. 5th. Adam was naked. Genesis 2:25. All this was in Eden before the fall. Must all men now eat and work and dress and do just as Adam did in Eden? No one believes that. Then it would not follow that we must keep the seventh day even if Adam did. This simple fact demolishes the most confident argument of Sabbatarians. The Sabbath at the Exodus The first mention of Sabbath observance is in Exodus 16. Many eminent scholars hold that God here changed the day of rest from the original seventh day to the sixth day of the creation week. Others hold that the Jews, during their long slavery in Egypt, had lost the Sabbath and that it was here renewed; while others hold that it was here given for the first time. Whichever position is correct, it is clear that the keeping of the Sabbath was a new thing to the Jews. A few facts are plain. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt marked a new era in the history of the church and of Israel. This is kept prominent all through the Bible. Here God gave them a new year and a new beginning of months. "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you." Exodus 12:2. Hence it is very probable that he might have given them a new Sabbath day or one for the first time. The account of their first keeping the Sabbath shows plainly that they were not accustomed to it before.

Dr. H.C. Benson, the eminent M.E. editor, scholar and author, says of Exodus 16 : "It is so explicit that we are not left in doubt as to the fact that the Sabbath, as observed in the wilderness of sin, had not been a day hallowed by the Lord previous to that time." Quoted and approved by Dr. Potts

and Bishop Harris in The Lord’s Day Our Sabbath, page 15.

John Milton over 200 years ago said: "That the Israelites had not so much as heard of the Sabbath before this time, seems to be confirmed by several passages of the prophets." Treatise on Christian Doctrine, Vol. I, book 2, chapter 7.

John Bunyan also said: "The seventh day Sabbath, therefore, was not from paradise, nor from nature, nor from the fathers, but from the wilderness and from Sinai." Complete Works, page 895.

It was new to them. Read it: Moses said on Friday, "Tomorrow is a solemn rest, a holy Sabbath unto the Lord." (R.V.) The last verse gives the conclusion of the whole matter. "So the people rested on the seventh day." That is, thus and for this reason the people here began resting on the seventh day. There is no sense in the language if this is not the meaning. Several scriptures harmonize well with this idea. Thus, Nehemiah 9:13-14. "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai... and MADEST KNOWN unto them the holy Sabbath." This implies that it was not known before. In harmony with this, Ezekiel 20:10-12 says: "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness." "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them." When did God give them the Sabbath? When he brought them out of Egypt. Where did he give it to them? In the wilderness. What for? For a sign between himself and them.

It does not say that God RESTORED the Sabbath, but that he gave them the Sabbath. "I gave them my Sabbaths" implies the act of committing it to them, showing that they did not have it before. Surely all these facts are plainly stated. They show that the keeping of this day was a new thing to them and only for them. Deuteronomy 5:15, states that the Sabbath is to be kept as a memorial of Egypt. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence; ...therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." This indicates that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution. One reason given why they should keep it was because they had been delivered out of Egypt. Of course they would not keep it till the reason existed for keeping it. The laws regulating how it should be kept show that it was a local institution adapted only to the Jewish worship and to that warm climate. 1.) No fires must be built on the Sabbath. Ex. 35:3. 2.) They must neither bake nor boil that day. Ex. 16:23. 3.) They must not go out of the house. Ex. 16:29. 4.) Their priests must offer two lambs that day. Num. 28:9. 5.) They must compel all among them, living in their land, to keep it. Ex. 20:10. 6.) They must stone all who break it. Ex. 31:14. 7.) It must be kept from sunset to sunset. Lev. 23:32. 8.) Their cattle must rest. Exodus 20:10. No meetings were appointed for that day. It was to be wholly a day of rest.

Seventh-day Adventists observe none of these things. Indeed, it would be impossible for them to do most of them. They would freeze without fires and suffer without warm food. They go many miles on the Sabbath and drive their teams; they offer no lambs; they can compel no one to keep it; nor do they stone those who break it. In the extreme north and in traveling around the earth they do not go by sunset time, for they cannot. Their Sabbathkeeping is no more like that of the Old Testament, such as the law required, than darkness is like light. It shows the folly of their effort to keep an obsolete Jewish day. Nowhere are Gentiles required to keep the Sabbath except such as dwell among the Jews. They were also required to keep the other feast days. Leviticus 16:29. All through the Old Testament the Gentiles are denounced over and over for all other sins, but not once for breaking the Sabbath, though none of them kept it. The reason for this must be that it was

not binding upon them. John Bunyan says: "We read not that God gave it to any but to the seed of Jacob." Complete Works, page 895.

"The Jewish Sabbath" - A Proper Term for the Seventh Day

Sabbatarians strongly object to our calling the seventh day the "Jewish Sabbath." They ask, "Where does the Bible call it the Jewish Sabbath? It is 'the sabbath of the Lord they God.'" This simple argument has great force with many. But I am satisfied it is perfectly proper to designate the seventh day as the Jewish Sabbath. Seventh-day brethren are constantly talking and writing about "the ceremonial law" and the "moral law," nor could they properly express their ideas of the "two laws" without using these terms. But neither of them is once used in all the Bible. How is this? Will they admit that their idea is unscriptural because these exact words are not used in the Bible? No. They freely use the terms "Jewish festivals," "Jewish sabbaths," "annual sabbaths," "sabbaths of the Hebrews," etc. See "History of the Sabbath," pages 82, 83, 84, etc. Yet not one of these terms is found in the Bible, though they cannot get along without them. It would be amusing to confine a Sabbatarian strictly to the Bible language and then hear him attempt to preach on the two laws and the different sabbaths. "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

1. "Sabbath" is purely a Hebrew word never found till the time of Moses. Ex. 16:23 2. The Word Sabbath is never used in the Bible except in connection with some Jewish holy time. 3. There is no record that the Sabbath was ever kept till the Jews kept it. Exodus 16:4. The Sabbath was given to the Jews. "I gave them my Sabbaths." Ezekiel 20:12 If God gave it to the Jews, was it not their Sabbath; was it not the Jewish Sabbath? I give Fred a knife. Is it not Fred's knife? 5. Notice how plain the record is that God gave the Sabbath to the Jews, but to no others. "The Lord hath given YOU the Sabbath." Exodus 16:29. "Speak unto the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, saying Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep." Exodus 31:13. Who was told to keep the Sabbath? The children of Israel, the Jews. "It is a sign between me and the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL," the Jews. Verse 17. 6. God himself calls the Sabbath "her Sabbaths." Hosea 2:11. "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Isn't it the Jewish Sabbath, then? 7. The Sabbath was never given to any other nation. 8. "The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath throughout their generation." Exodus 31:16. To whom was it confined? To the generation of the Jews. 9. "It is a sign between me and the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL." Exodus 31:17. It was theirs exclusively, Jewish. 10. The Sabbath is classed right in with the other Jewish holy days and sacrifices. See Leviticus 23:1-44; Numbers 28:2; Numbers 28:16; 1 Chronicles 23:29-31; 2 Chronicles 2:4; 2 Chronicles 8:13, etc. 11. It was abolished with them. Colossians 2:14-23. The Jews comprise nearly all those who keep the seventh day; hence "Jewish Sabbath" is a natural and intelligent designation for that day. 13. Christians almost unanimously keep the first day in distinction from the Jews who comprise nearly all those who keep the seventh day. Hence the Jewish Sabbath is intelligent and proper again. 14. The few Christians who keep a different day from the great body of the church keep the Sabbath which the Jews keep. Hence, again, it is significant and proper to designate them as those who keep the Jewish Sabbath. 15. But Sabbatarians say that the seventh day is called "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Exodus 20:10, and "my holy day," Isaiah 58:10, therefore it is not proper to call it "the Jewish Sabbath." Answer: Every holy season, place, person, or article was called the Lord's as "the Lord's passover." Exodus 12:11. Yet we read, "The passover, a feast of the Jews." John 6:4. So it is "the Sabbath of the Lord" in one place and "her Sabbaths" in another. Hosea 2:11. Hence it is correct

and scriptural to call the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath."

Exodus 31:16-17, The Sabbath Perpetual

Here Sabbatarians find three expressions from which they argue that the Sabbath can never end. 1.) "Throughout their generations." 2.) "Perpetual." 3.) "Forever." Thus: "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, FOR a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." They ask, when will PERPETUAL and FOREVER end? They show that the generation of the Jews still continues; hence the Sabbath is still to be kept. But this argument would also perpetuate all the Levitical law, circumcision, incense, passover, priesthood, etc. Thus the passover: "ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." Exodus 12:14. It must be kept "THROUGHOUT THEIR GENERATIONS" and "FOREVER" just like the Sabbath. So of the offering of incense. "A PERPETUAL incense before the Lord THROUGHOUT YOUR GENERATIONS." Exodus 30:8. Now if the Adventist argument for the Sabbath based on the terms "perpetual," "forever," and "throughout your generations," is good, then they ought to keep the passover and offer incense! This is a fair sample of the weakness of Sabbatarian arguments. The same argument will prove the perpetuity of burnt offerings, Exodus 29:42; atonement, Exodus 30:10; washing of hands and feet, Exodus 30:21; first fruits, Leviticus 23:13; meat offering, Leviticus 6:18; oil for lamps, Leviticus 24:3; fringes, Numbers 15:38; pentecost, Leviticus 23:21; feast of tabernacles, Leviticus 23:41. See also Exodus 40:15; Leviticus 3:17; Leviticus 7:36; Numbers 10:8. The application of these terms to the keeping of the Sabbath is proof that it was to cease. Why? Because in every case where these terms are applied to the observance of any ordinance that ordinance has ceased. Adventists themselves will agree to this in everything except the Sabbath. None of these terms are ever applied to moral laws or duties. Where do you read, "you shall not kill throughout your generations?" "It shall be a perpetual statute that you shall not steal?" "It shall be a statute forever that you shall have no other gods?" This text, then, proves that the Sabbath was to cease with the other Jewish ceremonies.

"Gentile Christians must become Jews, Israelites, and so come under obligation to keep the Sabbath, for the Sabbath was given to Israel forever throughout their generations." This is a favorite Adventists argument for the law and Sabbath. But see its utter fallacy: Burnt offerings, incense, washing of hands and feet, fringes, priesthood, circumcision, passover, and all the Jewish law were also given to ISRAEL to keep forever throughout their generations. See above. Hence the argument proves that we must keep all these as well as the Sabbath! Do Adventists keep any of these? No.

It is argued that the Sabbath must be of perpetual obligation because it is associated in the decalogue with commandments of that nature. But it is also associated time and again with the ceremonial rites, types and shadows which were peculiarly Jewish. Thus: "Keep my Sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary." Leviticus 19:30. "The Seventh day is the Sabbath." Leviticus 23:3. "At even is the Lord’s passover." Verse 5. "The feast of unleavened bread." Verse 6. In verse 38 the Sabbath is named with "gifts," "vows" and "offerings." In Leviticus 24:1-8 the Sabbath is named with the offerings of oil, bread, frankincense. In Numbers 28:9-10 it is classed with the offerings of lambs, meat and drink offerings, burnt offerings, etc. In 1 Chronicles 23:29-31, the Sabbath is classed with meat offering, sacrifices, new moons, feasts, etc. This fact offsets all the argument

drawn from its place in the decalogue. The Sabbath in the Historical Books From Joshua to Job not a word is said indicating that the Sabbath was for any one but Jews; hence no argument can be drawn from this source to bind it upon Gentile Christians. The Sabbath in the Prophets The Sabbath is not mentioned in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, and most of the minor prophets. Nothing is said about it by any of the prophets which can fairly be made to apply to Christians. Several texts are applied by Adventists to our times, but it is all assumption without proof. For instance, Isaiah 56 is used to prove that the Gentile Christians should keep the Sabbath. It says: The stranger, Gentile, "that keepth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar." Verses 6, 7. If this proves that Gentiles must keep the Sabbath, it also proves that they must offer burnt offerings and sacrifices upon God’s altar in the temple on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, for all those are mentioned as plainly as the Sabbath. Either, then, this applies to the Jewish age and to those Gentile proselytes who embraced Judaism and were circumcised, Exodus 12:48, and observed all Jewish rites; or if it applies to the Christian age, then these terms "Sabbath," "altar," "sacrifice," "my house," "my holy mountain," must be taken figuratively, for Christians do not offer sacrifices, nor have a literal altar, nor go to Jerusalem to worship in that house nor on that mountain. So Isaiah 58:12-13 is boldly applied to our days and to the work of the Adventists in urging all to keep the Jewish Sabbath. But there is not a word in all the chapter even hinting such a thing. All this they assume without any proof and then apply the words to suit their purpose. I did that a hundred times while with them, just as the rest did. I know just how they do it. As last I lost all confidence in such a reckless way of handling the word of God. Then I had to quit using the most of their proof texts on the Sabbath, this with others. Look at it. The whole chapter is addressed to the Jews, "the house of Jacob," verse 1, the "nation," verse 2, and so on. Often in the Jewish age God called them to reform their lax ways in keeping the Sabbath as well as in other things. This is one of those cases. Isaiah 66:22-23. In the new earth "it shall come to pass THAT from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." This shows that the Sabbath will be kept in the next world, hence it is perpetual and so should be kept now. But it says just the same of the new moons and places them first before the Sabbath. So if this text proves that we should keep the Sabbath it proves we should keep the new moons also. Do Adventists keep the new moons?

Ezekiel 22:26. "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." This text they also apply to their work now and to the ministers who oppose the Jewish Sabbath. But there is not a word in the whole chapter that even intimates that this applies away down here in the gospel and to Gentiles. But God himself applies it to the Jewish nation when they were overthrown by Babylon several hundred years before Christ. Read the whole chapter and compare it with Nehemiah 13:17-18. See verses 2, 6, 18, 19, etc. "Wilt thou judge the bloody city," etc. "Behold, the princes of Israel." "The house of Israel is to me become dross." "Therefore will I gather you into the midst of Jerusalem." The evidence is clear that it applies there, while no proof whatever can be given to show that it belongs away down here where Adventists apply it. I became fully convinced that it was by such groundless assumptions as these, by roundabout and far- fetched arguments, that the seventh-day theory is sustained. When you look for one plain,

direct statement in all the Bible requiring Gentile Christians to keep the Sabbath, it cannot be found. It has to be INFERRED from this; QUESSED from that, and CONCLUDED from the other; all inference, nothing direct. So the Old Testament furnishes no evidence that Christians are to keep the Jewish Sabbath. If such proof is to be found, it must be in the New Testament itself.

02.14. Chapter 14 - The Sabbath in the New Testament

Chapter 14 - The Sabbath in the New Testament

The Sabbath in the Gospels With the opening of the gospel comes the most glorious period of the church's history. The Son of God himself stands before us clothed with all the authority of heaven. Matthew 28:8. God says, "Hear ye him." Matthew 17:5. He came to introduce the gospel, "a new and living way," Hebrews 10:20, "the new covenant," "a better covenant," Hebrews 8:6; Hebrews 8:8, which sets aside and supersedes the old, verse 13. Compared to the Jewish age it is a "great light," Matthew 4:16, and the gospel church is represented as "a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." Revelation 12:1. Much which was before was dark, shadowy and mysterious, is now light and plain. Romans 16:25-26. A great and radical change in the mode of worshipping God is now introduced. Many institutions of the Old Testament, which were once given in the most solemn manner, and by the authority of God himself, are no longer binding.

Now, where shall we look to find the clearest light upon these old institutions? Where shall we go to learn the real design of them all? Where shall we turn to obtain the necessary rules for a Christian to live by? Shall we go back to the moonlight of the Jewish law? To the starlight of the patriarchal age? Or shall we come to the full sunlight of the gospel? Evidently the New Testament furnishes the clearest, and only authoritative guide for the Christian. The Old Testament can be read and rightly understood only in the light of the New. But it is a fact that Sabbatarians have to go back to the Old Testament, even clear back to the uncertain institutions of the patriarchal age, as their clearest and most certain authority for the seventh day. The evidence from the New Testament only comes in as secondary and collateral. All their strongest arguments for the Sabbath are away back among the shadows of the Old Testament. Take these from them, and the very foundation has fallen out from their theory. I know that this is so, for I have gone over the ground a thousand times. I know just how a seventh-day man feels, and where he rests his confidence. Of the New Testament he is a little shy. But is there any other Christian duty which is plainly laid down only in the Old Testament? I do not think of a single one, though in the past I tried hard and long to find it. On al other points the New Testament is clear and full. In it we have chapter after chapter, epistle after epistle, and book after book packed full of instruction on every Christian duty in every possible phase of it. The duty or sin covered by each of the other nine commandments is directly named many times over in the New Testament. But the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned. We arrange side by side: The Ten Commandments of the Old Testament in the New Testament

1. Thou shalt have no other gods 1. We preach unto you that ye should before me. Exodus 20:3 turn from these vanities unto the 2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any living God, which made heaven and graven image; Thou shalt not bow earth and the seas. Acts 14:15 down thyself to them, nor serve them. 2. Little children keep yourself Exodus 20:4-5 from idols. John 5:21. 3. Thou shalt not take the name of the 3. But above all things, my brethren, LORD thy God in vain. Exodus 20:7 swear not, neither by heaven, neither by earth, neither by any other oath. James 5:12. 4.

Remember the sabbath day, to keep it 4. There is no command in all the New holy. Exodus 20:8 Testament to keep the seventh day. 5. Honour thy father and thy mother. 5. Children, obey your parents in the Exodus 20:12 Lord, for this is right. Ephesians 6:16. Thou shalt not kill. Exodus 20:13. 6. Thou shalt not kill. Romans 13:9. 7. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Neither fornicators nor idolators Exodus 20:14 nor adulterers...shall inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Corinthians 6:9-20. Thou shalt not steal. Exodus 20:15. 8. Steal no more. Ephesians 4:28. ^9. Thou shalt not bear false witness. 9. Lie not. Colossians 3:9 Exodus 20:16. 10.Covetousness, let it not be named 10. Thou shalt not covet. Exodus 20:17 among you. Ephesians 5:3

"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 New Testament. Idolatry, which is the second commandment, is condemned twelve times. Profanity, the third commandment, is plainly condemned four times. Honor thy father and mother, which is the fifth commandment, is taught six times at least. Murder, which is the sixth prohibition, is found condemned twelve times. Theft, the eight, six times. False witness, the ninth, four times. Covetousness, the tenth, nine times. Now, with these facts before us, how can there be any danger that the law of God will be made void? Another remarkable fact is that the fourth commandment is not repeated in the New Testament, that no Christian was ever commanded to observe it, that no Christian was ever condemned for Sabbath breaking." Time and again, all through the New Testament long lists of sins embracing every possible shade of wickedness are given, but a disregard of the seventh day is never once included. Thus: Mark 7:21-22, thirteen sins; Romans 1:29-31, nineteen sins; Galatians 5:19-21, seventeen sins; 2 Timothy 3:1-4, eighteen sins, etc. How is this? Would the Sabbatarians have left it so?

Strange to say, the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned in the whole New Testament. There is not one single command from either Christ or any of the apostles to keep that day. It is not once said that it is wrong to work on the seventh day, or that God will bless any one for observing it. There is no promise for keeping it, no threatening for not keeping it. No one is ever reproved for working on the seventh day, nor approved for observing it. If disregarding the seventh day is so great a crime as its advocates now claim, it is unaccountable that no warning against it should be given in all the New Testament, not even once. Is all this silence merely accidental? So Sabbatarians have to believe; but the supposition is absurd. Evidently it was left out on purpose, the same as the pentecost, passover, new moons, sacrifices and the like.

Paul, in all his fourteen epistles never even names the Sabbath but once, and that only to show its abolition. Colossians 2:6. Contrast this with Adventists' literature! The usual answer is that the Jews were already keeping the Sabbath, even too strictly, and therefore the Jewish Christians needed no instruction on this point. But this answer is not satisfactory. The Jews were just as strictly opposed to false gods and images, and yet over and over Christians are warned against these things. Thus Paul says: "Neither be ye idolaters," and "Flee from idolatry." 1 Corinthians 10:7; 1 Corinthians 10:14. But where does it say, "Keep the seventh day?" or "Flee from Sabbath breaking?" Besides, the great body of the Christian converts in the latter years of the gospel, were Gentiles, who had never kept the seventh day at all. Why should they not be instructed how to keep it? Why should they be repeatedly warned against all other evil practices of their former lives, but never warned against breaking the Sabbath as they certainly had done before? This was a point which I was never able to answer satisfactorily to myself while I kept the seventh day. The simple and manifest fact is, that it was not intended to bind the Jewish Sabbath upon the Christian

church. Hence it was quietly allowed to drop out with the other old covenant holy days and institutions. The arguments offered out of the New Testament for the observance of the seventh day are few and not hard to answer. Let us examine the main ones.

Jesus Kept the Seventh Day, Therefore We Must With Sabbatarians this argument has more weight than all others from the New Testament. It always did with me. But now I am not satisfied that, when fairly considered, there is nothing in it. Jesus was born and lived all his life under the law. Galatians 4:4. That law was binding till his death. Colossians 2:14. Of course he ought to have kept every item of that law till the cross, just as he evidently did do. On this point Elder George I. Butler, Seventh-day Adventist, says: "He lived under all the ceremonies and observances of the law of Moses, the same as did the other Jews. Thus he was 'born under the law' and subject to it. All his life he was careful not to break any of its provisions, and he never permitted his disciples to do it to the day of his death." The Law in Galatians, page 59. This is the plain truth in the case. But it shows the utter fallacy of arguing that we must keep the seventh day just because Jesus did. If we observe one institution of the Old law just because Jesus did, then we should also keep all that he did; that is, live just as the Jews did under the law of Moses! For that is just what Jesus did. He instructed his disciples to offer gifts upon the altar, Matthew 5:23-24, sent a man to offer a gift, Matthew 8:4, commanded his disciples to observe all that the scribes taught, Matthew 23:2-3, and was very particular to keep the passover just according to law only the day before his death. Luke 22:7-15. But who thinks now of doing all these things because Jesus did? No one. Jesus was circumcised. Do Sabbatarians circumcise? No. Then why pick out the seventh day from all other holy days and rites and hold on to that while rejecting all the rest which he also observed? It seems as though a candid man must admit that this argument for the Jewish Sabbath is not a success. If that day is binding upon Christians it must be upon some other ground than because Jesus kept it while living as a Jew under the Jewish law.

Mark 2:27-28. The Sabbath Made for Man The Sabbatarian use of this text is directly contrary to its plainest meaning. Jesus was not giving a history of the origin of the Sabbath, nor defending its sacredness against desecration, now showing that it was made for all the race. No such thought is the subject of his remarks. He is not claiming the Jewish Sabbath as his day, as the day consecrated to himself. It was not as God, the Creator, that he claimed to be its Lord; but it was as the SON OF MAN, the representative of man, that he claimed to be lord over the Sabbath.

Notice his premises and his conclusions: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath: THEREFORE the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." He says that as the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, THEREFORE he, a son of man, was Lord of it. Why was Jesus Lord of the Sabbath? Because he was the Son of God and had made it? Not at all; but because he was the Son of man, man for whom the Sabbath was made. It is as a MAN that he claims to be its Lord. And this he said to defend his disciples against the charge of breaking the Sabbath. How did it apply? Why, the Sabbath was made for them and hence it was only their servant. They were superior to the Sabbath. Notice the cases he used to illustrate his statement. Matthew 12:3-12.

1) David went to the priest and ate holy bread which the law forbade to any but priests. His needs were superior to that ceremonial precept.

2) "The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless." Verse 5. They would slay cattle all the Sabbath day. Their service was superior to the Sabbath.

3) If a sheep fall into a pit on the Sabbath they would work hard to get him out. The preservation of animal life was superior to the Sabbath. I have seen Adventists work hard on the Sabbath in case of a fire to save even the goods, though the law says, "In it thou shalt not do any work." Would they dare violate the letter of any other commandment that way? No. Then, surely, Jesus himself being judge, the observance of the strict letter of the Sabbath law is not a matter of the highest importance. This is the lesson plainly taught here by Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath. It squarely condemns the rigid interpretation of the Sabbatarians who make the Sabbath more important than man himself for whom it was made.

4) The Sabbath was made for MAN, hence the necessities of men are above the Sabbath law. So, then, this text, when fairly read, gives no support to the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath under the gospel.

Matthew 24:20 As this is one of their favorite texts we will examine it. Foretelling the fall of Jerusalem which occurred forty years after his death, Jesus said that when they saw the armies come around the city, they must flee immediately or be caught in the city, and perish with the others. Hence he said, "Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house. Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day. For then shall be great tribulation." Matthew 24:17-21. From this it is argued that the Sabbath would continue to be a sacred day after the resurrection. Adventists admit that it would not be a violation of the Sabbath to flee on that day in case of necessity. Then where is there any argument in the text? If their flight had occurred on the Sabbath to save their lives, would that have desecrated the day? They own that it would not. Then the sacredness of the day was not what Jesus had in view. The context plainly shows that it was for their SAFETY that he was providing, not for the keeping of the say. The proper observance of the Sabbath is not the subject at all. The dangers and tribulations of that time was the subject. Notice four points: 1) Those with child. 2) Those with nursing babes. 3) Fleeing in the winter. 4) Fleeing on the Sabbath. If they had to flee suddenly, in haste, and without preparation, even without their ordinary clothes, women with child or with little babes, or persons in the cold of winter would be liable to suffer or die. So in all these three cases Jesus refers to the inconvenience and danger of their flight; and this is exactly why he mentions the Sabbath. On that day the gates of the city would be shut and so hinder them greatly if not detain them entirely. The gates of all the villages through which they must pass would be closed. The Jews would suspect them and arrest them as traitors. Hence it would be dangerous, almost impossible, to flee on that day. A candid person can see that this is all there is to that text. Of this I became convinced sometime before I gave up the Sabbath, and so I stopped using it.

Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:1-2. "The Sabbath" is the Day Before "The First Day of the Week

"In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week." "When the Sabbath was past, ***the first day of the week." According to this the Sabbath, after the death of Christ, is still the day before the first day of the week. Hence the first day of the week on which Christ rose was not the Sabbath yet. Answer: All the days in the week, in the month, and in the

year, still continued to be called by their old Jewish names for many years after Christ; but it does not follow that they continued to be sacred days, for Paul expressly states that all those feast days, new moons, and Sabbath days were nailed to the cross. Colossians 2:14; Colossians 2:16; Galatians 4:10-11; Romans 14:5-6. Take three examples: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," Acts 2:1. "Then were the days of unleavened bread." Acts 12:3. "Went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day/" Acts 13:14. Here, long after the cross, we have the same old names for three of the Jewish holy days, viz: Pentecost. Days of unleavened bread, and Sabbath day. Are all these days still holy days because they are still called by their former names? If so, then we ought to observe Pentecost and the days of unleavened bread as well as keep the Sabbath. So there is no force in the argument from the use of the Word Sabbath after the cross. The resurrection day was not called the Sabbath in the New Testament nor by Christians for several hundred years after Christ. It was called "Lord's Day." Revelation 1:10.

"THE SABBATH" was the name of the Jewish rest day, "which was a shadow of things to come." Colossians 2:16-17, but the resurrection day is another day entirely. It is called "the first day of the week," "the eighth day," or the "Lord's Day." It is only in an accommodated sense that it is called the Sabbath now as we use the words "altar," "sanctuary," "temple," "sacrifice," "Israel," etc.

Luke 23:56. The Woman "Rested the Sabbath Day According to the Commandment" This was after Christ died; hence it shows that they thought that the Sabbath was still to be kept. They were the followers of Jesus and knew what he taught. Answer: But this was before Jesus rose from the dead, before they knew anything about his resurrection, and before they had any idea of the great change which the gospel was to make in the service of God. Their old Jewish idea still blinded their minds so that they could not at once take in the nature of what Jesus had really come to do. Just before this Jesus said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." John 16:12. So he had not tried to explain all these less important matters to them; but he said that he would, after the resurrection, send them the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth. John 16:13. It was not till after the Holy Ghost came upon them at Pentecost that they began to comprehend the true nature of the gospel. So it is no proof that the Jewish Sabbath is binding on Gentiles because the Jewish women kept it while Jesus was dead and in his grave. Turn to Acts 1:14; Acts 2:1, and we find all these same women fifty days after the resurrection still carefully keeping "the day of Pentecost," another Jewish holy day. But do our Sabbatarians keep Pentecost because these women kept it? No, but they should if they keep the Sabbath because those women kept it. This shows how groundless that argument is. The Sabbath 59 Times in the New Testament

They say, the fact that the Sabbath is named 59 times in the New Testament is proof that it was still of great importance and should be kept. Well, the temple is mentioned in the New Testament 115 times; circumcision, 55 times; sacrifices, 38 times; the passover, 28 times, etc. Then I suppose we ought also to have all these over in the gospel!

Sabbatarians think they have a fair argument in the Acts. Here the seventh day is always called "the Sabbath," and it may be that the Jewish Christians still observed it, and met with the Jews in worship on that day. From this it is concluded that all Christians should keep that day, too. This is based upon the false assumption that whatever customs and laws of the old covenant were still observed for a few years by the Jewish Christians after the resurrection, must be binding upon the

Gentile church now. A careful examination of what the disciples did really do for many years after the resurrection will show that they kept all the Mosaic law, including feast days, the Sabbath day, sacrifices, circumcision, vows, and the whole Jewish ritual. But they did this as Jews, according to their national law and long established custom. That they did not do so as a Christian duty is manifest from the fact that Gentile Christians were not required to observe these things. Acts 15:19-28; Acts 21:25. "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observed no such things." Every mention of the Sabbath in Acts, without a single exception, is in connection with the Jewish worship on that day. Acts 13:14-15; Acts 13:42-45; Acts 15:21; Acts 16:13; Acts 17:1-2; Acts 18:4. The law and the prophets were read, and Jewish worship conducted as usual. Certainly the disciples could not hold distinctively Christian meeting here under these circumstances. They must assemble by themselves to worship Jesus and have the Lord’s supper, and that is just what we find them doing on the first day of the week. Acts 20:7. There is no record of a single meeting of Gentile Christians upon the seventh day, nor of Jewish Christians, except in the Jewish worship.

Consider a few facts as to why the Jewish Christians did not immediately give up the observance of the Mosaic law. How carefully and gradually Jesus unfolded his new doctrines, even to the chosen apostles. To the multitude he spoke only in parables "as they were able to hear it." Mark 4:33. Had Jesus at once and plainly told the people the radical change which he had come to make in the Jewish system of worship, they would have killed him immediately. Even the apostles would doubtless have left him. During all the ministry of our Lord, nothing stands out more prominently than the fact that he was gradually, but cautiously, preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God. The great obstacles he had to contend with were their narrow views, their tenacity for the forms and ceremonies and letter of the law, and Jewish ideas of God’s kingdom. That he was to take the throne of David, subjugate the world to Israel, and carry on the Jewish mode of worship with the temple service - this idea was so firmly rooted in the minds of even the apostles, that they could not understand Jesus even when he plainly told them to the contrary. Hence the Saviour simply left them to outgrow these ideas as the nature of his gospel more fully dawned upon them, after his resurrection and ascension and the descent of the Holy Spirit. Just before Jesus died, he said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." John 16:12-13. How often he had to say to them, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe." Luke 24:25. "Are ye also yet without understanding?" Matthew 15:16.

During all the ministry of Christ he never once stated directly that any of the Jewish rites would be abolished, not even sacrifices, the temple service, circumcision, the feast days, or anything. Yet he well knew that all these were soon to end, and designed that they should. Neither the people nor the disciples were then prepared for such an announcement. Hence he left these things for them to learn later. It is in the epistles of Paul that these changes are distinctly stated, just where we find the Jewish Sabbath abrogated.

Forty days after the resurrection still found them clinging to their old Jewish idea of the temporal reign of Jesus at Jerusalem. "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Knowing that it was impossible to correct their wrong notions by a mere statement, Jesus left them to outgrow these errors as they learned more of the gospel. Now follow them through the book of

Acts, and observe how long and tenaciously they held on to all the observances of the old Jewish law, not only the Sabbath, but all the temple service and ceremonies of the Mosaic law. On Pentecost we find them keeping the sacred day with the other Jews. Acts 2. As late as ten years after the resurrection they were "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only." Acts 11:19. Not a sermon had they thought of preaching to a Gentile till God, by a special miracle, sent Peter to Cornelius. Acts 10. As late as this Peter was scrupulously regarding the Mosaic law of meats. He said, "I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." Verse 14. And he designed to keep right on observing it. And when the Holy Spirit came upon the Gentiles, the disciples were astonished "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Verse 45. When he returned to Jerusalem, the whole church was in an uproar over it. "And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Acts 11:2-3.

Up to this time, then, we find the church at Jerusalem, with Peter at its head, still keeping the Jewish law concerning food, and refusing to eat with Gentiles. Now study the great council at Jerusalem, held over twenty years after the resurrection. Acts 15. Not only did the whole church in Judea keep the entire Mosaic law in all its rites, including circumcision, but some of them endeavored also to force it upon the Gentile converts. Verses 1-19. But through the influence of Paul, this move was defeated. If it had not been that, in the providence of God, Paul was raised up to oppose it, the whole Christian church would have been placed under the bondage of the Mosaic Law. As it was, that council freed only the Gentile converts from obedience to Moses' law. Acts 15:19; Acts 15:23; Acts 21:25. All the Jewish Christians still kept it.

Even as late as A.D. 60, or nearly thirty years after the cross, we still find the whole Jewish church in Judea strictly keeping the law of Moses as to circumcision, offerings, vows, shaving the head, etc. Not only did they themselves observe all these rites of the old law, but they required all Jewish Christians throughout the world to do the same. When Paul went up to Jerusalem only a few years before his death, they demanded of him a pledge that he himself also kept these rites. Read carefully Acts 21:20-26.

These words show conclusively that the Jewish Christians observed all the rites of the laws of Moses as late as that, which was but a few years before the fall of Jerusalem. All church historians agree that the Jewish Christians continued to observe the seventh day, even for some time after the fall of Jerusalem, as we have seen.

Philip Schaff, the greatest of living authors, in his History of the Apostolical Church, page 118, says: "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." Elder Waggoner, Adventist, says: "Dr. Schaff is justly esteemed as a man of extensive learning, and whose testimony regarding facts no one would call in question," Replies to Canright, page 132. Good. Now let them accept Dr. Schaff's statement and cease their denials.

Elder Butler, Adventist, truly says: "Indeed, it may well be doubted whether a large portion of the early church who were Jews before conversion ever fully realized the scope and extent of the

gospel in setting aside those laws peculiarly Jewish. They clung to them, and were zealous for them long after they were abolished at the cross. To Paul we are indebted, through the blessing of God, for the only full explanation of the proper relation of these laws to the plan of salvation." Law in Galatians, page 8.

How much, then, does it prove in favor of the Jewish Sabbath to find that it was still called "the Sabbath," or that it was kept by the Jewish Christians, or even by Paul himself? Just nothing at all; for by the same argument, as we have seen, we must observe the passover, pentecost, offer offerings, make vows, shave your heads, be circumcised, and keep all the rites of the Mosaic law the same as those disciples did for years. The Apostle Paul and the Keeping of the Sabbath Day

Seventh-day Adventists try to make an argument for the Jewish Sabbath from Paul's example. They count up some 84 Sabbaths which they claim he kept, and they say that if he kept it we ought also. I used to think there was great force in this argument and have used it scores of times to convince others. But I became satisfied finally that the whole argument was a fallacy. Let us examine it.

1. Paul was a Jew, but we are Gentiles.

2. Paul was brought up in all the observances of the Jewish law. Acts 22:3. We were not.

3. The great desire of Paul's heart was to win his Jewish brethren to Christ. To do this he was willing to die, yea even to be accursed himself. Romans 9:3-4.

4. To win these Jewish brethren he was very cautious not to do anything, as far as he could possibly avoid it, which would prejudice them against him and so cut off his access to them.

5. As these Jews were very zealous in the observance of all Jewish law, Paul knew that he must himself also keep this law if he were to obtain any access to them. Hence he says: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law [the Jews], as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law." "And this I do for the gospel's sake." 1 Corinthians 9:20; 1 Corinthians 9:23. See what he did in the case of Timothy. "Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those quarters; for they knew all that his father was a Greek." Acts 16:3. Paul wanted Timothy to help him among the Jews, but he knew that the Jews would not listen to him if he were not circumcised. So he circumcised Timothy to gain the Jews, though he said, "Circumcision is nothing." 1 Corinthians 7:19. For just the same reason he kept the Pentecost, Acts 18:21; Acts 20:16; shaved his head, Acts 18:8; made offerings, Acts 21:20-26; and lived the same as the Jews did, though he knew and taught that all these things were done away.

Now suppose it could be shown that Paul always kept the Sabbath, would that prove that he regarded it as obligatory upon all Christians, specially the Gentile Christians? Surely not. To them he wrote very plainly that they were not to keep the law concerning meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and Sabbath days. See Colossians 2:14-17; Romans 14:1-5; Galatians 4:10. He taught with regard to all these just as he did about circumcision, Galatians 5:2, that none of these were necessary, yet he himself circumcised Timothy.

We will now examine every text where Paul is said to have kept the Sabbath. Acts 13:14-15. "He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and sat down. After the reading of the law and the

prophets" he was invited to preach to them, which he did. This was with the Jews in Jewish worship, in the Jewish synagogue, on the Jewish Sabbath. Paul as a Jew joined them in this, in order to preach the gospel to them. So, verses 42-46, on the next Sabbath he met with them again in the same place for the same purpose. This was two Sabbaths Paul kept. Acts 16:13, "on the Sabbath he went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made," or rather where there was a PROSEUCHE, a Jewish house of prayer. So the Syriac and Greek. Here he found Jewish women at worship, and preached Jesus to them. This was the third Sabbath he kept. Acts 17:1-2. Paul "came to Thessalonica where was a synagogue of the Jews, ***and three Sabbath days reasoned with them." Here again it was in the Jewish worship among the Jews in their synagogue on their Sabbath. Three more Sabbath here, six so far. Acts 18:1-4. Paul is again among the Jews "and he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Same as before, his Sabbath keeping is every time while he is among the Jews in their Sabbath worship. But how many Sabbaths did he meet with them here? Verse 11 says: Paul remained there in Corinth one "year and six months," which would be 78 weeks. Hence Adventists say he kept 78 Sabbaths here. These added to the six before make 84. But verses 6 and 7 put a different face on the matter. Instead of reasoning in the synagogue every Sabbath all this time, he withdrew from the Jews and said, "Henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." Then he went into the house of Justus near the synagogue. So there is no evidence that he preached in the synagogue more than a few Sabbaths. So their 84 Sabbaths that Paul kept dwindled down to ten or a dozen and all these were with the Jews in Jewish worship. And this he himself explains by saying, "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews." 1 Corinthians 9:20. Not one single case can be found where Paul kept the Sabbath in a Christian assembly, nor is it ever mentioned in any way in connection with Christian meetings, while it is said that the disciples met on the first day of the week. Mark this: "Wherever the apostles entered the Jewish synagogues on the Sabbath to preach, it was before the Christian church was planted in such places."

Paul Did Nothing Against the Custom of the Jews, Hence Kept the Sabbath In Acts 25:8, Paul says he had done nothing "against the law of the Jews," and in Acts 28:17 says, he had "committed nothing against the people or customs of our fathers." From this it is claimed that he must have kept the Sabbath, for that was the law and custom of the fathers. True, but so it was their custom to circumcise, to offer sacrifices, to keep the new moons, yearly feasts, etc. Hence Paul must have done all these. Shall we then do all these because Paul as a Jew did? Hardly. Notice that nearly every argument applies equally as well to all the Jewish law and would bind that whole system on Christians!

02.15. Chapter 15 - The Jewish Sabbath Abolished. Colossians 2.

Chapter 15 - The Jewish Sabbath Abolished. Colossians 2.

1. We now come to the direct statement of Paul that the Sabbath was abolished: Colossians 2:14; Colossians 2:16-17. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. * * * Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." With other Jewish ordinances, the Sabbath was blotted out and nailed to the cross; therefore no man is to judge us about keeping "the Sabbath days." The statement is positive and plain. When I kept the seventh day this text always perplexed me as it does my Advent brethren now, say what they will. Paul directly names "the Sabbath" or "the Sabbath days," for there is no difference, as among the shadows which have passed away.

2. It is said by some that "the Sabbath days," plural number, is not the same as "the Sabbath," singular number, hence is not the weekly Sabbath. This is a groundless objection, for both the singular and the plural numbers are used indifferently for the weekly Sabbath. Thus Greenfield's Greek N. T. Lexicon says: "Sabbaton. The Sabbath, * * * both in the singular and plural." Bagster's Greek Lexicon says: "The Jewish Sabbath both in the singular and plural." So plain is this fact that even Elder Smith, Adventist, is compelled to admit it though he tries to save his theory by excepting Colossians 2, and Acts 17:2, but without reason. He says: "When it [Sabbaton] is used in the plural form [excepting Acts 17:2 and Colossians 2:16], it means just the same as if it had been written in the singular." Greek Falsehood, page 8. Colossians 2:16, is no exception to the rule. In Acts 17:2, the word THREE is what marks the plural. The Revised Version properly renders Colossians 2:16, in the singular, thus: "Let no man therefore judge you in respect of a Sabbath day," singular number. Sawyer's translation says: "In respect to a feast, or new moon, or Sabbath," singular. The Bible Union says: "Of a feast day, or of a new moon, or of a Sabbath," singular. A few quotations will show that both the singular and plural numbers are used for the weekly Sabbath. "My Sabbaths [plural] shall ye keep for it [singular] is a sign between me and you." Exodus 31:13. This is the weekly Sabbath. "Keep my Sabbaths." Leviticus 19:3. "Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." Leviticus 23:38. Adventists argue that this is the weekly Sabbath. "Blessed is the man that * * * keepeth the Sabbath," "the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths." Isaiah 56:3-4. Either singular or plural, no difference. "I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign." Ezekiel 20:12. This is the weekly Sabbath, as Adventists well know. "On the Sabbath days [plural] the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath" [singular]. Matthew 12:5. Here we have in the same verse both the plural and singular used for the weekly Sabbath. "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days?" Matthew 12:10. "Taught them on the Sabbath days." Luke 4:31. "Three Sabbath days reasoned with them." Acts 17:2. "Let no man therefore judge you * * * in respect of the Sabbath days." Colossians 2:16. Who can read this list of texts and not be profoundly impressed that by "the Sabbath days" of Colossians 2:16 Paul means just what that language means in all the other cases? Of course he did, and no other reasonable application can be made of it.

3. In the Greek, in which Paul wrote Colossians 2:16, he uses not only the same word which is always used for the weekly Sabbath, but exactly the same form of the word used in the fourth commandment itself! I will give the Greek word for "Sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16 and other texts where the same word and same form of the word, letter for letter, is used for the weekly Sabbath. Colossians 2:16. "Let no man judge you in respect to the Sabbath days," Greek, Sabbaton, genitive plural.

Exodus 20:8; Exodus 20:10, fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day (Greek, Sabbaton, genitive plural) to keep it holy." "But the seventh day is the Sabbath [Greek, Sabbate, accusative plural] of the Lord." Here it will be seen that Paul uses the same Greek word, letter for letter, that is used in the decalogue. Hence he surely meant that very Sabbath day. Notice, further, that in each case in the fourth commandment where the word "Sabbath" occurs it is plural in the Greek. So if the use of the plural in Colossians 2 shows any thing, it shows that the Sabbath of the decalogue is meant. Moreover, the Revised Version renders Exodus 20:10, and Colossians 2:16, exactly alike. Thus: "The seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord." "Let no man judge you in respect of 'a Sabbath.' " Plainly, then, Colossians 2:16, refers to the Sabbath of Exodus 20:8-11.

Further, Sabbaton, genitive plural, the form of the word used in Colossians 2:16, is the one often used in other texts for the weekly Sabbath. Thus: Exodus 35:3, "Kindle no fire * * * upon the Sabbath day," [Sabbaton]. Leviticus 23:38. "Besides the Sabbaths [Sabbaton] of the Lord." Leviticus 24:8. "Every Sabbath [Sabbaton] he shall set it in order." Numbers 15:32. "Gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day," [Sabbaton] Numbers 28:9. "On the Sabbath [Sabbaton] day two lambs." Deuteronomy 5:12. Fourth commandment again, "Keep the Sabbath [Sabbaton] day." Isaiah 58:13. "Turn away thy foot from the Sabbath," [Sabbaton] Matthew 28:1. "In the end of the Sabbath," [Sabbaton] Luke 4:16. "He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath [Sabbaton] day." Acts 13:14. "Went into the synagogue on the Sabbath [Sabbaton] day." Colossians 2:16. "Let no man therefore judge you * * * in respect of the Sabbath [Sabbaton] days."

Unless a man is blinded by a pet theory, he must see that Colossians 2:16 does surely mean the weekly Sabbath, as in all the other texts where the same word occurs.

4. The only word ever used in the Bible, for the weekly Sabbath is the very one Paul did use, Sabbaton. So if he had meant to name that Sabbath, what else could he have said than just what he did say, the Sabbath days? Why, then, deny that he means just what he says when he could have said nothing else if he had meant the Sabbath?

5. The word Sabbath occurs in the New Testament 60 times. Seventh-Day Adventists admit that in 59 out of these 60 cases it means the weekly Sabbath; but in the 60th case, where exactly the same word is used both in Greek and English, as we have seen, they say it must mean something else! Isn't that remarkable? Hear them: "In the New Testament the Sabbath of the Lord is mentioned 59 times, and those local Sabbaths, which expired by limitation and ceased at the cross, are mentioned once." Scripture References, p. 9. Strange that the Sabbath means the Sabbath 59 times and the 60th time it don't! "Jewish feasts are often spoken of in the New Testament but, not one of them anywhere is called a Sabbath or credited with the nature of a Sabbath." The Sabbath for Man, p. 544.

6. "The feast days and new moons" of Colossians 2:16, include all the holy days of the Jews except the weekly Sabbath; hence there was nothing else left to which it could apply but that Sabbath. The entire list is given in Numbers 28, 29.

7. But what settles it beyond a reasonable doubt that Colossians 2:16, does refer to the weekly Sabbaths is the fact that exactly the same list of holy days here given by Paul is given about a dozen times in the Old Testament, where we know it means the seventh day.

Turn to Numbers 28, 29, and you have a detailed law as to just what offerings shall be made on each day of the whole year. The first were the daily offerings of "two lambs," day by day, for a continual burnt offering. "The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at the even." Verse 3 and 4. The second were the offerings on the sabbath. "And on the sabbath day two lambs of the first year without spot," verse 9 and 10. None will deny that this was the weekly sabbath. Third, in the very next verse come the new moons. "And in the beginning of your months ye shall offer a burnt offering unto the Lord," verses 11-15. Fourth comes the annual feast days. "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord," verse 16. Then follows a complete list of all the annual feast days, closing with these words, "These things shall ye do unto the Lord in your set feasts," Numbers 29:39.

Here we have the law for the daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly offerings; or, those on each day, on the weekly sabbaths, on the new moons, and on the yearly feast days. Now read the following texts, and notice how this list of daily offerings, offerings on the sabbaths, on the new moons, and on the set feasts, as laid down in the law of Moses, is repeatedly referred to in almost exactly the words of Colossians 2:16.

1 Chronicles 23:30-31 : "To stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even; and to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts, by number, according to the order commanded unto them." Here is a direct reference to the daily offerings, offerings on the weekly sabbaths, new moons and set feasts, just as ordered in Numbers 28, 29. Can any one doubt that "the sabbaths" here are the weekly sabbaths, the same as there? Certainly not.

2 Chronicles 2:4 : "Behold, I build an house to the name of the Lord my God, to dedicate it to him, and to burn before him sweet incense, and for the continual shew bread, and for the burnt offerings morning and evening [daily], on the sabbaths [weekly], and on the new moons, [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly] of the Lord." Precisely the same list again, and in the same order, hence the weekly sabbaths are the ones named. Besides, it would be absurd to suppose that Solomon would name all the other and minor holy days, but say nothing about the chiefest of all days, the weekly sabbaths. Every candid man would admit that "the sabbaths" here are the weekly sabbaths, and so they are in all the passages which follow.

2 Chronicles 8:13 : "Even after a certain rate every day [daily again], offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths [weekly], and on the new moons [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly], three times in the year." Same list and order as before.

2 Chronicles 31:3 : "The morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." The same list again, daily, weekly, monthly and yearly offerings, just in the order they would naturally

come, and just as given "in the law of the Lord." Numbers 28, 29. But if the sabbaths are not the weekly sabbaths, then the Lord names the daily, monthly and yearly offerings, but skips the weekly offerings. Every thinking man knows that such an interpretation is false. But it is the only way the sabbaths can be saved from Paul's list, Colossians 2:16, for that is the same as all these. As the object in these passages is to mention the service of God which must be performed on each of the holy days, it would be absurd to suppose that all the other sacred days in the whole year would be carefully mentioned time and again, while no reference whatever it made to the weekly sabbaths, the most important and the most numerous of all the sacred days.

Nehemiah 10:33 : "For the shew bread, and for the continual meat offering, and for the continual burnt offering, of the sabbaths, of the new, moons, for the set feasts." Same list again, daily, weekly, monthly and yearly. Either the weekly sabbaths are meant here, or else reference to the worship of God on the Sabbath is always studiously avoided, while all the rest is carefully mentioned. The evidence is too plain to mistake which.

Ezekiel 45:17 : "Offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths." Here are named exactly the same days that Paul gives in Colossians 2:16, and in the same order, yearly, monthly, weekly.

Hosea 2:11 : "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Same list of holy days that we have had over and over, where we know that sabbath meant the seventh day.

Colossians 2:16 : "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day, (Rev. Version), or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." Here, as before, are the yearly, monthly and weekly holy days just as laid down in the law where we know the weekly sabbaths are meant. It is evident that Paul had in his mind those lists of holy days so often given in the Old Testament, where the sabbath is included. The words "the sabbath days" would certainly embrace the weekly sabbaths unless they were especially named as excepted. But no such exception is made. Hence we must apply the term as it is used in the law, to the seventh day.

Hosea 2:11, is a plain prophecy that all these holy days should cease just as we know has happened in fact; and in Colossians 2:16, is proof that they were nailed to the cross.

8. TESTIMONY OF OTHERS ON Colossians 2:14-17

Bunyan: On this text, John Bunyan, than whom no man ever studied his Bible more closely, says: "Here also as he [Paul] serveth other holy days he serveth the Sabbath, he gives a liberty to believers to refuse the observation of it. Nor hath the apostle (since he saith, or of the sabbath), one would think, left any hole out at which men's inventions could get." Again: "The old seventh-day Sabbath is abolished and done away." Bunyan's Complete Works, pages 899, 900.

Dr. Scott says: "Doubtless, this last related principally to the weekly Sabbath, which, as observed on the seventh day, was now become a part of the abrogated Jewish law." The Pulpit Commentary on this text says: "The Sabbath days' referred to the Jewish Sabbath which was always observed on Saturday." "If the ordinance of the Sabbath had been in any form of lasting obligation on the Christian church, it would have been quite impossible for the apostle to have used this language."

John Wesley: "In respect of a yearly feast, the new moon, or the weekly Jewish Sabbath."

Dr. Lee, Methodist: "The apostle refers to the seventh day Sabbath and he gives them clearly to understand that they are not morally bound to observe it. * * * By a 'holy day' and the 'new moon,' he included all other feasts and rests which might be called Sabbaths, leaving nothing but the seventh day Sabbath to be meant by the Sabbath days." Lee's Theology, page 375.

9. That upon which Seventh-Day Adventists rely to save this text from applying to the sabbath is the assertion that there were several yearly or annual sabbath days, and that Paul's language must apply to these instead of to the weekly sabbaths. Thus Elder Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," says, "There were seven annual sabbaths," and then he names all the Jewish feast days, as the pentecost, day of atonement, etc., and cites Leviticus 23. It is true that in our English version the word sabbath is applied to four of these feast days. But we turn to the Greek, in which Paul wrote, and find that the word for "sabbath" is sabbaton. Is that the term used where the word sabbath is applied to the annual feast days? No, indeed, except in just barely one instance. The day of atonement is called a sabbath (sabbaton) in the Greek. Leviticus 23:32. "In the Old Testament Hebrew none of those feast days are ever termed a Sabbath, save the day of atonement." Sabbath for Man, page 544. The Hebrew word for sabbath is shabbath. In only this one instance is it ever applied to any of the annual festivals. But the word "sabbath" in the English version, when applied to these annual feasts, is from the Greek term ANAPAUSIS, and in the Hebrew from shabbathon. These words should not be translated "sabbath," but should be rendered "rest," as they are in the Revised Version. Thus all these texts read in the New Version: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, there shall be a solemn rest unto you." Leviticus 23:24. "On the first day shall be a solemn rest, and on the eighth day shall be a solemn rest," verse 39. So also in the English version of the Hebrew used by the Jews these words are translated rest, not sabbath. Thus: "In the seventh month, on the first day of the month, shall ye have a rest," not sabbath, verse 24. "On the first day shall be a rest, and on the eighth day shall be a rest," verse 39.

Hence, except the weekly sabbaths, among all the feast days and holy days of the Old Testament only one single day in the whole year is ever called a sabbath. So it is not correct to speak of "the annual sabbaths," much less to say that there were seven of them. There was just one, and no more, and this one was included in the annual feast days. Even Elder Andrews confesses that "the annual sabbaths, were part and parcel of these feasts and could have no existence until after the feasts to which they belonged had been instituted. Thus the first and second of these Sabbaths were the first and seventh days of the pascal feast. The third annual sabbath was identical with the feast of pentecost." History of the Sabbath, page 86. By his own confession the days he calls annual sabbaths were all included in those yearly feasts and could have no existence separate from them. Feast days (heortes) is the term embracing all those days, as we have seen. Hence "the sabbath days" (sabbaton) must apply only to the weekly sabbaths. Or, to say the least, this term being pre-eminently, almost exclusively, applied to the weekly sabbaths, must include them any way, whether it did any others or not.

10. Seventh-Day Adventists try to make a difference between "the Sabbaths of the Lord," Leviticus 23:38; Exodus 20:10, and "her Sabbaths," Hosea 2:11. They say that "her Sabbaths," were the Jewish Sabbaths, yearly feast days; but that the Lord's Sabbath is never called her Sabbaths. The

assertion is contrary to facts.

Why, were the yearly holy days her days? Did the Jews appoint them? No; the Lord appointed them just as he did the sabbath, and gave them to Israel to keep, just as he gave them the sabbath to keep. Hence, from one point of view they are the Lord's, but from another view they are her days. God's, because he commanded them; hers, because given to them. "I gave them my sabbaths." So we read of nearly every sacred institution of the Bible. In one place it is "the Lord's" and in the next it is "hers," "yours" or "theirs," but the same institution all the time. Thus we read of the temple: "Mine house," Isaiah 56:7; "your house," Matthew 23:38. Of the sacrifices: "The sacrifices of the Lord," Leviticus 10:13; "my offering, and my bread for my sacrifices," Numbers 28:2; "your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes," Deuteronomy 12:6. Of the law: "My law," Jeremiah 6:19; "your law," John 10:34. Now notice particularly that the feast days are spoken of in exactly the same manner that the sabbath is; that is, "my feasts," and "her feasts," "my sabbaths" and "her sabbaths." Thus: "The Lord's passover," Exodus 12:11; "the feast of the Lord," Leviticus 23:4; "the sabbaths of the Lord," verse 38; "my feasts," verse 2; "my sabbaths," Exodus 31:13; "a feast unto the Lord," Leviticus 23:41; "the holy sabbath unto the Lord," Exodus 16:23; "her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths," Hosea 2:11. These quotations are sufficient to show the fallacy of trying to make a distinction between "my sabbaths" and "her sabbaths." The same argument would prove that "my feasts" and "her feasts," "my sacrifices" and "your sacrifices," "my house" and "your house," etc., were entirely different. But everybody knows better. These experiences apply to the same thing from different standpoints; the sabbaths of the Lord as appointed by him; her sabbaths as kept by them; and this is the whole of it.

11. Paul represents these things as "blotted out," "nailed to the cross." Colossians 2:14. It is said that this could not apply to the Sabbath which was engraved in the stones in the decalogue, as you could not blot out nor nail up this. The answer is easy. To blot out and to nail up are only used as an illustration. Anciently a document that had been canceled, or abolished, was rubbed or blotted out, or a nail was driven through it, as now a conductor punches a ticket to show that it has been used up. As an illustration it could be applied to laws written in any manner, no matter what. Such objections are unworthy a candid man. Paul says these things were against us; but it is said that the Sabbath was not against us; hence it cannot mean that. Answer: 1. Paul says it was; that ought to settle it. 2. The Jewish Sabbath was the great sign of Judaism. Ezekiel 20:10-13; Deuteronomy 5:15. As such, it carried with it that whole system and so was against Christians.

12. It is said that the weekly Sabbath was never associated with meats, drinks, feast days, etc., as in Colossians 2:16. This is a great mistake as we have already seen. It is classed with these a score of times. See Leviticus 23:2-6; Numbers 28:3-11; 1 Chronicles 23:29-31, etc.

13. But it is argued that as "the sabbath days" of Col. 16, "are a shadow of things to come," verse 17, and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same, for the sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it cannot point both ways? The passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Exodus 12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Colossians 2:16-17. "Even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," 1 Corinthians 5:7. So all these annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know. But who would ever have thought of

this if the apostles had not said so? If, then, these feast days could be both memorials and types, pointing both ways, so can the, Sabbath. Paul says plainly that the Sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasonings. This is in harmony with Paul's argument in Hebrews 4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. For forty years they have tried to explain away this text , and to show that it really cannot mean what it says; but there it stands and mocks all their theories. The Sabbath is a type, for inspiration says so. Again, it is said that the Sabbath was instituted before the fall, but types could not have been instituted till after the fall. How do you know that they could not be? Where does the Bible say so? Peter says of Christ: "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times, for you," 1 Peter 1:20. The revelator says, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," Revelation 13:8. If, then, Christ before the foundation of the world was ordained to die, then the Sabbath might have been designed even before the creation of the earth, as a type of Christ. Dr. Watson says: "It is used as an expressive type of the heavenly and internal rest." Theol. Inst. Vol. II, page 509. The Pulpit Commentary says: "The Sabbath of the Jews was typical." On Colossians 2:17. Dr. Adam Clarke says: "The truth is, the Sabbath is considered as a type." On Exodus 20:8. Even Elder Andrews, Seventh-Day Adventist, says: "When the Creator gave existence to our world, did he not foresee the fall of man? And, foreseeing that fall, did he not entertain the purpose of redeeming man? And does it not follow that the purpose of redemption was entertained in that of creation?" History of the Sabbath, page 151. Exactly; and so the Sabbath as a type of that redemption might have been given in Eden according to their own showing. So, on close inspection, every argument of our Seventh-Day brethren on Colossians 2 fails them.

14. By a false and ungrammatical construction of the relative pronoun "which" in Colossians 2:17, Adventists try to exclude the weekly Jewish Sabbath from the text. They make the pronoun which refer only to "the Sabbath days," making it read, "Those, Sabbath days which are a shadow." This they say, implies that there are other Sabbaths which are not a shadow, that is the seventh day. But the Greek word for "Sabbath days" is Sabbaton, genitive plural, while the word for "which" is HA, nominative plural, neuter. Hence which cannot agree with Sabbath days, as any scholar knows. "Which are a shadow" relates to the whole list given in verse 16, viz., meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and Sabbaths. The revised version renders it, "a feast day, or a new moon, or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow." Not simply the Sabbath alone, but all these together were a shadow. Hence the phrase, "which are a shadow," applies to each item in verse 16. Does Paul, then, mean to say that only certain feast days, certain new moons, and certain Sabbaths were shadows, while there were other feast days, other new moons and other Sabbaths which were not shadows and so were excepted from his list? No, he makes no exception whatever, neither of feasts, moons, or Sabbaths. All were included, none were excepted. Hence as Paul included every feast day, and every new moon, so he also included every Sabbath of the Old Testament, and that took in the weekly Sabbath as the chief of all, to say the least. So the last peg on which to hang the Jewish Sabbath goes down.

Professor A. M. Weston, President of Eureka College, Ill., says very truly: "If the Sabbath does not look to Christ for its underlying principle, then it is the one important observance of the Old and New Testament that fails to do so." The Evolution of a Shadow, page 16. We know that there was in Eden one type of Christ, that was Adam, for the Bible says so, Romans 5:14. "Adam * * * who is

the figure of him that was to come." Figure is from the Greek TUPOS, type. "Who was the type of him that was to come." Syriac, Diaglott, Sawyer, Living Oracles, and Bible Union Translations. Hence types were instituted in Eden. Therefore the Sabbath cannot be excepted from the types on that ground. In Galatians 4:10-11, Paul sets aside the keeping the Jewish Sabbath and all those holy days of the law. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you." That this refers to the holy days of the old law is proved by his reference to that law, both before and after this text. Thus: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Galatians 3:24-25. That law has ended at the cross as Paul said in Colossians 2:14-17. Again: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Galatians 4:21. "Ye are not under the law." Galatians 5:18. So, then, he means the holy days of the law and these included the Sabbath as the chief of all. Look at his list: Days, (Sabbath days, weekly), months (new moons), times (yearly feasts), and years (Sabbatical years). This is exactly the list of Jewish holy times. To the Romans Paul taught the same doctrine: the observance of the Jewish holy days was not to be regarded. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Romans 14:5.

Dr. Potts, Methodist, says: "That the Sabbath question entered into Paul’s reasonings on the occasion is evident from Romans 14:1-6." The Lord’s Day Our Sabbath, page 27. These were the days enjoined in the law for it is of the law that he treats all through the book of Romans. He makes no exception of the Sabbath day, but says plainly " every day." Only a few verses before he has quoted five of the ten commandments, Chap. 13:9, showing that he included the days of the decalogue. It does not avail to say that Paul means only the annual Sabbaths because he mentions eating meat and herbs. I have already proved that the weekly Sabbath was associated with these time and again.

What proves that Paul did intend to set aside the Sabbath, as his words naturally mean, is the fact that nowhere does he ever in all his instructions to the churches say one word in favor of keeping the Sabbath. Time and again he enjoins every other duty, but never a word about keeping the Sabbath in all his fourteen letters. Most of those to whom he wrote were Gentiles who never had kept the Sabbath and hence needed instructions in it if they were to keep it. But not a word does he say to them about it; though he does command them about the first day of the week. 1 Corinthians 16:1-2. But it is said that this view of Paul’s language abolishes all holy days and leaves the church without any rest day. The answer is easy and manifest. Paul was treating of the old institutions which had been nailed to the cross. Colossians 2:14. Hence his language has no reference to the new institutions of the gospel, of which there might have been a dozen holy days, so far as these texts are concerned.

02.16. Chapter 16 - A History of Numerous Efforts to Revive the Jewish Sabbath

Chapter 16 - A History of Numerous Efforts to Revive the Jewish Sabbath

Why Not Found Out Before?

If Sabbatarians are right on the Sabbath question, then the whole Christian church has broken the Sabbath for the last 1,800 years, and has kept Sunday, "a popish institution," "the mark of the beast," in its stead. During these long ages all the holy men, martyrs, reformers, commentators, historians and Christian scholars, with all their seeking of God, searching the Bible, and studying history, never discovered this great mistake! Is it reasonable to believe that the entire church, during all its history, has been trampling upon one of God's most holy commandments? Can it be that the wrath of God is now to be poured out upon the church for keeping the same day that all others have kept for 1,800 years? Would God have blessed the reformers and his church as he has, if Sunday-keeping is such a fearful crime against God as is now claimed?

Now, just to think that the whole church of Christ, immediately after the death of the apostles, should fall into this fearful sin and error, and practice this crime without rebuke during the entire history of the church, till just a few days before Jesus comes, and then only a few find it out and change. According to the Seventh-Day Adventists, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, with all the church of Christ for hundreds of years, committed two fearful sins each week of their lives; they broke the holy Sabbath, the most important commandment in the decalogue, and kept Sunday, the mark of the beast! Yet God has let the whole thing go on without any protest, till the last minute of time, and now everybody who does not accept this "new light," is to be hopelessly damned for doing what Christians generally have always done! In all candor, this is a pretty big pill to swallow. But Sabbatarians say that this has nothing to do with the case. "Our appeal is to the Bible alone. The Bible plainly teaches it, and we will go by that." So they say, and so they believe; but the fact is, it is only their interpretation, their explanation, of the Bible which makes it say so. Did you ever know a sect under heaven, even the wildest and most fanatical, who were not always on hand ready to "prove it all by the Bible"? Yes; they know that they are right beyond a doubt, "because the Bible just says so." They will argue you blind, and grow more confident every day, and always end by saying, "It is true, not because I say so, but because the Bible says so." Meet a Mormon, and he has the Bible at his tongue's end. He "proves it all by the Bible." So the Shaker, and the Swedenborgian, and the Universalist, and the rest of them, "prove it all by the Bible." How many persons and sects have arisen at different times with a perfect furor of enthusiasm over some new idea besides "the old, old story of Jesus and his love." No matter what harm it does to other Christians and to the gospel, "the Bible teaches it, and that is enough. When we give this up we will give up the Bible too." So they go on till time alone demolishes their theory, and then they do indeed give up the Bible and all, while precious souls are lost.

Keeping The Jewish Sabbath A Failure

Sabbatarians began in England in the time of the Reformation, over three hundred years ago. They had many able men, ministers and writers. They published many books, discussed the subject widely, and made many converts. Here they had a fine field and a fair start. How did Sabbath-keeping succeed? What have they accomplished in England? Three hundred years ought to be long enough to tell whether it is a success or not. Let Elder Andrews tell the sad story: "In the seventeenth century eleven churches of Sabbatarians flourished in England, while many scattered Sabbath-keepers were to be found in various parts of the kingdom. Now but three of these churches are in existence! And only remnants, even of these, remain!" Hist. Sabbath, p. 491. Since he wrote the above, two more out of the three, I believe, have expired, and only one little company of less than ten members survives! Elder A. sorrowfully asks, "To what cause shall we assign this painful fact?" The cause is evident; God is not in it. It comes to naught every time it is tried. Three hundred years hence the same mournful requiem will be chanted over the grave of Seventh-Day Adventism.

Now look at the history of the Sabbatarian effort in America. In 1664, over 200 years ago, the Seventh-Day Baptists began teaching that doctrine in America at Newport, R. I. The first church was organized Dec. 23, 1671. See "Manual of the Seventh-Day Baptists," pages 39, 40. From that time on they industriously taught the observance of the seventh day, both in America and other lands, even as far as China, by preaching, by tracts, books and periodicals, till the religious world is familiar with their views. They were numerous enough to organize a general conference as early is 1802. See Hist. S. D. Bap. Gen. Conf., pages 15, 238, or any cyclopedia. They have had academies, colleges, and universities; learned men, able writers, and zealous workers. What have they accomplished? Almost nothing. They now number only about 8,000, and are not holding their own, but are losing ground every decade. They can not even hold the increase of their children. Largely their youth abandon Saturday for Sunday. For convenience they mostly colonize together, and so have little influence on the world. To their praise be it said that they are an excellent people, and free from any fanatical or other heretical notions. Here again the seventh day has had the fairest possible chance of success. Its advocates are intelligent, highly educated, respected, and live in this free land and age of investigation. Why has it not succeeded? That it has not they themselves must admit. These sober, stubborn facts should have weight with us. Sabbatarian brethren, stop and weigh these things fairly. What is the use of wasting life contending for what is a practical failure? In 1846, nearly seventy years ago, Seventh-Day Adventists began teaching the Sabbath. They have practiced it zealously, devoted everything to it, poured out treasures by the million, and filled the land with their literature. What have they accomplished? They number only about 100,000 now. Have 4,000 workers in the field and spend $2,000,000 yearly yet again only about 4,000 yearly, or one to each worker! Half of these are from other churches. The system lacks vitality and gospel power.

Contrast with the above the work and success of the First-Day Baptists. What a grand work they have done for Christ and souls in the last two hundred years. Instead numbering 8,000, as the Seventh-Day Baptists do, they number 5,000,000. As a body they are just as pious and devoted as the Seventh-Day Baptists. Then look at the Methodist and other Sunday-keeping churches, and see how God has blessed them all. Experience shows that keeping the Jewish Sabbath dwarfs, cripples, and unfits a church for gospel work.

If, now, keeping Saturday is so highly pleasing to God, why does he not prosper it more? If Sunday observance is such a sin in the sight of God, why does he so remarkably bless those who persist in it?

Luther And The Sabbath

Even the Adventists acknowledge the greatness of Luther in piety and a deep knowledge of the word of God. Mrs. White says of him: "Zealous, ardent, and devoted, knowing no fear but the fear of God, and acknowledging no foundation for religious faith but the holy scriptures," etc. "Angels of heaven were by his side and rays of light from the throne of God revealed the treasures of truth to his understanding." Great Controversy, pages 94, 97. Good. Now hear Luther. Carlstadt, a zealous and learned Sabbatarian, laid his arguments for the seventh day before Luther, who examined them. Here is Luther's decision in his own words: "Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath -that is to say, Saturday- must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised; for that is true and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as the law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all." Hist. Sabbath, p. 457. So then, the "light" on the Sabbath question was given to Luther, and he rejected it, just as the great body of Christians do now. The other leaders of the reformation were likewise familiar with the arguments for the seventh day, but, as Elder Andrews confesses, they "as a body were not friendly to such views." Hist. Sabbath, p. 460.

These facts show how untrue it is to say that people have been unacquainted with this Sabbath question before.

John Milton On The Sabbath So the great John Milton, author of "Paradise Lost," has thoroughly discussed the whole Sabbath question, using the same arguments as we use now to show the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath. I quote a few sentences from his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," Vol. 1, Book 2, Chap. 7. "It is evident from more than one passage of scripture that the original Sabbath is abrogated." "If, then, the commandment of the Sabbath was given to those alone whom God brought out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage, it is evidently inapplicable to us as Christians." He argues the question this way at considerable length.

Richard Baxter On The Sabbath This great divine, the author of "Saints' Rest," "Call to the Unconverted," etc., in 1671, wrote his "Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day" against the Seventh-Day advocates of his times. Gilfillan, says: "Baxter (1671) and Bunyan (1685) wrote their interesting defences of the Lord's day for relieving the perplexities with which some good people in their time were distressed in consequence of the proselyting zeal of Saturday Sabbathists." The Sabbath, p. 144. so the Sabbatarians over 200 years ago were giving the same "light" and doing the same proselyting work as now. They were answered by such men as Baxter, Bunyan, Milton, etc.

I give a few words from Baxter: "It is also confessed, that the universal church from the days of the apostles down till now have constantly kept holy the Lord's day in the memory of Christ's resurrection, and that as by the will of Christ delivered to them by or from the apostles; insomuch that I remember not either any orthodox Christian, or heretic, that ever opposed, questioned, or scrupled it, till of late ages." Part 2, Chap. 18. Of him even Mrs. White says: Baxter, a man "of

talent, education, and deep Christian experience, stood up in valiant defense of the faith once delivered to the saints." Great Controversy, page 175. Yes: such men as these stood up and opposed the Jewish Sabbath heresy.

John Bunyan

Hear Mrs. White on Bunyan: "John Bunyan breathed the very atmosphere of heaven." Great Controversy, page 174. Well, now hear Bunyan: "As for the seventh day Sabbath, that, as we see, is gone to its grave with the signs and shadows of the Old Testament; yea, and it has such a dash left upon it by apostolical authority, that it is enough to make a Christian fly from it for ever. 2 Corinthians 3" "Again the apostle smites the teachers of the law upon the mouth, saying, 'they understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.'" Complete Works, page 915.

If ever a man this side the apostles lived near to God, drank into his spirit, and knew the true intent of the Bible, that man was Bunyan, author of the immortal work, Pilgrim's Progress. He met these Sabbatarians and their work in his day. He studied the subject fully and wrote a book against them from which I have quoted.

He regarded them just as they are regarded now, as legalists, blind zealots, and disturbers of the church. So all this talk that the church did not have the light on the Sabbath question till Adventists arose to give it is contrary to facts as the above proves. It is simply the old arguments of 200 years ago rehashed.

02.17. Chapter 17 - The Law

Chapter 17 - The Law

The foundation of the Sabbatarian error, I believe, is the idea that "the law," in all the strictness of the old letter, is binding on Christians. Hence, their constant theme is the law, law, law. They preach it ten times as much as they preach Christ. Unfortunately, a false theory of the law taught by some other churches has led them into this sad error. For twenty-eight years I was held in that "bondage." Now that I have found my way out, if I can help others, I shall rejoice. The following simple facts with regard to the law helped me out of Adventism and I have never known anyone to get out of it any other way. I believe it to be the correct answer to the Saturday Sabbath error. I write for candid readers. They will examine my arguments fairly and allow others to do the same, even if they should not agree fully with every position. As a result of the present agitation of the Sabbath question, we ought to expect a better understanding of the whole subject than heretofore. Forty years of investigation and discussion of the question have firmly settled me on the following propositions. They are in harmony with the best men and theologians of this and past ages; hence nothing original on my part.

Antinomianism

Antinomians, from ANTI, against and NOMOS, law, against law, is a term applied to those who maintain that Christians are under no obligation to keep the law of God or to do any good works. If they commit any kind of sin it will not hinder their salvation at all if they only believe in Jesus. Salvation is wholly of faith without any regard to a man’s deeds. See any cyclopedia. This is an abominable doctrine, subversive of the gospel; yet Seventh-Day Adventists brand all as Antinomians who do not agree with them as to what is the law of God. I am as much opposed to Antinomianism as they. I believe in strict obedience to law, in keeping the commandments of God, and in the necessity of good works, as strongly as they do. Luther vehemently opposed Antinomianism and yet taught the abolition of the Mosaic law. It is unfair and unjust for Adventists to call people Antinomians who abhor that doctrine. We plead for a pure life, good works and obedience to God, as necessary to salvation. Hence it is a falsehood and a slander to represent us as Antinomians. Men who are conscious of being in the right can afford to state the position of their opponents fairly. Bunyan, Judson, and a host of such men have repudiated the Sabbatarian idea of the law, and yet have been holy men. I am not afraid to stand with them.

Even Elder Waggoner says: "As to whether the Saviour abolished the ten commandments and with them the Sabbath, is a theological question; it is only a matter of Scripture interpretation." Replies to Elder Canright, page 164. Very well; then men may differ on this question and still be honest Christians. I will now lay down a few propositions concerning the law, which seem to me so plain and well supported by the Bible, that all must agree with them.

PROPOSITION 1. "THE LAW" EMBRACES THE WHOLE MOSAIC LAW, MORAL, CIVIL AND CEREMONIAL. The term, "the law," when used with the definite article and without qualifying

words, refers "in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch." Smith's Bible Dictionary, article Law. Largely the Adventists use the term, "the law," for the ten commandments only. They hang up a chart of the decalogue and constantly point to it as "the law, Matthew 5:17; "the law of the Lord," Psalms 19:7; "the law of God," Romans 7:22. This is their fundamental error on the law. I affirm that "the law" included the whole system of law given to the Jews at Sinai, embracing all those requirements, whether moral, civil or ceremonial, decalogue and all. Look at the term "law," in a concordance, or in any Bible lexicon, dictionary or cyclopedia. "The law" commonly included the whole of the five books of Moses. Even Elder Butler is compelled to make this confession: "The term, "the law,' among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical and civil." Law in Galatians, page 70. That is the truth exactly. Dr. John Kitto, in his Cyclopedia of Religious Literature, article Law, says: "If, however, the word law alone is used it is almost invariably equivalent to the law of Moses." "The law is especially embodied in the last four books of the Pentateuch."

Now bear in mind this one simple fact, wherever you find the term "the law," and you will have no trouble with Sabbatarian arguments on "the law."

Take a few examples of the use of the term "the law." 1 Corinthians 14:34. Women "are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." Where does the law say this? Genesis 3:16. So Genesis is in the law. Again: "The law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Romans 7:7. Where? Exodus 20:17. So Exodus is in the law. Once more: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Matthew 22:36. Jesus then makes two quotations from the law; first, "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart." This is taken from Deuteronomy 6:5. So Deuteronomy is in the law. Second, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This is from Leviticus 19:18. So Leviticus is a part of the law. And this: have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?" Matthew 12:5. It is from Numbers 28:9. These then, embrace all the five books of Moses as "the law." Observe a little where the law is spoken of and you will soon see that it refers indiscriminately to each and all of the books of Moses as "the law." Of course any verse in any of these books is quoted as "the law," because it is a part of the law. So then the ten commandments are quoted as the law because they are a part of the law.

Again, "the law" embraces all parts of the law, moral, civil or ceremonial. Thus the ceremonial precepts: "The parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law." Luke 2:27. That is, to offer a sacrifice. Verse 24. Moral precepts: "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers." 1 Timothy 1:9. This is the decalogue. Civil precepts: "Commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" Acts 23:3. Notice that every time it is simply the law. "Gamaliel, a doctor of the law." Acts 5:34. Of what law? Was he simply a doctor of some part of the law, as the moral, or civil, or ceremonial precepts? Every intelligent man knows that "the law," of which he was doctor or teacher, was the whole Pentateuch, decalogue included. The law, then, is the whole Jewish law, in all its part. This one point, clearly settled, destroys nine-tenths of all the Seventh-Day Adventist argument for the Jewish Sabbath. The Two Laws

PROPOSITION 2. THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS TWO SEPARATE LAWS GIVEN TO THE JEWS. To sustain their doctrine Sabbatarians have invented a theory of two laws given at Sinai;

one the moral law, the other the ceremonial.

Adventists attach the utmost importance to their theory of two laws as well they may; for if this is wrong their cause is lost. Elder U. Smith says: "No question, therefore, more vital to the interest of Sabbath-keepers can be proposed." Synopsis of Present Truth, page 258. But that they are wrong on this vital question is very easily shown.

1. "Moral law," "ceremonial law." Adventists use these two terms as freely as though the Bible was full of them; yet, strange to say, the scriptures make no such distinctions, never speak of one law as "moral" and of another as "ceremonial." Adventists severely criticise those who happen to use an unscriptural word or phrase; yet they themselves do the very thing commonly, as in this case. It would be amusing to hear one of them try to preach on the "two laws" and confine himself to Bible language! He could not possibly do it. If there were two distinct laws given to Israel, so opposite in their nature, it is strange that there is no record of it, no reference to it in the Bible. If one was abolished and the other was not, strange that Paul should not make the distinction when he has so much to say about the law. Why did he not say, "we establish the moral law"? or, "the ceremonial law was our schoolmaster"? No, he just says "the law" and leaves it there. He seems not to have been quite as clear on that point as Adventists are! On this point Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, Article Law, says: "Neither Christ nor the apostles ever distinguished between the moral, the ceremonial, and the civil law, when they speak of its establishment or its abolition."

2. The two laws contrasted. Adventists have drawn up a long list of things which they claim are true of the "moral" law and an opposite list which can apply only to the "ceremonial" law. These two they contrast and make out two laws. Thus Elder Smith: "Moral law: "Was spoken from Sinai by the voice of God and twice written upon tables of stone by his own finger." "Was deposited in the golden ark." "Related only to moral duties." Synopsis of Present Truth, page 266. Of course this was just the ten commandments, nothing more, nothing less. So here we have their "moral law." Now here is the other one: "The ceremonial law: "Was communicated to Moses privately and was by Moses written with a pen in a book. Deuteronomy 31:9." "Was put into a receptacle by the side of the ark. Deuteronomy 31:26." "Was wholly ceremonial." Same page.

Hence everything not found in the decalogue belongs to the ceremonial law and everything Moses himself wrote in the book of the law placed in the side of the ark is "wholly ceremonial." Deuteronomy 31:26, reads: "Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark." The decalogue was in the ark, the book of the law was by the side of the ark. We enquire, then, how much "the book of the law" contained. The answer is easy: it contained all the five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Thus 2 Kings 14:6, says it "is written in the book of the law of Moses," and then quotes Deuteronomy 24:16, as that book of the law. 2 Chronicles 35:12', says: "It is written in the book of Moses," and refers to Leviticus 3:3. Ezra 6:18, says: "It is written in the book of Moses," and refers to Numbers 3:6. Joshua 8:31 quotes Exodus 20:25, as that which "is written in the book of the law." 1 Corinthians 14:34 refers to Genesis 3:16, as "the law." Dr. Scott on Deuteronomy 31:26, says "This (book) appears to have been a correct and authentic copy of the five books of Moses." So what they call the ceremonial law contains scores of precepts as purely moral as any in the decalogue. Read these: "Thou shalt not vex a stranger." "Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child." Exodus 22:21-22. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." Exodus 23:2. "Ye shall be holy." "Thou shalt not go up and down as a

tale bearer among thy people." "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Leviticus 19:2; Leviticus 19:16; Leviticus 19:18. Thou shalt not respect persons." "Thou shalt be perfect." Deuteronomy 16:19; Deuteronomy 16:18; Deuteronomy 16:13. Are these precepts, and scores like them, to be classed as ceremonial because God did not write them on a stone but gave them to Moses to write in a book? Surely not. Then the nature of a precept was not determined by the way it was given. God gave them all at different times as it pleased Him. As we have seen, "the law" embraces the "whole law." Galatians 5:3. Of course, in that law, some precepts refer to moral duties, other to civil, and others to ceremonial but all are only different parts of the same law, called, as a whole, "the law." Thus Jesus quotes from Leviticus 19, as "the law." See Matthew 22:36-40. Now read the whole chapter, Leviticus 19, and you find moral, civil and ceremonial precepts all mingled together, and often in the same verse. Adventists, to sustain their theory, have to go through this chapter, as they do through the whole Bible, and cut and carve, and split hairs, and label one sentence "the moral law," another "the ceremonial law," etc. This is what is properly termed "the scrapping system." It does great violence to the Scriptures, wresting them out of their evident meaning. In no place can they find their ceremonial law given by itself. They have to pick it out here and there in scraps. The "book of the law," which was placed in the side of the ark, Deuteronomy 31:24-26, is pointed to as the ceremonial law. But this "book of the law," as we see, embraced the whole five books of Moses.

It contains all of the ten commandments word for word twice repeated. Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. Elder G.I. Butler himself makes this confession: "The "book of the law,' which was placed in the side of the ark, or at the side of it, contained both the moral and ceremonial laws." Law in Galatians, p. 39. That drops the bottom out of the theory that the moral law was "in the ark, and the ceremonial law in the side of the ark," as they usually claim. So, on close examination, every text on which they rely for two laws will fail them. That the "book of the law" did contain moral precepts is settled by Galatians 3:10. "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." Where in the book of the law is this written? In Deuteronomy 27:26. Turning there we have a curse against images, verse 15, disobedience to parents, verse 16, adultery, verse 20; murder, verse 24; bribery, verse 25; then comes the verse quoted as "the book of the law." So if the decalogue contains moral law, then the book did too. This shows the utter fallacy of their theory of two laws. The following passage alone overturns the two law theory of Adventists: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law? 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." Matthew 22:36-40.

1. These two great commandments were "in the law." 2. But neither of them is found in the decalogue. 3. Both of them are in what Adventists call the ceremonial law. 4. Neither of them was spoken by God, nor written by him, nor engraved on stones, nor put into the ark. Both were given by God to Moses privately and he wrote them with a pen in the book of the law which was placed in the side of the ark. And yet these two precepts are the greatest of all. Jesus said of the first one that it is "the first of all the commandments." Of the two he said, "There is none other commandments greater than these." Mark 12:29; Mark 12:41. And on these two hang all the law.

So, then, the greatest commandments are in the book of the law, not on the tables of stone. How utterly this demolishes their two law argument. It shows that the mere fact that the ten commandments were spoken by God, written on stone, and placed in the ark, is no proof that they were superior to those given through Moses in the book of the law.

We will examine a few more of their contrasts of the two laws as they arrange them. Thus: "1. Moral: Existed in Eden before the fall. Ceremonial: Was given after the fall. 2. Moral: Was perfect. Psalms 19:7. Ceremonial: Made nothing perfect. Heb. 7:19. 3. Moral: Contains the whole duty of Man. Ecclesiastes 12:13. Ceremonial: "Stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances.' Hebrews 9:10."

1. Where do they read that the decalogue was given in Eden? Nowhere. This they assume not only without proof, but against the plain record of Exodus 19, 20 that it was given at Sinai. So their very first comparison is a failure.

2. The law is perfect, Psalms 19:7, and again, the law made nothing perfect. Hebrews 7:19. This they regard as one of their clearest proofs of the two laws. But where is the proof? Does it follow that if the law is perfect it will or can make sinners perfect? If it could, then, as Paul says, righteousness should be by the law," Galatians 3:21, and "then Christ is dead in vain." Galatians 2:21. The law could be perfect and yet fail to make anybody perfect. So there is no proof of two laws here after all.

3. Ecclesiastes 12:13 is quoted as referring to the ten commandments alone and then it is asserted that these contain every duty of man. Both statements are fallacious. There are scores of duties we owe to God and men not even hinted at in the decalogue. Then there is not a particle of evidence that Ecclesiastes 12:13 refers alone to the decalogue. It manifestly embraces all God's commandments on all subjects. Look at the second quotation, Hebrews 9:10. It does not refer to any law whatever but is speaking of the services of the priests in the temple, which service "stood only in meats, drinks," etc. Read it. Thus their "two laws" are made out: 1. By pure assumptions. 2. By misapplications of scripture. 3. By detached phrases here and there taken out of their proper connection. So I could go through their whole list and show that it proves no such contrast as they claim. But they assert that such opposite things are said of "the law," that it cannot be the same law all the time. This method of proving two laws by contrasting particular expressions about the law when spoken of from different standpoints would make bad work with the Bible if urged on other subjects. Paul said he was "a Jew," Acts 21:39, and again that he was "a Roman," Acts 22:25; two Pauls. So Christ is "a Lion" and "a Lamb," Revelation 5:5-6. "The everlasting Father," Isaiah 9:6. And born of a woman, Luke 2:7; Prince of Life, Acts 3:15, yet died through weakness, 2 Corinthians 13:4; a child, Isaiah 9:6; and yet God, Hebrews 1:1-8; two Christs. It would be much harder to reconcile the apparently opposite things said of Christ, than it would be the different things said about the law. There were different sides to Christ's nature, yet he was but one person. So there were different sides to the law, but it was only one law for all that. Viewed in the light of its ultimate design, viz.: to prepare the way for Christ, Romans 10:4; Galatians 3:23-25, in its spirit, Romans 7:6; in its righteousness, Romans 8:3-4; it was "holy and just and good," Romans 7:12. But viewed from the side of its mere letter, Romans 2:29; Romans 7:6; 2 Corinthians 3:6-7; its numerous rites, ceremonies, penalties and rigorous exactions, it was "the ministration of death," 2 Corinthians 3:7; and a "yoke of bondage," Galatians 5:1-3; Acts 15:1-10. This is the true

explanation of their "two laws." Further, it is not true that there was nothing ceremonial in the decalogue. The weekly Sabbath was the chief ceremonial of all the Jewish worship. See this proved in the first part of chapter nine. Also see chapter eighteen on the decalogue. In Chapter XXI I have examined every text they use on the two laws.

PROPOSITION 3. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS ALONE ARE NEVER, CALLED "THE LAW OF THE LORD" NOR THE "LAW OF GOD." Sabbatarians constantly use these two terms, applying them to the decalogue alone. With them "the law of God" and "the law of the Lord" is just the decalogue and nothing more. They are the only ones who keep God's law, as all others break the Sabbath, the seventh day. But now notice this fact which I know to be the truth, after a most thorough examination. The word law occurs in the Bible over 400 times, yet in not one single instance is the decalogue as a whole and alone called "the law." It is never in a single instance called "the law of the Lord," or "the law of God." Of course the ten commandments are a part of the law of God, but only a part, not the whole. Examine a few texts: Luke 2:22. "The days of her purification according to the law of Moses;" verse 23, "It is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb;" verse 24, It is "said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle doves;" verse 27, "To do for him after the custom of the law." Here "the law," "the law of the Lord," and "the law of Moses," all mean the same thing, viz: the law touching the birth of a son. Again, sacrifices, offerings, Sabbaths, new moons and feasts are all required "in the law of the Lord." Thus: "He appointed also the king's portion of his substance for the burnt offerings, to-wit, for the morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the Sabbaths, and for the new moons and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." 2 Chronicles 31:3. Scores of texts like these could be quoted, showing that "the law of the Lord" includes sacrifices, circumcision, feast days and all the Jewish law. So "the law of God" is not simply the decalogue, but the whole law of Moses. Read Nehemiah 8:1-3; Nehemiah 8:7-8; Nehemiah 8:14; Nehemiah 8:18. "The book of the law of Moses," "the law," "the book of the law," "they read in the book of the law of God," "the law which the Lord commanded by Moses," "the book of the law of God." The law of God, then, includes the whole law of Moses. No Sabbatarian, therefore, keeps "the law," "the law of God," or "the law of the Lord," for if he did he would offer sacrifices, be circumcised, and live exactly as the Jews did. So all their talk about "keeping the law" amounts to nothing, for none of them do it. Moreover in their attempt to keep a part of that law they thereby bring themselves under obligation to "keep the whole law," as Paul argues in Galatians 5:3. But as none of them keep the whole law, they bring upon themselves the curse of the law, by constantly violating one part while attempting to keep another. This is the very point which Paul made against Judaizing legalists of his day. "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 them." Galatians 3:10. That is, the person who keeps one precept of the law just because the law says so, thereby acknowledges that the law is binding on him. Then if he neglects some other part of the law, he thereby becomes a transgressor of the very law he professes to keep. This is exactly what Sabbatarians do. They keep the Sabbath because the law says so and thereby become "debtors to do the whole law." Galatians 5:3. Then they neglect many things in the same law and so are under the condemnation of the law. Galatians 3:10. But Christians do this or that, not because the law says so, but because so says the New Testament.

PROPOSITION 4. "THE LAW" WAS GIVEN BY MOSES AND THE "LAW OF MOSES" INCLUDES THE DECALOGUE. Not that Moses was the author of it, but it was through him God gave it to Israel. This is stated so distinctly and so many times that it is useless to deny it. Thus: "For the law was given by Moses," John 1:17. "Did not Moses give you the law?" John 7:19. "The law which the Lord had commanded by Moses," Nehemiah 8:14. "God's law which was given by Moses," Nehemiah 10:29. This includes the decalogue. "Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother," Mark 7:10. This is the fifth commandment. Again: "Did not Moses give you the law and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me?" John 7:17. The law against killing is here called the law of Moses. In Hebrews 10:28, it is said that "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses." Persons were put to death for violating the decalogue. See Deuteronomy 17:6. They were put to death for breaking the Sabbath, Exodus 31:14, blasphemy, theft, and the like. Hence the decalogue is included in the "law of Moses." But in verse 24 they said ye must "keep the law." So in one verse it is "the law of Moses" and in another verse it is simply "the law": Hence there is no difference between "the law" and "the law of Moses." In Joshua 8:30-31, we read: "Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God of Israel in mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lift up any iron." It says that this about the altar was written in the "book of the law of Moses." Now turn to Exodus 20:25, the very chapter where the decalogue is found, and there you have the text referred to. "And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou has polluted it." This proves beyond denial that the ten commandments are in the law of Moses.

PROPOSITION 5. "THE LAW" WAS NOT GIVEN TILL THE TIME OF MOSES AND SINAI. The texts above quoted prove this. Thus: "The law was given by Moses." John 1:17. "Did not Moses give you the law?" John 7:19. "For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses." Romans 5:13-14. The entrance of the law is here located at Moses. Again it is located under the Levitical priesthood. "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, for under it the people received the law." Hebrews 7:11. So the giving of the law is located "430 years after the covenant with Abraham." "And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." Galatians 3:17. This brings us to the very year the Jews came out of Egypt and arrived at Sinai. "And it came to pass at the end of 430 years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all of the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." Exodus 12:41. Beyond dispute, then, what the Bible calls "the law" was not given till Moses, 2,500 years after Adam, or nearly half the history of the world.

PROPOSITION 6. THE LAW IS NO WHERE FOUND TILL MOSES. No copy of the law nor any reference to it can be found till Moses. Of course God's great moral and spiritual law, condemning every sin and requiring every righteous act - that existed from Adam, nay, from eternity. But what in all the Jewish Scriptures is known as "the law," as drawn out in a code on Sinai, whether in a book or on the tables of stone, this certainly did not exist till Moses. The whole dispute between Paul and the Judaizers of his day was over this law. See Romans, Galatians and Acts 15, 21. The question was whether "the law," that which was written in "the book of the law," Galatians 3:10, and "engraved in stones," 2 Corinthians 3:7, was to be kept under the gospel. Paul said, No; they

said, Yes. Sabbatarians now stick for the law of Sinai as did the Judaizers of old. To say that the principles of the law existed before Sinai, does not prove that the law existed. These principles could have been taught to Adam and his descendants in a different form from the law as afterwards given at Sinai. But where do you find the law or even one of the ten commandments, as worded on Sinai, before that time? Nowhere. The various principles and precepts, moral, ceremonial, and typical, which had previously been taught in different ways, were now gathered into one code and worded so as to adapt them, for the time being, to the circumstances of the Jewish nation. As thus worded, certainly this law had never been given before.

PROPOSITION 7. THEIR FATHERS DID NOT HAVE THE DECALOGUE AS WORDED ON THE TABLES. This Moses directly states. Deuteronomy 4:12-13, says God spoke to them from heaven, and declared to them "his covenant," "even ten commandments," Chap. 5:2, 3, says: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us." Then he repeats the ten commandments as spoken from heaven. Verses 4-22; That the main principles and requirements of this code were taught to the fathers in some way no one can doubt; but that the fathers had the law as worded and arranged at Sinai is directly denied by Moses, as above.

PROPOSITION 8. THE LAW WAS GIVEN ONLY TO THE JEWS. This is so manifest in every item of the law, that it needs no argument to prove it. Moses says, Deuteronomy 4:8, that no nation has a law so good "as all this law which I set before you this day." Then he names the ten commandments as a part of it. Verses 10-13. "This is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel." Verse 44. Before whom? Israel, not the Gentiles. So again, Chap. 5:1. "Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears." Then follows the decalogue. So it is a hundred times over all through the law. It is addressed to the Jews and to them only. The very wording of the law shows it was designed for them only. The decalogue is introduced thus: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Exodus 20:2. To whom is that applicable? Only to the Jewish nation. Neither angels, Adam, nor Gentile Christians were ever in Egyptian bondage. Then this law is not addressed to them. To whom was the law given. Let Paul answer. "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law." Romans 9:4. It was given to Israel. "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." Malachi 4:4. The law was "for all Israel," and them only.

All these things show that this was a national law worded to fit the condition of the Jews at the time.

PROPOSITION 9. THE GENTILES DID NOT HAVE THE LAW. This has been proved already; but Paul directly says so. Romans 2:14. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves." This is too plain to need arguing. The Gentiles did not have the law. Paul says so directly and that ought to settle it, and does. To understand and obey the great moral principles of that law is one thing, to be under the letter, the exact wording of the law as given in detail on Sinai, is quite another, as we will see further on.

PROPOSITION 10. THE REWARDS AND PENALTIES OF THE LAW WERE ALL TEMPORAL. There are no promises of future rewards, nor threatenings of future punishments in all the Mosaic

law. The learned Bishop Warburton has fully demonstrate this in his "Divine Legation of Moses." Every careful student of that law must be aware of this feature of it. The reason is evident: it was a national, temporal law, given for a national, temporal purpose. As a sample of all, see Deuteronomy 28:1-19. If they keep the law, they shall be blessed in children, in goods, in cattle, in health, etc. If they disobey, they shall be cursed in all these. Stoning to death was the penalty for theft, murder, etc. Hence that was the "ministration of death written and engraved in stones," 2 Corinthians 3:7, and "is done away," verse 11.

Paul states that the promise of Christ and the future inheritance was made to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the law was given. From this he argues, and forcibly, too, that the keeping of that law was not necessary in order to obtain Christ and the inheritance. Verses 16-18. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, 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, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." So to the Romans he wrote: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Romans 4:13-14. This plainly teaches that the law was not given with reference to the future inheritance. Certainly Abraham did not keep a law which was not given till hundreds of years after he died. But Abraham is the father of all the faithful, and not simply of those who were "of the law." Romans 4:13-16. This point alone ought to open the eyes of those who contend so earnestly for the keeping of that law as necessary to salvation. We are the children of Abraham, Galatians 3:29, and "walk in the steps of our father Abraham," who was never under the law. Romans 4:12-16. We are under the covenant of promise made to Abraham 430 years before the law, Galatians 2:15-19, and not under the covenant of law from Sinai, which is bondage. Galatians 4:21-26.

PROPOSITION 11. GOD'S ETERNAL LAW OF RIGHTEOUSNESS EXISTED BEFORE THE LAW OF SINAI WAS GIVEN. This proposition is self-evident. Surely God had a law by which to govern his creatures, both angels and men, long before Sinai. But "the law," as worded in the decalogue and in "the book of the law," was not given till Moses, 2,500 years after creation. Hence moral obligation did not begin with that law, nor would it cease if that law was abolished. "All unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5:17. And "sin is the transgression of the law." Chap. 3:4. This text is used by Sabbatarians to prove that every possible sin is always a violation of the ten commandments. But, 1. "The law" is the whole Mosaic law, not merely the decalogue. 2. A correct translation entirely spoils this text for them. The word law is not in the text in the original. The revised version gives it correctly. "Sin is lawlessness." This is the true meaning of the text. Sin is lawlessness, a disregard for some law, but not necessarily always the same law. Thus: "The angels sinned." 2 Peter 2:4. But they did not violate the law of Sinai, for it was not given till thousands of years after they fell, and they were not under that law any way.

Adam "sinned" long before that law was given. So Paul says, Romans 5:12-14. Cain sinned, Genesis 4:7. The Sodomites were "sinners," Genesis 13:13, and vexed Lot with their "unlawful deeds," 2 Peter 2:8. Surely none of these violated "the law," which was not given till Moses, hundreds of years afterwards. To say that they must have violated the principles of that law is not

to the point. When the Jews killed Stephen, Acts 7:59, they violated the principles of the law of Michigan, which forbids murder; but did they violate the "law of Michigan"? No; for it was not given for 1800 years after. And they were not under it any way. So neither the angels, nor Adam, nor the Sodomites could have transgressed the law of Sinai, for it was not yet given. So Abraham kept God's laws, Genesis 26:5, but surely not "the law which was four hundred and thirty years after," Galatians 3:17. All this clearly shows that God had a law before the code of Sinai was given.

Jesus, under the gospel 1500 years later, in naming the commandments, gives them neither in the same words nor in the same order as found in the decalogue. Further, he mingles with them some precepts from the book of the law as of equal importance with the ten commandments. Thus: Do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, defraud not, honor thy father and mother. Mark 10:19. This shows that the mere form and order of the commandments is of no consequence as long as the idea is given. So the two editions of the decalogue in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 vary much in the wording; yet one is as good as the other. This shows that the exact wording is not essential. In whatever form or manner God chose to communicate his will to men, this would be "his commandments, his statutes, and his laws." Genesis 26:5. Paul says: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Hebrews 1:1-2. A disregard for his revealed will would be lawlessness - sin. But to claim that God gave the patriarchs his law in the exact form and words of the ten commandments is a proofless assumption, contrary to reason and all the facts in the case.

PROPOSITION 12. THIS ORIGINAL LAW IS SUPERIOR TO THE LAW OF SINAI. When asked "Which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus said: "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." Matthew 22:37-40. Neither of these is in the decalogue; but that law hangs on this higher law, and so is inferior to it. These principles, clad in the panoply of eternal immutability, lay back of the Mosaic law and existed with it throughout that dispensation as they had existed before and exist now. In its very nature this great law of supreme love to God, and equal love to fellow creatures, must be as eternal and everlasting as God himself. This law governs angels, governed Adam, the patriarchs, the pious Jews, while under "the law," and Gentile Christians now. It is applicable to all God's creatures, in all ages and all worlds. Idolatry, murder, theft, selfishness and "all unrighteousness," 1 John 5:17, are and always were violations of this supreme law of God. This great law might be worded in different ways at different times and yet the same essential idea be preserved. Thus Jesus stated the second great commandment in another form. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." Matthew 7:12. The idea is the same as "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The exact words or form in which this law is stated is not material so long as the idea is made plain. Evidently this supreme law must have been made known to Adam and to the patriarchs but in just what form we are not told. To say that it was in the exact words of the decalogue is to affirm what can in no wise be proved.

PROPOSITION 13. THE MOSAIC LAW WAS FOUNDED UPON THE HIGHER AND ORIGINAL LAW. Jesus directly affirms this, Matthew 22:40. "On these two commandments hangs all the law." The principles of this great law were interwoven all through the law of Sinai, being the life, "the

spirit," or "the righteousness" of "the law." Romans 2:26-29; Romans 8:4. As an example, examine Leviticus 19. Here you have the second great commandment, verse 18, and the principles of every one of the ten commandments. Thus: 1st commandment, verse 32; 2nd, verse 4; 3d, verse 12; 4th, verse 30; 5th, verse 3; 6th, verse 17; 7th, verse 29; 8th, verse 13; 9th, verse 11; 10th verse 35. Mingled among these are commandments about sacrifices, verse 5; harvest, verse 9; clothing, verse 19; priests, verse 22; first fruits, verse 23; wizards, verse 31. Gentiles, verse 34, etc. All these are founded upon this higher law and can be changed to fit circumstances without affecting the supreme law, which is ever the same. The particular wording of the law as adapted to the Jewish age was "the letter" or "form" of the law for the time being. While the spirit of the law can never change, the letter of it must change to fit the changing circumstances of God's people. If a Jew loved God with all his heart, he would have circumcised his sons, offered burnt sacrifices, paid tithes, kept the passover, the new moons, the Sabbath, and attended the temple worship, for this was "the law of the Lord." 2 Chronicles 31:3; Luke 2:22-27. But if a Christian loves God he will be baptized, Acts 2:38, take the Lord's supper, 1 Corinthians 11:24, attend church, Hebrews 10:25, keep "the Lord's day," Revelation 1:10, and do many things very different from a Jew. Hence "there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Hebrews 7:12. This is both Bible and common sense. Those who make the mere letter of the Jewish law an iron rule, and contend for the exact wording under all circumstances, and in all ages, miss the spirit of the gospel, and are in bondage to a system out of date. Galatians 3:19-25; Galatians 4:21-25; Galatians 5:1-3; Galatians 5:13-14; 2 Corinthians 3:3-15.

PROPOSITION 14. "THE LAW" OF SINAI WAS GIVEN TO RESTRAIN CRIMINALS WHO WOULD ONLY OBEY GOD THROUGH FEAR. Consider this proposition well. A failure to understand this simple fact is the cause of all the blunders of Sabbatarians and legalists in their extravagant and unscriptural praises of "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones." 2 Corinthians 3:7. On this point hear Paul state why that law was made and notice that it is of the moral precepts of the law that he speaks. "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." 1 Timothy 1:9-10. There can be no doubt that he refers to the code of Sinai, that which prohibited murder, thefts, etc. This law he says was not made for a righteous man but for the lawless. Of this law in another place Paul says: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions." Galatians 3:19. Again, "The law entered that the offense might abound." Romans 5:20, and, "until the law sin was in the world," verse 13. Hence it is manifest that sin, offense and transgression existed before "the law" was given, and that it was given to prohibit already existing crimes. Evidently God put the race on trial from Adam to Moses under the same eternal law of right and love which governed the angels and holy men. But mankind failed shamefully. They did not live by that rule. They became lawless. Disregard of God and open violence towards men were increasing, till life and property were insecure. Then God selected one nation, the Hebrews, and gave up the rest to their own ways. Romans 1:20-28.

Up to this time God's people had not been a nation by themselves but had dwelt among other nations and had been subject to their civil laws which prohibited open violence and protected life

and property. But as soon as they became a nation by themselves, it became absolutely necessary to have a national law of their own which would prohibit and punish open crime, such as murder, theft, adultery, etc. Life and property would not have been secure without this, because many among them were wicked, lawless men, "stiff-necked and rebellious." If all had been righteous, if all had loved God and their neighbors, there would have been no need of a prohibitory law with a death penalty. We can readily see the reason why Paul says "the law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless," These lawless ones would have robbed and murdered the righteous ones had there been no national, temporal law to protect them, for these, wicked men would have cared little about God's higher law, which pertains to the future judgment. But as the Jewish government was a theocracy, one in which God himself was ruler, the law required and regulated service to him as well as duties among themselves.

Hence to this nation God gave the law of Sinai. Exodus 20:2. Would it have been given if men had obeyed God without? Paul has settled that point. "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." l Tim. 1:9. Then the law was not made till man had sinned, Romans 5:13, offended, verse 20, transgressed, Galatians 3:19, and became lawless. This then is not God's original law by which he prefers to govern men. It was a law largely of prohibitions, threats, pains and penalties. Its object was to restrain open crime, protect men in their natural rights and preserve the knowledge of God in the earth till Christ should come. Galatians 3:19-25. In order to keep that nation separate from all others, many burdensome rites were incorporated into the law which made it a yoke of bondage. Acts 15:10; Galatians 5:1; Galatians 5:3. When Christ came, and the Jewish nation was rejected and dispersed, and their national law overthrown, and the gospel went to all nations, that law had served its purpose, and so passed away as a system. Matthew 5:17-18; Romans 10:4; Galatians 3:24; Hebrews 7:12-19. Now Christians are not under the Aaronic priesthood, nor the Jewish law. Hebrews 7:11-12; but are under the priesthood of Melchisedec, verses 14-19, as was Abraham our father, Genesis 14:18-20, who never had "the law" of Sinai, Galatians 3:17, but walked by the higher law which governs angels and holy men, Genesis 26:5. The Jewish law being removed, we now come under the same law by which Enoch and Abraham "walked with God." The sermon on the mount is a beautiful elucidation of that law, the rule by which all Christians should live, and by which all sinners will be judged at the judgment.

Now, as in the days before Moses, God's people are not a nation by themselves, but are scattered among all nations where they are governed and protected by the civil law of those nations. Hence the New Testament provides no civil law for the government of Christians, no temporal penalties for criminals. It would be directly contrary to the nature of the gospel to do either. All this is left to the rulers of nations wherever Christians happen to be. Open criminals, who will not obey from principle, the higher law, are now turned over to the civil magistrate. Paul makes this matter very plain and puts the question beyond dispute. Thus: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For,

for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Romans 13:1-6.

There is where you find prohibitory law for "the lawless;" that is, in the civil law of the land where they live. This punishes their crime against society. Their offenses against God's great law will be recompensed at the judgment, but the saints of God must be governed by the higher law, the law of supreme love to God and equal love to fellows. Such obedience can come only from a heart renewed by the Spirit of God, 2 Corinthians 3:3, and "if ye be led of the Spirit ye are not under the law." Galatians 5:18. Is any man a Christian who refrains from murder, theft, and adultery, simply because the law says, "Thou shalt not"? No, indeed, he must refrain from these from a higher motive than that. Then surely he must be governed by a higher law than the decalogue. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Romans 13:10. The dispute between Paul and the Judaizers then was over the nature and obligation of the Jewish law. The dispute now concerning the Jewish Sabbath involves the same point, the obligation of the letter of the Jewish law.

PROPOSITION 15. THE LETTER OF THE LAW IS NOT BINDING UPON CHRISTIANS AS A COERCIVE CODE. Little argument ought to be needed to prove this; for if the letter of the law is binding, then we must be circumcised; offer sacrifices, keep the seventh day and all the Jewish ritual, for "the law" included the whole law, Galatians 3:10; Galatians 5:3.

Notice in the following text that "the righteousness of the law" and the spirit of the law is one thing, while "the letter" and outward service is quite another. Notice further that a man may "fulfill the law" without keeping the letter of it, and thus condemn the formalist who keeps the letter of the law but not the spirit of it. Paul says: "If the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Romans 2:26-29.

Paul argues that Christians must be circumcised, but not "outwardly in the flesh," as formerly, but "inwardly in the spirit, not in the letter." By this he illustrates the difference between keeping the law now and formerly. So, further on: "Ye are not under the law but under grace." Romans 6:14. So in the next chapter he says: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Romans 7:6.

How can one misunderstand language so plain? Now, under Christ, we are delivered from the law; that law is dead, and we serve Christ in the spirit, "not in the old letter." So again he says, urging this point: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Chap. 8:4. Paul uses the word "flesh" for the outward "works of the law." See Galatians 3:2-3. We do not walk according to the outward form of the law, but we do obey the intent and spirit of it or its "righteousness," as he here calls it. The higher law of God, supreme love to God and equal love to our neighbors, upon which the Jewish law hung, was the "spirit," "righteousness," or real intent of "the law." This "first and great" law Christians do keep, while free from the mere letter of the law, which was bondage. Hence to the Galatians who were being troubled with Judaizing legalists, Paul wrote: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only

use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Galatians 5:13-14; Galatians 5:18.

How he reiterates the truth in all his letters, that Christians are not under the law; that they are called to a liberty which Jews never enjoyed. Notice how he states it over and over that all the law is fulfilled in this, Love your neighbor as yourself. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Romans 13:8; Romans 13:10. This is not a liberty to licentiousness and self-indulgence; but it is a liberty from the forms and ceremonies of the law which bound the Jews. In Jeremiah 31:3 l-34, it was foretold that the Lord would make a "new covenant" with Israel, "not according" to the one he made at Sinai; for he would put his laws in their hearts and minds. This clearly indicated a change from the previous formal way of governing God's people. Paul thus refers to that prophecy: "not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." "Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." 2 Corinthians 3:3; 2 Corinthians 3:6.

Now the law for the Christian is not that written in the book or on the tables of stone. It was not the letter but the spirit of that law which the apostles taught. So Paul says. Then he says that "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones, was" "done way." Verses 7, 11. Surely, then, Christians are free from the letter of that law; but it is still to be studied with reverence and its spirit carried out in Christian duties though in form these must differ from Jewish duties. The observance of the Lord's day meets the spirit of the fourth commandment. We are circumcised in heart, not in the flesh. Romans 2:26-29.

Rev. W.P. Harrison, D.D., book editor of the M.E. Church, South, truly says: "The coming of Christ did not repeal any moral law, and the ceremonial law was not repealed, but fulfilled. All that was permanent, useful, or spiritual in the Mosaic economy remains, NOT IN THE LETTER OF STATUTES, but in the fulfilled and completed dispensation of grace." The Christian Sabbath, page 30. So Rev. J.H. Potts, D.D. Methodist, says: Law under the Mosaic dispensation was formulated into nine moral precepts, with a Sabbath commandment added, making ten in all. This same law under the Christian dispensation is summarized under two grand heads - love to God and love to man. Yet not one jot or one tittle of the essence of the moral law is abated. When Paul, referring to the abolishment of the law dispensation, said: 'For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious,' he indicated the correct status of the law. The ESSENCE of the moral law 'remaineth.'" This is exactly what I believe. The following, from Peter, is a fair illustration of the spiritual application of the old law which the apostles make all through the gospel: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 2:5. The old temple, priesthood, and sacrifices of the law, now have a spiritual meaning as found in the church and its service.

PROPOSITION 16. THE LAW WAS CHANGED. Jeremiah predicted that under the new covenant, God's law would be written in the heart and not as it was before. "I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." Jeremiah 31:33. Paul refers to this when he says, Ye are our epistle "written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Corinthians 3:3. So then God's law is not now written on tables of stone as at Sinai. This is a square contradiction to what Adventists teach. They claim that God's law is still

on stones in heaven the same as of old. Paul says no, it is written by the spirit upon the heart. This implied a radical change in the form of the law and the way it was to be taught. In Hebrews 7:12, it is expressly declared that "there is made of necessity a change also of the law." The letter of the Jewish law is wholly unfitted to the condition of the Christian church. It can only be a guide to us as modified and interpreted by the gospel. But in the gospel there is no injunction to keep the seventh day. Hence the letter of that command does not concern us.

PROPOSITION 17. THE WHOLE MOSAIC SYSTEM ENDED AT THE CROSS. Surely this is so plainly taught all through the New Testament that no one should deny it. But we have clearly proved that "the law" included the whole code of laws given to Israel at Sinai, moral, civil, and ceremonial precepts, decalogue and all. That entire system of law was framed to fit the Jewish age and could not possibly be applied to Gentile Christians in all parts of the world. Hence a "new way," Hebrews 10:20, a "new covenant," Hebrews 8:13, a new "ministration," 2 Corinthians 3:8, was introduced, so there was "made of necessity a change also of the law," Hebrews 7:12.

Examine carefully a few texts to which I will refer. "The law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17. This implies a change. "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Romans 6:14. "Under the merciful dispensation of the gospel." John Wesley. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster," Galatians 3:24-25. "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ," Romans 7:4. "Now we are delivered from the law," verse 6. "Christ is the end of the law," Romans 10:4. "The ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious." "That which is done away was glorious," 2 Corinthians 3:7; 2 Corinthians 3:10. That ends the decalogue.

"Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," Ephesians 2:15. "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 the cross." "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days," Colossians 2:14; Colossians 2:16, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." "For the law made nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope." Hebrews 7:12; Hebrews 7:18-19.

Read Acts 15:1-29 and see this whole matter of "the law" discussed by the apostles and settled in these words: "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." Verse 24. The, decision is positive and clear: the apostles gave no commandment to "keep the law." It does not say "ceremonial law," or a part of the law, but simply "the law." Adventists say we must keep the law or "ye can not be saved," exactly what those Judaizers said, verse 1, and just what the council condemned. Circumcision was specially mentioned because it was the initiatory rite, the sign which represented the whole law. Thus when a Gentile would partake of the privileges of the nation, he had first to be circumcised. Exodus 12:48. To be uncircumcised was to be a heathen, unclean, and lost; to be circumcised was to be an Israelite, a member of the holy nation. Hence circumcision represented the whole law of Moses in all its parts. Elder Butler, Adventist leader, has to confess this. He says: "The term 'the law,'

among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical, and civil. This as a system these Judaizing teachers desired to maintain. Circumcision was a sign of the whole." Law in Galatians, page 70. Never was a truer statement. Circumcision was the sign of the whole Mosaic system, moral, typical, civil, all that was written in the five books of Moses, of which the decalogue was a chief part. The apostles decided that Gentile believers were free from this whole system of law. Put with Butler's statement this from Elder Smith, another leading Adventist, and you have the whole truth: "That which was abolished at the cross was an entire system. God did not single out and abolish portions and pieces of some arrangement or system, and leave other parts remaining." Synopsis of Present Truth, page 259. Correct; the whole system ended at the cross.

PROPOSITION 18. NO PART OF GOD'S GREAT SPIRITUAL LAW WAS ABOLISHED, RE-ENACTED, OR CHANGED AT THE CROSS. Adventists make a great ado over the absurdity of the idea that God should abolish his law at the cross and then immediately re-enact nine-tenths of it. They say, as well cut off your ten fingers to get rid of one bad one and then stick nine on again. So they go on with a whole jumble of absurdities involved in the position that God's moral law was abolished at the cross and a new one given. But this is only a man of straw of their own making and hence easily demolished. We hold no such absurd position. God's great moral law is unchangeable. But the Mosaic law was only a national one founded upon the principles of God's moral law. Even while it existed it did not supersede God's higher law, and when it ended it in no way affected God's law, which continued right on unchanged and unchangeable. To illustrate: The state law of Michigan forbids murder, theft and adultery. In these items it is founded upon God's moral law. Now abolish the law of Michigan. Does that abolish God's law? No. So with the state law of Israel. Neither its enactment on Sinai nor its abolition at the cross in any way changed God's great moral law by which he will judge the world. The Advent absurdities grew out of their own false theory, that is all. Adventists agree with us that the law of Moses, Acts 15:5, was abolished. Well, that law contained many precepts as purely moral as anything in the decalogue. Here are some: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." Deuteronomy 6:5. "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another." Leviticus 19:11; Leviticus 19:18. Scores of such precepts are all through this law which they admit was abolished. They are just as moral, spiritual, and necessary as anything in the ten commandments, and yet all this law was abolished as they admit. But did that abolish the duty enjoined in these precepts? No, because they were inherent in a higher law. Just so every moral principle involved in the decalogue existed in a higher law before that document was given, and so did not cease when that law expired. Elder White himself makes this admission: "The ten commandments are adapted to fallen beings. As worded in the sacred Scripture, they are not adapted to the condition of holy angels, nor to man in his holy estate in Eden. * * * But the two grand principles of God's moral government did exist before the fall, in the form of law. * * * These two great commandments embrace all that is required by the ten precepts of the decalogue." Law and Gospel, pages 4, 5. Good and true. Then the ten commandments are not God's primary law. They are only temporary, while that containing all that is moral in them, and much more, continues always.

"The teachings of Christianity are facts and principles, not propositions and restrictions; its institutions are simple outlines, not precise ceremonies; and its laws are moral sentiments, not minute mechanical directions." Pulpit Commentary on 2 Corinthians 3:6. This is the truth well put.

So the wicked who do not live by these principles, who do not love God nor their fellows, but who live selfish, corrupt lives, will be judged and condemned by these principles of God’s eternal law, as taught in the New Testament.

02.18. Chapter 18 - The Decalogue Examined

Chapter 18 - The Decalogue Examined

With Seventh-Day Adventists the decalogue is the one supreme moral and spiritual law of God, than which there is none higher. It is the law which governs the angels in heaven. Thus Mrs. White says: "The law of God existed before man was created. The angels were governed by it. After Adam and Eve were created, God made known to them his law." "Spirit of Prophecy," Vol. I, page 261. It governs all men in all ages, and in the world to come. These ten commandments cover the whole duty of man, so that there is no sin which can be committed that is not a violation of this law, while at the same time it enjoins every virtue. "No virtue known to the moral world herein fails of approval and commendation; and no vice or crime of which man was ever guilty, escapes condemnation." Perfection of the Ten Commandments, page 4. But these claims are extravagant and unfounded. A desire to sustain the seventh-day Sabbath has led to this false position on the decalogue. Twenty-five hundred years, nearly half the entire history of the world, passed away before the decalogue was given at all, as we have proved. This is strange if the decalogue is so all important.

Let us examine it. Moses says distinctly that all the words which the Lord spoke were written on the tables of stone: "And the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone, written with the finger of God: and on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spake with you in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire." Deuteronomy 9:10. This text is too decisive to be evaded. All that God spoke was written on the tables and was a part of the decalogue. Here are the first of those words: "And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me," etc. Exodus 20:1-3. These words are as much a part of the decalogue as any of the rest of it. They were spoken by God from heaven, written by his finger, were engraven on the stone, and put in the ark. Now look at the law chart which Seventh-Day Adventists hang up as the "law of God." Are these words on there? No, indeed. Why are they left off ? Because, if put on, they would spoil their whole theory of that law. They claim that this law is binding upon the angels. But how would this sound to the angels: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage"? Were the angels in bondage in Egypt? Would not that sound a little queer to Gabriel and the seraphs, to be told that they had been in bondage in Egypt? Read it to Adam. That would have been news to him to learn that he had been in bondage in Egypt! Read it to a free-born American; read it to all the redeemed hosts in heaven. To whom are the words applicable? Just to the Jewish nation and to no others. For them the decalogue was framed and to them it was given. For years I searched to find one text stating that this law was ever given to any people but the Jews. I never found it. These first words show plainly that it was addressed only to them.

Seventh-Day Adventists assert that the Sabbath precept is the only thing in the decalogue that tells who gave it. Thus: "Aside from this precept [the Sabbath] there is nothing in the decalogue to

show by whose authority the law is given." Mrs. White, in Great Controversy, page 284. This is not true. The introductory words tell plainly who gave it. It was the God who brought them out of Egypt. Here are the name, signature and seal of that law in the first words of it. Here God stands before them as their *Deliverer*, rather than as their *Creator*. Their obedience to these commands is based upon this fact. See how plain it is. I am the Lord thy God that brought thee out of Egypt, therefore thou shalt do thus and so. Egypt, not Eden, is pointed to. In the copy of the decalogue as given in Deuteronomy 5:6-21, there is no reference whatever to creation, while deliverance from Egypt is made prominent. "To extend it further than its own preface is to violate the rules of criticism."

What an unnatural and unheard of thing it would be, in giving an important document, to sign the, name of the author in the middle of it, as Sabbatarians say the Lord did in giving the decalogue! In our time the name is signed at the close of a document; but anciently, specially among the Jews, the name of the author was, always given first, in the first sentence of the document. Thus: "Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra," etc. Ezra 7:12. The vision of Isaiah," etc. Isaiah 1:1. "The words of Jeremiah," etc. Jeremiah 1:1. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ," etc. Romans 1:1. "James, a servant of God," etc. James 1:1. "Peter, an apostle," etc. 1 Peter 1:1. So it is all through the Bible, the name and authority are given first, then follows the body of the document. Just so the Lord, according to this ancient custom then in use and familiar to all, in giving the decalogue first announces his name, "the Lord thy God," and his power, "that brought thee out of Egypt." This he does in the opening words of that law. Here, then, in the very first words of the decalogue, and not in the Sabbath precept in the middle of the law, is the name, sign and seal of the law-giver. Jehovah, who brought them out of Egypt. This settles it that this law was not given till then, was given only to the Jews and was designed for no others. To illustrate: Opening to a law passed by the legislature of Michigan, February 16, 1882, I read: "Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the state of Michigan," etc. Now suppose that some one should claim that this law was passed one thousand years ago and was designed for the whole world. Would not these opening words show that this law was not enacted till Michigan became a state and that it was designed only for the people of Michigan? Assuredly. Just so the opening words of the decalogue show that this law was not given till God brought Israel out of Egypt, that it was given to them and to no others. If any one will find a copy of the decalogue before this time, we will give up the case. All the way through it there are evidences that it was worded to fit only the Jewish nation in their peculiar circumstances.

Take the Sabbath commandment: "Thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Exodus 20:10. Think of that commandment being given to angels in Heaven! "Sons," "daughters," and "thy neighbor’s wife," verse 17, when they neither marry nor are given in marriage! Again: "Cattle," "ox," "ass," etc. Do the angels own cattle and work oxen and asses in heaven? So "man servants and maid servants." This means bond servants or slaves, such as the Hebrews owned in those days. This is shown by the tenth commandment, verse 17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass." These were his property, servants or slaves, oxen, asses, etc. But do the angels own slaves? Did Adam have servants in Eden? Will the redeemed own them hereafter? What nonsense to apply this law to the angels and to Eden and to heaven! This wording was specially adapted to the social condition of the Jews as a nation in the land of

Canaan, and to no others.

Once more: "Thy stranger that is within thy gates." Verse 10. As everybody knows, "the stranger" was the Gentile. "Within thy gates" was a common expression meaning within your cities or dwelling in your land. It has no reference to living on your farm or inside the gates that enclose your farm, as Adventists always explain it. The towns were walled in and entered by gates. Here is where the judges sat and all business was done. Thus: "All that went in at the gate of his city." Genesis 23:10. "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates." Deuteronomy 16:18. To this custom of the Jews the Sabbath commandment refers. All the Gentiles dwelling in their cities among them must be made to keep the Sabbath. This shows it to be a national law, worded in all its parts to fit the circumstances of the Jews at the time. This command, then, could not apply to any but the Jews there. Again, the fifth commandment: "The land which the Lord giveth them," verse 12, plainly refers to Canaan, which God gave them. The ninth precept: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbors" This does not relate to lying in general, but only to a false oath against a neighbor in court. See Deuteronomy 19:15-19. A man could tell a hundred lies which would not be false witness against a neighbor. The command against lying is found in Leviticus 19:11 : "Neither lie one to another." This is a moral precept much broader than the ninth commandment.

Every principle contained in the decalogue is also found time and again laid down in the law of Moses, either in the same or similar words. Thus, for example: Leviticus 19 reiterates every principle found in the ten commandments, with many more besides. How erroneous, then, to call one the moral law and the other the ceremonial law, when both are of the same nature, the decalogue simply being representative precepts from the law of Moses. But the chief argument used to prove the superior nature of the ten commandments is that they were spoken by God’s voice, written by His finger on stone, and placed in the ark, while all the rest of the law was written by the hand of Moses in a book. Why were these commandments thus selected out and given in such a manner if not to exalt them above all others? The answer is easy: According to the custom of those times, any solemn contract or covenant was commemorated by selecting some object as witness or testimony of it. Thus: Jacob erected a pillar as a witness of his vow to God. Genesis 28:18. Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones as witness of their covenant. Genesis 31:48. Abraham set apart seven lambs as "a witness" of his covenant with Abimelech. Genesis 21:27-30.

Just so when the solemn covenant was made between God and Israel at Sinai, the Lord gave them the tables of stone to be always kept as a witness or "testimony" of that agreement. Hence they are called "the tables of testimony," that is, witness. Exodus 31:18. So the tabernacle was "the tabernacle of testimony," Numbers 1:53; or, "the tabernacle of witness," Numbers 17:7. These tables of stone, then, containing some of the chief items of the law, were always to be kept as "witness" of the covenant which Israel had made to keep that law. Evidently this is the reason why the decalogue was given as it was, and not because it was a perfect and eternal law in and of itself.

Manifestly it would have been impossible to carry around the whole law if written on stones; hence only a few samples out of that law could have been selected and put on stones to be kept as a witness of that covenant. So the reason why God spoke these words was not because it was a perfect law, but to impress their minds so that they never would forget it. This is just what God

says himself: "I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live." Deuteronomy 4:10. How much more simple and manifest these reasons are than the imaginary ones invented by Sabbatarians. That the decalogue was merely the national law for the Jews and temporal in its obligation, is proved by the fact that stoning to death was the penalty for its violation. When death was thus inflicted upon a man, he had paid the penalty of that law, and all the penalty there was. But is stoning to death the penalty for God's moral law? No, that is eternal death at the judgment. A man who is hung for murder has paid the penalty of the law of our land, the same as the Jew who was stoned paid the penalty of the law of his land. Will God judge a man the second time at the judgment by the law of our land after he has once paid its penalty by hanging? No, but he will be judged by another and a higher law, the great spiritual law of God. And so it will be with the Jews. They will never be judged the second time by the decalogue, for that was only national, but by the higher law, the one that requires supreme love to God, and love to man as to himself. A law without a penalty is a nullity; but stoning, the penalty attached to the decalogue, was abolished at the cross; hence the law must have ceased there too.

Seventh-Day Adventists claim that the ten commandments are a perfect law, condemning every possible sin and requiring every possible virtue. But this is all assumption and contrary to the manifest truth. Which one of the ten commandments condemns pride, boasting, drunkenness, unthankfulness, love of pleasure, anger, filthy talk, impatience, variance, selfishness, and the like? Which one of the ten commandments requires us to feed the poor, to visit the fatherless and the widow, to suffer long and be kind, to be gentle, meek, temperate, to pray, to repent, to go to meeting, to forgive, and the like? No, the, decalogue does no such thing, because it was made for no such purpose. It was merely prohibitory in its nature. The man who merely did nothing, who simply avoided crime, kept that law. But the law of God, by which a Christian must live, requires him to do, and to do much. He must love God, love his neighbor, love his enemies, visit the widow and the needy, suffer wrong, be patient, entertain strangers, and be active in every good work.

It requires unceasing activity and the consecration of all our energies to good works; but the decalogue requires nothing but to avoid open crime. The decalogue alone is never called the law of God, nor the law of the Lord, nor a perfect law, nor is it said that any one will be judged by it, or that it is binding on Christians. The Catholic Division Of The Decalogue

Seventh-Day Adventists have made a great ado over the way Catholics divide and number the ten commandments. They have gotten up a chart showing in one column the decalogue "as changed by the pope" and in another as "given by God." Here they show how "the pope has changed God's law in fulfillment of Daniel 7:25." According to this, the Catholics included in the first commandment what we have in the first two. Then our third is their second, our fourth their third, and so on till our tenth of which they make two. Adventists claim that the pope did this to get rid of the second commandment and to change the Sabbath. But the whole thing is utterly false, as may be seen under the word decalogue in any religious encyclopedia. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "There have been three arrangements of the decalogue--the Talmudic (Jewish), the Augustinian (adopted by the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches), and the Hellenistic (Greek), the view of Philo, Josephus, Origen, the Greek and Reformed churches, etc. The following table exhibits the differences, the record in Exodus 20 being used.

TALMUDIC. -------- 1. I am the Lord, etc.(v.2) 2. Against Idols and Images,(1-6). 3. Blasphemy. 4. The Sabbath. 5. Filial Obedience. 6. Murder. 7. Adultery. 8. Theft. 9. False Witness. 10. Coveting.

HELLENISTIC ---------- 1. Against Idols, (v.3). 2. Against Images, (4-6). 3. Blasphemy. 4. The Sabbath. 5. Filial Obedience 6. Murder. 7. Adultery. 8. Theft. 9. False witness. 10. Coveting.

AUGUSTINIAN ---------- 1. Against Idols and Images (3-6). 2. Blasphemy 3. The Sabbath. 4. Filial Obedience. 5. Murder. 6. Adultery. 7. Theft. 8. False witness. 9. Thou shalt not covet they neighbors h. (17) 10. The rest of v. 17.

It will be seen here that the Catholics have simply followed the early fathers in this, while we have followed the Greeks. The pope had nothing to do with making this division of the commandments. It will be seen that according to the Talmudic (Jewish) division, which is the oldest of all, the first commandment is the words, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt," etc. The Jews, the Catholics, and the Lutherans include in their first commandment the introductory words, "I am the Lord thy God," &c., just as all should do, for these are the most important words of all, for they tell who gave that law. Adventists expunge these to save their theory. Thus, as I learned more, I began to see on every hand how the arguments of the Adventists were fallacious and contrary to history and to facts.

Eminent Authors On The Decalogue

Many of the most eminent, devout and learned men of the church have held that the decalogue was abolished, though they were far from being Antinomians.

Among these were the apostolical fathers, Luther, Calvin, Milton, Baxter, Bunyan, Doddridge, Whately, Grotius, Locke, Sherlock, Watts, Hessey, Judson, George Dana Boardman, and a host of such men. Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, says: "The law promulgated on Horeb is now old and belongs to yourselves (Jews) alone: but this is for all universally. Now law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it." Dialogue with Trypho, Chap. 11. On this Elder Andrew says: "That Justin held to the abrogation of the ten commandments is also manifested." Testimony of the Fathers, page 43.

Tertullian, A. D. 200, says: "The abolition of the ancient law we fully admit." Against Marcian, Book 5. Chap. 2. On the law he quotes Colossians 2:16, and says: "The apostle here teaches clearly how it has been abolished." Ibid. Chap. 19.

Luther says: "The ten commandments do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt. If he says no, then say: 'How, then, does Moses concern me, since he speaks (in the ten words) to the people that have been brought out of Egypt.' In the New Testament Moses comes to an end and his laws lose their force." See Kitto's Cyclopedia, Article Law. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, says: "In its individual, or what is usually called its 'moral' aspect, the Law bore equally the stamp of transitoriness. It seems clear enough that its formal, coercive authority as a whole, ended with the close of the Jewish dispensation." Art. Law.

Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, says: "They [Christ and the apostles] even clearly indicate that the moral law is by no means excepted when they speak of the abolition of the law in general." Art. Law. The recent popular commentary of Jamison, Faussett and Brown, says: "The law

(including especially the moral law wherein lay the chief difficulty in obeying) is abrogated to the believer as far as it was a compulsory, accusing code." On Colossians 2:16. The Encyclopedia Britannica says: "The ten commandments do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews." On the Ten Commandments.

Says Dr. Dobbs, Baptist: "Nor is this 'new and dangerous teaching.' It was the doctrine of the Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century. Calvin argues in this strain in his Institutes. The eminent Baptist scholar and commentator, John Gill, says, writing on Exodus 20:1-2 : 'Verse 2 shows that this body of laws was delivered out to the people of Israel, and primarily belongs to them; for of no other people can the above things be said.' On Matthew 5:17, and 2 Corinthians 3:7-11, Gill is emphatic in similar reaching. Read this, on the latter passage: 'The law is that which is done away; not merely the ceremonial law, or the judicial law; but the whole ministry of Moses; and particularly the law of the decalogue.' I close by citing an incident related by Mrs. Emily C. Judson, in the Life of Adoniram Judson, by his son, Dr. Edward Judson. Mrs. Judson says that her husband once reproved her for introducing some lessons from the Old Testament into her Bible classes, 'comparing it to groping among shadows when she might just as well have the noonday sun.' Mrs. Judson in relating this incident, says: 'My impression, drawn from many a long talk, is that he considered the Old Testament as the Scriptures given to the Jews especially, and to them only. He did not like the distinction commonly drawn between the moral and the ceremonial law, and sometimes spoke with an earnestness amounting to severity, of the constant use made of the ten commandments by Christians. He thought the Old Testament very important as explanatory and corroborative of the New -- as a portion of the inspiration which came from God, etc., but binding on Christians only so far as repeated in the New Testament. He used to speak of the Mosaic law as fulfilled in Christ, and so having no further power whatever; and to say that we have no right to pick out this as moral, and therefore obligatory, and the other as ceremonial and no longer demanding obedience. Practically, we had nothing to do with the Old Testament law."' Life of Judson, pages 411,412.

Rev. George Dana Boardman, D. D., the eminent Baptist divine, in his recent book on "The Ten Commandments," says: "Although the decalogue, in its spirit, is for all lands and ages, yet, in its letter, it was evidently for the Jews. The very preamble proves the assertion: 'God spake all these words, saying: I am Jehovah, thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.' Then follow the ten commandments, based on the unique fact that Jehovah was the covenant God of Israel." Pages 127-130.

John Milton says: "With regard to the doctrine of those who consider the decalogue as a code of universal morality, I am at a loss to understand how such an opinion should ever have prevailed; these commandments being evidently nothing more than a summary of the whole Mosaic law as the fourth is of the whole ceremonial law; which therefore can contain nothing applicable to the gospel worship." Treatise on Christian Doctrine, Vol. 1, Book 2, Chap. 7.

02.19. Chapter 19 - The Two Covenants

Chapter 19 - The Two Covenants

No other subject perplexes Adventists so much as the covenants. They dread to meet it. They have tried various ways to explain it away, but they are not satisfactory even to themselves. I have been there and know. "The abolition of the Sinatic covenant carries with it the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath so completely that no authoritative trace of it can be found this side of the grave of our risen Lord."

Elder Smith says: "If the ten commandments constituted the old covenant, then they are forever gone." "This, therefore, becomes a test question." Two Covenants, page 5. We will soon see the force of this. Jeremiah 31:31-32, says: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." Here we learn these facts about the first, or old covenant: 1. It was made between God and Israel. 2. It was made when he brought them out of Egypt. 3. A new covenant is to be made. 4. It will not be according to the old one. Adventists and all agree that this old covenant is found in Exodus 19-24. We all know that the ten commandments, how and why they were given, are the prominent things in those five chapters. We also know that they are called "the covenant," that was given on Sinai or Horeb. Thus: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. 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." "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." Deuteronomy 4:12-13; Deuteronomy 5:2-3. Then follows the ten commandments as the covenant named. Again: "The tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you." Deuteronomy 9:9. So also, "and he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Exodus 34:28. Surely this is plain enough for a common man. What is a covenant? Webster says: "A mutual consent or agreement of two or more persons to do or forbear some act or thing; a contract." As the decalogue alone is not a mutual agreement, it must enter into, and so become a part of, some agreement, to be called the covenant as it is so frequently. Examining, we find that the decalogue was the very basis of the covenant at Sinai; the chief thing in the covenant between God and Israel. This even Elder Smith owns: "It was the basis of the whole arrangement." The Two Covenants, page 10. Being the chief thing in the covenant, it is by way of eminence put for the whole and so called "the covenant."

Opening to Exodus 19, we read: "In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai." Verse 1. It was at Sinai as they came out of Egypt. Moses was mediator. Verse 3. The Lord sends him to say to Israel "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine." Verse. 5. Moses goes and repeats this offer to

the Jews: they say: "All that the Lord hath said we will do." Verse 8. Here was an agreement, a covenant, between God and Israel. They agree to obey his voice. He agrees to bless them. Next they prepare to hear his voice. Verses 9-25. In Chap. 20 God speaks the ten commandments and follows them with various precepts through Moses to the end of chapter 23, closing with a promise to bless their bread and water, to take away sickness from them, to drive out the Canaanites and give them the land. Chapter 24:1-8, relates how Moses then rehearsed to the people "all the words of the Lord and all the judgments." Again they agree to obey. Verse 3. Then "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord" in a book. Verse 4. Assembling the people again, he read "the book of the covenant" to them, and the third time they say, "All that the Lord hath said we will do." Verse 7. "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, 'behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.' Verse 8. That closed the covenant. We know that this was the first, or old, covenant, for Paul, quoting this very verse, says it was. Hebrews 9:18-20. That settles it.

How much did the covenant embrace? Only one truthful answer can be given, viz. All included in the record from Exodus 19:1 to Exodus 24:8, for this is the covenant in detail written out. Is the decalogue included in it? As well deny that the sun shines, for there it is written out in full in the very heart of the covenant. Exodus 20:1-17. As Smith said above, "It was the basis of the whole arrangement." It was so prominent a part of the covenant that it alone is put for the whole covenant, as we often speak of seeing a vessel, a house, or a river, when we saw only a part of it. Hence the stones on which the decalogue was written are called "the tables of the covenant," Deuteronomy 9:9; the, book in which it was written was called "the book of the covenant," Exodus 24:7; the ark in which it was deposited was called "the ark of the covenant," Deuteronomy 31:26. But Exodus 19-24, is only an epitome of the covenant; for all the subsequent teachings of Moses are only a further explanation of it and belonged to it. Indeed, it gave its name to the whole Old Testament, that is, Old Covenant. This covenant was only national and temporal, given only to the Jews and referred only to earthly blessings. It made no reference to the future life. Dr. Scott says: "The national covenant with Israel was here meant. It was an engagement of God, to give Israel possession of Canaan," etc. "It did not refer to the final salvation of individuals." On Exodus 19:5.

Now notice how plainly and how repeatedly the ten commandments are called "the covenant," which God gave at Sinai to Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.

"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." Deuteronomy 4:13.

"When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you." Deuteronomy 9:9. What covenant was on the tables of stone? The one the Lord made with them. Again he tells when it was made and what it was: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount), saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before me." Deuteronomy 5:2-7. So he goes on giving the ten commandments. That ought to settle it. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words:

for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And 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." Exodus 34:27-28. If that is not plain enough, what would be?

"There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt."

"And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." 1 Kings 8:9-21.

"And in it have I put the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, that he made with the children of Israel." 2 Chronicles 6:11. This shuts off all possible doubt as to what the covenant was. 1) There was nothing in the ark except the tables of stone. 2) Yet in that ark was "the covenant of the Lord which he made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt." That certainly was the ten commandments. Elder Smith says: "If the ten commandments constituted the old covenant, then they are forever gone." Two Covenants, page 5. So they are indeed as we will now see. That Covenant Is Done Away As we have seen, Jeremiah, Chap. 31:31-34, foretold that the Lord would make a new covenant not according to the old one. Paul quotes this in full and says it is fulfilled in the gospel, thus: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Hebrews 8:6-13.

Notice the points in this. 1. Jesus is mediator of a better covenant than the old. Verse 6. Then we have something better than the decalogue. 2. The new is established on better promises than the old, which as we have seen, were all temporal. See Exodus 23:22-33. But the promises of the new covenant are all spiritual. They are (1) God’s laws are to be in their hearts. (2) All shall know the Lord, as only converted souls will be admitted; whereas under the old, every member of the nation, good or bad, was a citizen. (3) God will forgive and forget all their sins, and so they will all be saints and heirs of heaven. (4.) Paul says that if the first covenant had been faultless, no place would have been sought for a second. This shows that the first covenant was always imperfect. Hence the Lord says he will make a new one, not according to the old one. Then we cannot have the old decalogue right over again unchanged. Finally, Paul says the first is made old and is ready to vanish away. That ends the old covenant, the one from Sinai, the ten commandments as we have proved. In 2 Corinthians 3 Paul makes it even plainer still that the decalogue has been

removed.

Verse 3. "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. 6. Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament [covenant] not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. 7. But 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; 8. How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? 9. For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. 11. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. 13. And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: 14. But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which vail is done away in Christ."

Observe the following points: 1. Verse 3 refers to the prophecy of Jeremiah that a new covenant would supercede the old one on stones. Now Paul says it is not written with ink as the law of Moses was in a book, nor on stones as the decalogue was, but by the spirit in the heart. The law in the book and on stones have both gone. 2. Verse 6: he says the apostles do not minister the letter but the spirit. "The letter refers exclusively to *the law*." "The context shows that by the letter he meant the old covenant and by the spirit the new." Pulpit Commentary, pages 59-80. 3. To put it beyond all doubt, as to what he means, Paul, in verse 7, specifies "the ministration of death *written* and *engraven in stones*." Surely we know that this was the decalogue. This he calls "the ministration of death." 4. In verses 8 and 9 he calls the gospel "the ministration of the spirit" and "the ministration of righteousness" and says that it exceeds in glory the old ministration of death. 5. To put it beyond doubt that he means the decalogue, he refers to the vail which Moses put over his face when he came down with the tables of stone in his hands. Compare verse 13 with Exodus 34:27 to Exodus 35:6. Twice Paul directly names that which was "written in stone," verses 3 and 7; once he says we do not minister the letter, verse 6; he says that that which was engraven in stones was the ministration of death, verse 7, and the "ministration of condemnation," verse 9; then he says this was "abolished," verse 13, and three times he says it "was done away," verses 7, 11, 14. 7. Compare verses 7 and 11. "The ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious" and "that which is done away was glorious;" the very thing which was written in stones in verse 7, is said to "be done away" in verse 11. 8. In verse 7 the ten commandments are evidently taken to represent the whole Mosaic dispensation. If these, the foundation of the whole system, are removed, then of course all the system must go with them. "The ten commandments thus written here represent the whole Mosaic economy." Notes of Am. Tract Society on verse 7.

Adventists have tried to save their theory here by saying that in verse 7, "ministration" was not what was "engraven" in stones; but that "death" is what was written there. This will not do. In the Greek the word for engraven exactly agrees with *ministration* but does not agree with *death*, hence the decalogue is what is called "the ministration," and that was done away. Dr. Clarke says on this verse: "Here the apostle evidently intends the law." "This ministration of death, the ten commandments, written on stones, a part of the Mosaic institution, being put for the whole, was glorious." The Pulpit Commentary on this verse says: "Literally, *engraved in* letters on stones (Exodus 31:18). The reference shows that, in speaking of 'the letter,' St. Paul was only thinking of

the Mosaic Law, and indeed, specifically of the decalogue." "The ministration of death was written and engraven on stone in the form of ten commandments." Read with verse 7 Exodus 31:18; Exodus 32:16. "Tables of stone *written* with the finger of God." "The writing of God, graven upon the tables." How can a candid man deny that Paul meant this very thing, the decalogue? To the Galatians Paul also writes that the covenant of Sinai has gone. It will be seen that he uses "covenant" and "law" as synonymous, showing that the law was the covenant.

"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." Galatians 4:21-24. Here the old law covenant of Sinai is declared to be "bondage" and he says "Be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Chap. 5:1. So in Hebrews 12:18-24, Paul distinctly says that Christians do not go to Sinai and the thunders of the law, but they come to Jesus and the new covenant. Read it all. Here are a few sentences: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest. And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake: But ye are come unto Mount Sion. And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant."

Adventists are always dwelling upon the terrible scenes at Sinai at the giving of the law and pointing others there; but Paul says, No, do not go there; but to Mount Sion, to Jesus and the new covenant. So Jeremiah predicted the rejection of the covenant in the ark and that instead of it, men would seek to the name of the Lord at Jerusalem where the gospel went forth.

"In those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, the ark of the, covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more. At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem." Jeremiah 3:16-17.

Adventists are trying to revive the very thing the Lord said should be forgotten, "the ark of the covenant." All their study and worship is centered around that just as of old with the Jews. But the effort is vain. God has said it. Since the cross Jesus and Jerusalem have been where all eyes have turned while the ark and old covenant are forgotten, just as the Lord said it would be. So Isaiah 2:3; "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." There is where we now go for the law, not to the ark or to Sinai.

02.20. Chapter 20 - What Law Are Christians Under

Chapter 20 - What Law Are Christians Under

What Law Are Christians Under? When God speaks, is it not sin to disobey? Surely it is. Paul says: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son." Hebrews 1:1-2. This says that God hath spoken to men in various ways at different times. No matter in what way God's will was expressed, it would have been sin to disobey. "If the law of Sinai is gone, then there is no law, no sin," say Adventists. Indeed, then it is impossible for God to reveal his will to men, except in those exact words, letter for letter! Who believes such an absurdity? The whole controversy is reduced to simply this: Has God in the New Testament, plainly and fully revealed his will to men and told them what is right and what is wrong? Is the will of God revealed through his Son in the New Testament higher authority than the Old Testament, or is it not? Are the teachings of the New Testament to be modified to harmonize with the letter of the law in the Old Testament, or are the precepts of the Old Testament to be modified to harmonize with the gospel? The latter, certainly. But the gospel nowhere enjoins the seventh day.

Then is not the word of the Lord Jesus Christ law? Could there be any higher law? Said Jesus, "I and my Father are one," John 10:30, and "All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." John 5:23. Then the words of Christ are to be honored as highly as the words of God. They are law the same as God's words are. God promised to raise up Christ and put his words in his mouth, and he should speak as God commanded him, Deuteronomy 18:18. Jesus said his Father sent him and commanded him what to say, John 12:49-50. "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day," verse 48. Then we shall be judged by the teachings of Christ, not by the old law. Christians will be judged by the gospel. "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." Romans 2:16. God said, "Hear ye him," Matthew 17:5. All authority in heaven and in earth is given to him, Matthew 28:18. "He taught them as one having authority," Matthew 7:29. He has a law, Galatians 6:2. "Fulfill the law of Christ." "The isles shall wait for his law." Isaiah 42:4. We are under his law, 1 Corinthians 9:21. "Under law to Christ," Revised Version, "Under Christ's law," Diaglott. "Under the law of the Messiah," Syriac. The grandest summary of moral and religious truth the world ever heard was the sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5-7. It is as much superior to the decalogue as gospel is superior to Judaism. Here Christ forbids murder, Matthew 5:21-22; adultery, Matthew 5:27-28; swearing, Matthew 5:34; hypocrisy, Matthew 6:1-5; covetousness, Matthew 6:19-34; and every wrong act, Matthew 7:12. Would it not be sin to disobey the precepts of Christ?

Jesus gave commandments to his disciples, Acts 1:2, and commanded them to teach them to all nations. Matthew 28:18-20. We are to keep his commandments. John 14:15; John 14:21; John 15:10. Then would it not be sin to break them? Who dare deny it? "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God," Ephesians 1:1, said, "Put away lying," "sin not," and "steal no more," Ephesians 4:25-28, and, "The things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1

Corinthians 14:37. And yet Adventists will say, that if the old law is gone, there are no commandments against lying, stealing, etc. We know better, as the above teaches. Indeed Paul says, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you," "for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 20:20; Acts 20:27. Every sin of which the human heart is guilty, is plainly forbidden in the New Testament over and over by the authority of Christ and his apostles, as all know. Yet nothing condemns sin but the decalogue! The spirit of the Mosaic law, every moral principle in it, is reiterated over and over in the gospel, with all the authority of the Son of God. Not a Christian duty can be named which is not taught in the New Testament. Not a single thing is forbidden by the Old Testament which it would be wrong for a Christian to do, which is not also forbidden in the New, in some form. Excepting the Sabbath, the other nine commandments are in the New Testament, either in the same words or in substance.

Then is the Old Testament to be thrown away? God forbid. It should be received as the inspired word of God, a mine of precious truth; but it must be studied in the light of the New Testament, and modified by it. Nothing should be required of Christians simply because it is found in the law of the Old Testament. To bind our consciences, it must be required by the New Testament. Here the seventh day fails entirely, for there is no requirement in all the New Testament to keep it; but its abrogation is plainly taught.

"The Commandments Of God" In The New Testament

Seventh-Day Adventists have much to say about "the commandments of God," Revelation 14:12, and claim that these are the ten commandments. With them "the commandments" always means just the decalogue, nothing more. Wherever they find this term they thus apply it. But such a position is wholly erroneous. There are over 800 texts where the phrase, "the commandments," in its various forms is used. I have carefully examined every one of them. I find that it is a general term for all the requirements of the Bible. According to my best judgment, in forty-nine cases out of fifty it means something more than the ten commandments. Let the reader examine the following texts:

Leviticus 22 refers wholly to the duties of the priests and the offering of sacrifices. What the Lord commanded about these he calls his "commandments." Verse 31. In Deuteronomy 11:27-28, what Moses commanded is called "the commandments of God." In Deuteronomy 26:12-13, the term is used of the law of tithing. In Deuteronomy 28:1, it is applied to all that Moses commanded them. With a concordance, any person can readily find hundreds of cases where this term means something more than the decalogue. When Jesus was questioned about the law he named as the greatest "commandments," two entirely outside of the ten. See Matthew 22:35-40. So the precepts of Christ and His apostles are often called commandments. Jesus says: "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say." John 12:49. If God gave Christ commandments, and He gave them to His church, would they not be the commandments of God? Certainly. The old dispensation was passing away, and the Lord was proclaiming the commandments of God for the new dispensation, the gospel. So in the great commission He said, "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matthew 28:20.

Again Jesus said, John 14:15; John 14:21, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." How can we, in the face of

these plain texts, say that Jesus gave no commandments? Who is it that loves Christ? He that keeps his commandments. This is what it is in the New Testament to be a commandment keeper. So again John 15:10; John 15:14 : "If ye, keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

If, then, we do what Jesus commands us, is not that enough? And shall we not be safe and sure of his love and the love of his Father? But where did Jesus ever command to keep the seventh day? Nowhere. So Luke says he was taken up, "after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen." Acts 1:2. If Jesus gave commandments through the Holy Ghost, would they not be the commandments of God? Are not these equal to those given through Moses? Now hear Paul as to what are the commandments in the gospel: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Corinthians 14:37.

Then all Paul's writings are "the commandments of God." And the Apostle says, Let those who are spiritual acknowledge it. Will our Seventh-day brethren acknowledge it? They may see a new meaning in "the commandments of God," Revelation 14:12, if they will. Again Paul says, "For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus," 1 Thessalonians 4:2. Then the Apostles did give commandments by the authority of the Lord Jesus. Peter bears a similar testimony. 2 Peter 3:2. "That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets and of the commandments of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior." *Entole*, the Greek word for commandment, occurs in the New Testament, in its singular and plural forms, sixty-eight times. In at least forty-eight of these cases it cannot mean the decalogue, and in over half of the others it is used in a general way. In not a single case is it certain that it means all the ten and nothing more. There is not a hint that it means the decalogue in any one of the three passages where it occurs in Revelation. To claim that it does is to assume without evidence the very point to be proved. John, who wrote the book of Revelation, also wrote the gospel of John and the three epistles of John. He uses the word "commandments," plural and singular, twenty-eight times, and in not a single case does it refer to the ten commandments; but in nearly every case, if not in all, it refers to the commandments of Jesus. See John 14:15; John 14:21; John 15:10; 1 John 2:1-5; 1 John 3:22-24; 1 John 4:21; 1 John 5:1-3. And naturally we would suppose that he means the same thing by commandments in Revelation 14:12. As Christ is our "Lord and Master," John 13:13, the "Head" of the church, Ephesians 1:22; "All and in all," Colossians 3:11; having "all power in heaven and in earth," Matthew 28:18; and is to judge the world, John 5:22; at his judgment seat, Romans 14:10; how reasonable that he should give the laws to that church. This is just what he did do, Matthew 28:18-20; Acts 1:1-2. If any one will obey the teachings of Christ he need not fear about his salvation.

02.21. Chapter 21 - Forty-Seven Prominent Texts used by Sabbatarians Examined

Chapter 21 - Forty-Seven Prominent Texts used by Sabbatarians Examined

For the convenience of the reader, we will arrange here in order an examination of all prominent texts used by Seventh-Day Adventists on the Sabbath or the law. Where the text has been fully examined in the body of the work, we will refer to the chapter where it will be found.

* Genesis 2:1-3. See Chapter XIII, page 249. * Genesis 26:5. Abraham kept the Sabbath. Abraham kept God's "commandments and laws." This was the ten commandments, therefore he kept the Sabbath.

ANSWER: 1. They assume the very thing to be proved, viz: that this was the ten commandments. 2. This was 430 years before the decalogue was given. Galatians 3:16-17. How could he keep what was not yet given? 3. Anything which God commanded at any time would be "his commandments," and this would vary with circumstances. What Moses required is called "God's commandments." Deuteronomy 28:1; Deuteronomy 28:15. Says Paul, "What I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.". 1 Corinthians 14:37. "Sacrifice to the Lord our God as he shall command us." Exodus 8:27. The Lord's directions to Noah about the ark were God's commandments. Genesis 6:22. To circumcise was one of the commandments of God to Abraham, which he kept. Genesis 21:4. So Abraham obeyed all God told him to do. Hence, this text has no reference to the ten commandments, nor to the Sabbath.

* Exodus 16:23-30. See Chapter XIII, page 254. * Exodus 20:1-17. The decalogue. See Chapter XVIII. * Exodus 31:13-17. The Sabbath forever. See page 259. * Leviticus 23. The yearly Sabbaths. See Chapter XV. * Leviticus 23:38. "Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord."

It is claimed by Seventh-Day Adventists that the Lord here separates out the Sabbath from all other holy days, showing that it is of a different nature, in these words, verses 37, 38: "These are the feasts of the Lord: * * * beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." Yes, but read the whole verse, "Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside your gifts, and beside all your vows, and beside all your free-will offerings, which ye give unto the Lord." Not only the Sabbath, but gifts, vows and offerings are also excepted with the Sabbath in the same verse. The idea is this: the Sabbath, the gifts, vows and offerings are of regular weekly or daily occurrence, whereas the other holy days and special offerings were to come only once a year at stated seasons. When these yearly offerings and holy days came at the same time of the regular daily or weekly service they were not to take the place of the regular daily and weekly services, but must be observed besides all these. Any one can see that this is the simple meaning of the words "beside the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside your gifts," etc. The idea is not to distinguish the Sabbath above the other feasts, but to say that these must be kept in addition to the regular service of the Sabbath and the daily offerings.

* Deuteronomy 31:24-26. Two laws, one in the ark and another in the side of it. See Chapter XVII, page 309. * 2 Kings 21:8. Two laws. "If they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them."

It is claimed that this shows two laws, one given by God, the moral law, the decalogue; the other by Moses, the ceremonial, the one written in the book. Well, Moses in the book gave the law, "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart," Deuteronomy 6:5, and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Leviticus 19:18. These, then, must be ceremonial! No, there is no difference made between what God gave himself or gave by Moses. Indeed, the greatest commandments of all he gave by Moses. Matthew 22:36-40. 2 Kings 21:8, is loosely worded, that is all. Read the same text in 2 Chronicles 33:8. "If only they will observe to do all that I have commanded them, even all the law and the statutes and the ordinances by the hand of Moses." Revised Version. That makes it plain. God gave them all by the hand of Moses. See also Nehemiah 8:14.

* 1 Chronicles 16:15-17. The decalogue for 1,000 generations. Adventists claim that this covenant is the ten commandments. Hence it was given to the patriarchs and must be kept for ages yet, as less than 200 generations have passed since Adam. So this law must continue at least 800 generations yet.

ANSWER: 1. The term "a thousand generations" is manifestly an expression meaning an indefinitely long time, not exactly 1000 generations, no more, no less. If the world must stand 800 generations yet, what becomes of Adventism! So they can not take it literally themselves. Hence it may have ended ages ago. 2. As this is poetry, verse 7, the license of poetry is used. 3. The "covenant" here mentioned is not the covenant of ten commandments, for Moses says expressly that the fathers did not have the covenant of the decalogue. Deuteronomy 5:2; Deuteronomy 5:4. But this covenant was made with Abraham. 1 Chron. 16:16. 4. The covenant here referred to is God’s promise to give Canaan to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. See verse 18. "Saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." See Genesis 15:18; Genesis 26:3; Genesis 28:13. So it has no reference to the decalogue.

* Nehemiah 9:13-14. Two laws. God gave them one set of laws himself and then gave another set by Moses. Read it.

ANSWER: it is true that one part of the law was given in one way and another part in another way. But this neither says nor intimates that therefore they were different laws and of a different nature. See remarks on 2 Kings 21:8.

* Psalms 19:7. The law perfect. Adventists constantly quote this text as proof that the ten commandments are a perfect law and hence could not be changed.

ANSWER: An examination of this text will answer nine-tenths of all their law texts in the Bible. So we will make the answer here and refer to this from the other texts. The grand fallacy of all their arguments is the assumption that "the law" is just the ten commandments, nothing more, nothing less. Hence they ring the changes on "the law," "the law," without end. But remember "the law" means the whole system of law given to the Jews on Sinai, including moral, civil and ceremonial precepts, sacrifices, priesthood, circumcision, feasts, etc. Smith’s Bible Dictionary, Art. Law, says that the law refers "in nine cases out of ten to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch." Elder Butler confesses, "The term ’the law,’ among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses." Law

in Galatians, page 70. Don’t forget this fact and you will have little trouble with Advent arguments on "the law."

"The law," "the law of the Lord," and "the law of Moses," are all the same and include circumcision and sacrifices. Proof: Luke 2:22-24; Luke 2:27; 2 Chronicles 31:3. Again: "The law," "the law of Moses," "the, book of the law," and "'the law of God," are all the same. Proof: Nehemiah 8:2-3; Nehemiah 8:8; Nehemiah 8:14; Nehemiah 8:18.

Now what is meant by "the law" and "the law of the Lord" in the Psalms? It means all the law God gave Israel, that which was written in the "book of the law." Proof: David who wrote the Psalms was king of Israel. God required the king to keep a copy of "the book of the law" always by him and read in it every day of his life, Deuteronomy 17:15-19. The first Psalm refers to this: His "delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Verse 2. David as king read the law of Moses every day and to this he refers all through the Psalms. Adventists are constantly quoting Psalms 119 as meaning only the ten commandments. But "the law" here includes the whole law God gave Israel, moral, civil, ceremonial, all. Proof: Verse 128. "I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right." David regarded God’s precepts concerning tithes, sacrifices, feasts, public worship, moral duties, etc., as all right. Nine-tenths of "the law of the Lord" Seventh-Day Adventists do not pretend to keep any more than Sunday keepers do. If, then, we are law-breakers, so are they.

It is probable that Psalms 19:7, has a wider meaning than even the Mosaic law. The marginal reading is: "The doctrine of the Lord is perfect." Dr. Scott on this verse says: "The word here translated ’law’ may be rendered doctrine, and be understood as a general name for divine revelation, as then extant, the law of Moses being the principal part." Dr. Clarke, the Eclectic Commentary, and all I have consulted give the same interpretation. How narrow and unauthorized, then, is the interpretation which confines this text to simply the decalogue. It is by such unnatural methods that the seventh day is sustained.

* Psalms 40:8. The law in Jesus’ heart. "Lo, I come. * * * Thy law is within my heart." This refers to Christ. Adventists say that Jesus kept the law, the ten commandments, and therefore we should.

ANSWER: 1. See how they always assume that "the law" is just the decalogue. See this answered above on Ps. 19:7. 2. Jesus kept all the law of Moses, just as other Jews did. Do Adventists do it? Do they keep the law as Jesus did? No. Then their argument is a failure. 3. Jesus loved all the law and came to fulfill it. Matthew 5:17; Luke 24:44; and did fulfill it all at the cross. Acts 13:29. Hence "Christ is the end of the law." Romans 10:4.

* Psalms 89:27-36. God will not alter his covenant.

Seventh-Day Adventists claim a strong case here. The prophecy refers to Christ. If his disciples break God’s law, statutes, or commandments, God will punish them. God will not break his covenant nor alter what went out of his lips, the decalogue.

ANSWER: Assumptions are easy and do for the uninformed. God’s law is the whole law. See above on Psalms 19:7. The covenant and what went out of God’s lips has no reference to the decalogue, but refers to God’s covenant with David to give him a son to sit on his throne. See verses 3, 4, 19, 33-35. This is too plain to be denied. Thus vanishes another of their grand proof

texts.

* Psalms 119. The law exalted. Every verse in this long Psalm teaches the sacredness and perpetuity of the law.

ANSWER: But the law is the whole Mosaic law which the king studied daily and which Israel was to keep. See my notes on Psalms 19:7. Are Christians to keep that law? No. Seventh-Day Adventists even don't keep it.

* Proverbs 28:9. Must not turn away from the law. He that turns away from the law, his prayer is abomination. Those who break the Sabbath do this and God does not hear their players.

ANSWER: Seventh-Day Adventists turn away their ears from nine-tenths of that law, for it embraces sacrifices, feasts, circumcision, etc., none of which they do. See my notes on Psalms 19:7, for proof. So this text does them no good.

* Ecclesiastes 12:13-14. The ten commandments cover the whole duty of man. "Keep God's commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." These are just the ten commandments. Hence they are perfect. We need no other law. Being perfect it cannot be abrogated nor changed. All will be judged by it. Verse 14. So say Seventh-Day Adventists.

ANSWER: This is a soap bubble which vanishes with a touch. 1. Does it say that these are the ten commandments, no more, no less? No, they assume this, for they have no proof of it. See my note on Genesis 26:5, and Psalms 19:7. The commandments are anything God has commanded on any subject. 2. Solomon, a king of Israel wrote this to Israel, 1,000 years before Christ. Did the decalogue cover the whole duty of a man then? Was it not a duty to pay tithes, keep the feasts, offer sacrifices, be circumcised and a hundred other things about which the ten commandments are silent? Certainly it was. Then they did not cover the whole duty of man, and this text is misapplied by Adventists. Nor does the decalogue cover all the duty of man now, nor a tithe of it. Where does it require us to visit the sick, the poor, the widow and orphans, to be sober, patient, and loving? Nowhere. It is manifest, then, that the commandments here spoken of which did cover all man's duty, embraces all that God had commanded on all subjects, moral, civil, or religious. 3. That law has been fulfilled and ended at the cross. Ephesians 2:15; Galatians 3:19-25. Adventists themselves do not keep it.

* Isaiah 42:21. Jesus magnifies the law. "He will magnify the law and make it honorable." This is the decalogue. If Jesus magnified it he could not have abolished it; if he set it aside he would not have honored it.

ANSWER: See the ready assumption again that "the law" is just the decalogue. Does it say so? No. If the reader will bear in mind once for all that "the law" is the whole Mosaic code, he will easily dispose of all their proof texts. Jesus did magnify the law; first, by carefully observing every precept of that law, both moral and ceremonial; second, by fulfilling all its predictions and types, thus accomplishing the object for which it was given. Seventh-Day Adventists themselves claim that Christ abolished the ceremonial law. Well, did he thereby belittle and dishonor that law? They dare not say so. No, he magnified and honored it, as they must admit. Then a law can be honored and magnified, and yet set aside as having fulfilled its purpose. This is just what Christ did to the law as a whole. See my notes on Romans 3:31.

* Isaiah 56, the Sabbath to be restored. See page 261. * Isaiah 58:12-13. The Sabbath restored. See Chapter XIII, page 262. * Isaiah 66:22-23. The Sabbath in the New Earth. See Chapter XIII, page 262. * Ezekiel 22:26. The breach in the law. See page 262. * Daniel 7:25. The pope to change the Sabbath. "He shall think to change times and laws." This refers to the pope. He was to change God's law, the decalogue. He changed the Sabbath and thus changed times.

ANSWER: 1. It does not say that it was the decalogue; this they assume. 2. To change the fourth commandment and the Sabbath would change only one law and one time; but the prophecy says laws and times, both plural. This shows that the prophecy is of much wider scope than they give it. 3. There is not a word of truth in the assertion that the pope changed the Sabbath. See Chap. XI of this book. So this application is false. 4. The old law was changed by Christ, not by the pope. Paul says: "There is made of necessity a change also of the law." Hebrews 7:12. Many other scriptures declare plainly that Jesus fulfilled the law and ended it at the cross. Galatians 3:19-25; Romans 10:4; Colossians 2:14-17. This prophecy applies during the gospel age and so refers to the law of Christ, not to the old law of Sinai which ended at the cross. So their theory is wholly false. 5. In a hundred ways the pope has fulfilled this prediction outside of the Sabbath by legislating for the church in many things contrary to the laws of Christ. The Jews' translation says he shall "change the festivals and the law." See the scores of festival days which the pope has made, as Ash Wednesday, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, St. Patrick's Day, All Saint's Day, etc. This is what the prophecy means. Scott says: "Has it not multiplied its holy days till scarcely four of the six working days have been left?" Clarke says: "Appointing fasts and feasts, * * * new modes of worship, * * * new articles of faith." This is what the prophecy foretold. It has no reference to the Sabbath.

* Matthew 5:17-19. Till heaven and earth pass away. Jesus says he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. And "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Whoever breaks any one of these commandments is guilty. This law is the decalogue. Jesus says that every jot and tittle of it will stand till heaven and earth pass away. This shows that this law is unchangeable and still binding. The Sabbath is a part of it and therefore the seventh day must still be kept.

ANSWER: Seventh-Day Adventists consider this the strongest text in the New Testament for the law. They are constantly quoting it. If this fails, they have no stronger fort. I am sure it teaches no such thing as they claim. 1. Seventh-Day Adventists themselves admit that Jesus fulfilled and ended what they called the ceremonial law. He abolished it at the cross. Well, did he come to destroy that law? Certainly not, and yet he did it away. So, then, it is one thing to destroy a law, and quite another to bring it to a close by fulfilling it. He says he came to fulfill the law. 2. It does not say that every jot and tittle of the law will stand till heaven and earth pass away; but it does say that it will not pass away until it is all fulfilled. This teaches that it would all be fulfilled and pass away sometime. The idea is that sooner would heaven and earth pass away than one letter of the law would fail of being fulfilled. Luke's words make this matter very clear. "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail," Luke 16:17. Here we cannot mistake the meaning; the idea is not the length of time the law is to last, but the certainty that it will not fail to be fulfilled. "Fulfilled" is defined thus by Webster: "To fill up, to make full or complete; to accomplish." The Greek word is PLAROSAI and is defined by Greenfield, among other things, "To fulfill, to complete; to bring to a close, end, finish, complete." So Jesus did not come to destroy the law, but to finish it. The translation of Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge renders it: "Heaven and earth

shall sooner perish than one iota or one tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end." That is the idea exactly. Sawyer's translation says: "I am not come to destroy, but to complete." At the beginning of his ministry Jesus said he came to fulfill the law. After his resurrection he said: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Luke 24:44. And then Paul says: "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree." Acts 13:29. So it was all fulfilled at the cross. Hence Paul says it was nailed to the cross. Colossians 2:14-16. "Christ is the end of the law." Romans 10:4. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Galatians 3:24-25. What could be plainer than that the law ended at the cross? 3. The law here spoken of is not simply the decalogue, but the whole law of Moses. No candid man will deny this. All commentators and scholars admit it. The proof is abundant. Thus: "The law and the prophets was a customary phrase for the whole Old Testament." Whedon's Commentary (Methodist) on Matthew 5:17. "By the law or prophets are meant the writings of the Old Testament including the five books of Moses called the law, and the writing of the prophets or rest of the Old Testament." Notes on Matthew 5:17 by George W. Clarke. "As everywhere else, so here the word NOMOS (law) refers to the whole law, and not merely to the decalogue." Lange's Com. on Matthew 5:17. "By TON NOMON (the law) must be meant, in some sense, the law of Moses." Bloomfield's Notes on Matthew 5:17. "The law and the prophets summarily denote the whole Old Testament revelation." Meyer's Commentary on Matthew 5:17. "By the law and the prophets is here meant the Old Testament in general." Bible Commentary. Dr. Albert Barnes says on this text: "The law - the five books of Moses called the law. The prophets - the books which the prophets wrote. These two divisions here seem to comprehend the Old Testament." So all commentators. The Jewish scriptures were divided into the "book of the law," which included the five books of Moses, and the "book of the prophets," which included the books written by the prophets, as the historical books, etc. Sometimes a third division was recognized, viz: the Psalms, or poetical books. I have before me the Jews' Bible which is divided that way. Portions from the book of the law and also from the prophets were read in the synagogues every Sabbath. This division of the Old Testament is often referred to in the New Testament. Paul says: "All things which are written in the book of the law." Galatians 3:10. Again: "It is written in the book of the prophets." Acts 7:42. Once more: "After the reading of the law and the prophets." Acts 13:15. Hence "the law and the prophets" became a common term for the whole Old Testament. The law was the five books of Moses. Read a few texts: "This is the law and the prophets." Matthew 7:12. "All the law and the prophets prophesied until John," Matthew 11:13. Here the law can not mean just the decalogue, for the law prophesied. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matthew 22:40. "The law and the prophets were until John." "They have Moses and the prophets." "If they hear not Moses and the prophets." Luke 16:16; Luke 16:29; Luke 16:31. Here the law and the prophets is the same as Moses and the prophets. "Him of whom Moses is the law and the prophets did write." John 1:45. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets," "which was written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Luke 24:27; Luke 24:44. "All things written in the law and in the prophets." Acts 25:14. "Which the prophets and Moses did say." Acts 26:22. Paul preached "out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets." Acts 28:23. "Witnessed by the law and the prophets." Romans 3:21. See how common this phrase was then for the whole Old Testament. Hence Jesus said, "I

am not come to destroy the law or the prophets." Matthew 8:17. In the light of the above facts any one can see that Jesus here meant the whole Old Testament the same as in all the other texts. In proof of this, notice that he mentions various parts of the law-murder, altar, gift, adultery, swearing, eye for an eye, divorce, love to enemies, etc., verses 21-43. Is all this in the decalogue? No, it is in the book of the law.

It is absurd to say that he meant only the decalogue and the prophets. This would leave out the books of Moses entirely. So, then, the law here is the whole law of Moses. Now if every jot and tittle of that law is binding till the end of the world, then we have the whole Jewish law to keep as well as the Sabbath. This shows the fallacy of the Seventh-Day Adventists' position. The simple truth is that Christ fulfilled the law and it passed away after serving its purpose.

* Matthew 19:16-22. The commandments to be kept. The young man asks what to do to have eternal life. Jesus said, "Keep the commandments." When asked which, he said, Do not murder, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness; honor father and mother and love your neighbor as yourself. Here Jesus teaches that we must keep the commandments to have life. He then quotes five of the ten showing that to be the law he meant. The Sabbath is a part of that law, hence we must keep it.

ANSWER: 1. It is noticeable that Jesus omits the Sabbath not only here but on all other occasions like it. 2. Of course no one could gain eternal life and break the commandments which Jesus mentioned. 3. And it is manifest he did not mention all the commandments which must be kept. 4. If it is said that in quoting a part of the decalogue, he thereby implied and endorsed the whole of it as binding, then we reply that by quoting a part of the law of Moses he thereby bound all the rest of that law upon us also. The command to love your neighbor is not in the decalogue but in "the book of the law." So in Mark 10:19, he quotes "defraud not" from Leviticus 19:13, the law of Moses. Is then all the Levitical law binding on us because Jesus quoted a part of it? No. Then it by no means follows that the whole of a law is binding on us because Jesus quotes a part of it to a young man still under that law. We object to swallowing a whole ox because we are told that a piece of the flesh is good.

We should remember that at this time both Jesus and the young man were still under the law. Jesus often adapted his instructions to the time and circumstances. To the cleansed leper, Jesus said, "Go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded." Matthew 8:4. Shall we apply this to Christians now and conclude that they must offer gifts according to Moses? Of course not, for he was yet under the law and we are not. Again Christ said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Matthew 23:2-3.

Here they were directed to observe every item of the Mosaic law just as the Pharisees taught. Why don't Adventists quote that to prove we must keep the Sabbath, for it certainly included the Sabbath? This shows that Christ's directions about keeping the Jewish law were to those still under the law and not for all time to come. It is noticeable that Jesus never stated directly that any of the old law would be abolished, not even the sacrifices, the temple-service, circumcision, etc. The time had not come; the people were not yet ready for it. So this young Pharisee came as one looking to the law and his own deeds for righteousness. "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Jesus answered him according to his question and according to his duty under

the law, that law to which he was looking for salvation. "Thou knowest the commandments," do these, for the law said, "The man that doeth them shall live in them." Galatians 3:12. It is evident that Jesus did this to take the conceit out of him and to show him his need of something better. He succeeded, for the young man went away sorrowful and humbled.

* Matthew 24:20. The Sabbath A. D. 70. See Chapter XIV, page 270. * Matthew 28:1. "The Sabbath" still after the cross. See Chapter XIV, page 272. Mark 2:27. The Sabbath for man. See page 269. * Luke 23:5-6. The women kept the Sabbath. See Chapter XIV, page 273. * Acts 13:14; Acts 18:4, etc. Paul kept the Sabbath. See Chapter XIV, page 278. * Romans 3:31. The law established. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea, we establish the law." The law is the ten commandments. It is not abolished but established. This is a positive statement that the law is still binding under the gospel. The Sabbath is a part of the law and therefore must be kept.

ANSWER: 1. A few isolated texts cannot be interpreted to conflict with the general tenor, and many direct statements of the New Testament that we are not under the law but that it ceased at the cross. 2. There is nothing in the text or context that says or intimates that it is the decalogue only of which Paul speaks. 3. Paul has argued through these three chapters that no one has ever kept the law, neither Gentiles nor Jews. So he reasons that no one can be justified by "the law of works," but all can be justified "by the law of faith." Chap. 3:27. Then he "concludes that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Verse 28. Then he anticipates that some one will object that he is an Antinomian, setting aside all law. Verse 31. This he denies. Because the Jewish law is abrogated, it by no means follows that all law is abolished. So he says: "Do we then nullify law through the faith? By no means, but we establish law." Diaglott. This is a literal translation of the Greek and gives the idea correctly. Paul does not say THE law, but simply LAW in general. The definite article "the" is not used before law in the original. Hence in this verse we understand Paul to speak of law in general and not of "the law" of Sinai. Here are other reliable translations of the text, giving the same idea. "Do we then make void law through the faith? Far be it, yea, we establish law." American Bible Union Translation. "Do we, then, make law useless through the faith? By no means, but we establish law." Campbell, Macknight and Dodridge. "Do we, then, make law of none effect through faith? God forbid; nay, we establish law." Revised Version, marginal reading. The marginal reading in this Version where it differs from the authorized text as it does here, was supported by two-thirds of the learned translators present at the last reading. (See their preface.) This, then, is well supported.

Hence this text does not speak of the decalogue, nor even of the Mosaic law, but of law in the abstract. Paul affirms that faith in Christ does not nullify the use of law. This is exactly what I believe. God’s great moral law remains unchanged through all ages, while particular expressions of that law adapted to local circumstances as was the Jewish law, may be changed.

If it be insisted that this must be the law given to the Jews, then we reply: The law would be the whole Mosaic law, not the decalogue alone. Dr. Adam Clarke gives a sufficient answer to the Adventists: "By law here we may understand the whole of the Mosaic law in its rites and ceremonies, of which Jesus Christ was the subject and the end. All that law had respect to him, and the doctrine of faith in Jesus Christ, which the Christian religion proclaimed, established the very claims and demands of that law, by showing that all was accomplished in the passion and

death of Christ." On Romans 3:31. So this text in no way favors the Adventist idea, though it is their main hope.

* Romans 6:14-15. "NOT UNDER THE LAW."

Several times Paul says directly that Christians are "not under the law." See Romans 6:14-15; Galatians 3:23-25; Galatians 4:2 l; 5:18. It would seem as though that ought to settle it that Christians are not to be governed by that law: for surely if we are not under a law we are under no obligation to obey it. Living in Michigan, I am under the law of this state; but I am not under the law of England, hence it has no claim on me. So if we are not under the law it has no claims on us. In opposition to the plain meaning of this term, Seventh-Day Adventists say that it means that we are not under the curse or condemnation of the law. But Paul does not say that we are not under the curse of the law; but it is the law itself that we are not under. Every text where the term occurs shows that it means under the authority of the law. This subject is so plain that Seventh-Day Adventists themselves are divided over it, one party writing against the other. Elder Waggoner leads one party and Elder Butler the other. I quote from Butler against Waggoner in "The Law in Galatians," pages 51, 52. "But it is thought that in this verse (Galatians 3:23) the expression ’under the law’ must refer to the sinner under the condemnation of the moral law. Lengthy arguments have been made in support of this; but we fail to see evidence to prove this position." Then he admits to the other party that "under the law" sometimes means under its condemnation though this is not its primary meaning. He had to say this to save himself on other texts, but I deny that it ever has that meaning. He continues: "We read in Matthew 8:9, of a man under authority having soldiers under him, i. e., authority was over him and he was in authority over the soldiers, and each was to obey; not that he was under the condemnation of authority, or the soldiers under his condemnation. * * * The very nature of the expression itself signifies this, ’under the law’ simply meaning the law being above or having authority over the persons who were under it. This is the primary, simplest meaning of the term; and unless strong reasons can be adduced to the contrary, we should always give the expression ’this signification." "Greenfield gives no instance where it is used in the sense of being subject to the condemnation of the law." "We are no longer under a pedagogue (the law), i.e., no longer under his authority; his authority is no longer over us because his office ceased when the seed came." So writes Elder Butler, and he states the truth: but he tries to limit this to the ceremonial law. Here he fails, for it is "the law," not a part of it.

Here is what the lexicons say of the word under: "In relation to something that governs. In a state of subjection; subject." Webster. Under is from the Greek word "hupo," which is thus defined: "Of subjection to a law. Romans 6:14." Greenfield: "To express subjection;" "under his sway;" under its guidance;" "subject to." Liddell and Scott. "Subject to." Groves Gr. and Eng. Dict. "Under subjection to, Romans 14." Bagster’s Gr. Lex. So all the authorities I have consulted define "under" to mean under the authority of, subject to. Now Paul says, "Ye are not under the law," Romans 6:14; that is, not under its authority, not subject to it. This is plain enough.

Turning to the commentators, I read: "Under the law; in subjection to it." Clarke on Galatians 4:4. "Subject to the law," "Bound by its requirements." Barnes on Galatians 4:4. "Not under the law; not under a legal dispensation." American Tract Society, notes on Romans 6:14. "Under the law, under the legal dispensation." Scott on Galatians 3:23-25.

Thus all agree, that "under the law" means subject to its authority. But we are not under the law, not under its anthority. Read a few texts as to its meaning. "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah." 2 Kings 8:20. "Israel went out from under the hand of the Syrians." 2 Kings 13:5. "Ye purpose to keep under the children of Judah." 2 Chronicles 28:10. In every case it means under the authority of. Again: "A man under authority, having 13 soldiers under me," Matthew 8:9. "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Romans 6:14. "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law." "To them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law." 1 Corinthians 9:20-21. This passage shows beyond a doubt what Paul means by "under the law." The Jews were under the law. When with them he did as they did to gain them. He kept the law as they did. See for proof Acts 16:3, where he circumcised Timothy, and Acts 21:20-26, where he shaved his head and offered offerings. Those without law were the Gentiles who were never under the Jewish law. When with them he lived as they did to gain them. He did not keep the Mosaic law. But Paul is careful to add that he was under the law to Christ, or more correctly, "Under law to Christ." Revised Version. "Under Christ's law." Diaglott. "Under the law of the Messiah." Syriac. "Under the law of Christ." Clarke. "The law enjoined of Christ." Barnes. Paul says he was under Christ's law. Does he mean that he was condemned by the law of Christ? Surely not; but he was under its authority.

Again: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Galatians 3:23-25. When were people under the law? Before Christ came. Are they under it now? No. This shows what Paul means - a change of dispensations changed their relations to the law. Before Christ, under the law; since Christ, not under it.

Before Christ came they were under the law as a teacher who was preparing them for the great Teacher. When Christ came they were no longer under that old schoolmaster, the law. Proceeding with his argument, Paul says: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Galatians 4:4. This again is decisive as to the meaning of "under the law." Christ was born under the law, that is, subject to the law the same as any Jew. He carefully obeyed that law till it was abolished at His cross. He certainly was not born under the condemnation of the law, for he was without sin. To the Galatians who were going back to the observance of the law Paul says: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Galatians 4:21. Did they desii-e to be under the curse of the law? Nonsense. They desired to obey the law just as Adventists do now. Finally Paul says to them, "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Galatians 5:18. If they accepted Christ, they had no further need for the old law. So, then, Christians are not under the authority of the law for it was nailed to the cross. On this point Dr. Adam Clarke forcibly says: "Under the law: In subjection to it, that in Him, all its designs might be fulfilled, and by His death, the whole might be abolished, the law dying when the son of God expired upon the cross." On Galatians 4:4. That "under the law" means subject to the authority of the law is plainly proven by Romans 3:19. "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." The Jew readily admitted that all the Gentiles were sinners; but the point was to prove that the Jews themselves were also sinners. So in verses

10-18 he makes several quotations from their scripture, saying that, "There is none righteous, no, not one," etc. "Now," says Paul, "you cannot apply this to the Gentiles, for it is in your own law, and we know that a law speaks to those who are subject to it and not to those who are not. So it must mean that not one of you Jews are righteous. Hence, as all the Gentles are sinners, and this proves that all Jews are sinners too, therefore all the world are guilty." Again Paul argues that the law speaks only to "those who are under the law." But does the law speak only to those who are condemned by it? That is false and absurd. To every man in Michigan our law says, "you shall not steal," whether they have stolen or not. So the Mosaic law was addressed to all the Jews. "Hearken, 0 Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you." Deuteronomy 4:1. Who was to hearken to that law? All Israel, for it spoke to them all. This fact was so manifest that Paul said, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." What, then, does he mean by under the law? He means under the authority of the law, subject to the law, and this is what it always means. But Paul says over and over that Christians "are not under the law." But Adventists immediately exclaim, "Then, if we are not under the law, we can sin all we like, can steal, lie, kill, etc." They never seem to notice that this is precisely what the Judaizers, the opponents of Paul, said against his doctrine back there. He states their objection and answers it. "Ye are not under the law, but under grace, What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Romans 6:14-15. The fact that it was objected to Paul that his doctrine of the law gave license to sin shows that he did set aside the authority of the law. If not, why was this objection made to his doctrine? The Jews believed in the pardon of sin as strongly as Paul did. So if he merely taught that the sinner was pardoned by grace so that he was no longer under the condemnation of the law, the Jews would agree with him for they all believed in the pardon of sins. The fact that this objection was raised to Paul’s position on the law the same as it is to our position now, shows that we have interpreted him correctly.

* Romans 7. The law is holy. Verse 12. "Wherefore the law is holy and the commandment holy, and just and good." This is the decalogue as shown by verse 7. As late as A.D. 60, Paul said it was holy, just, good, and spiritual, verse 14, and that he delighted in it, verse 22. Certainly then it was not abolished.

Answer: Whoever has access to Dr. Clarke’s Commentary on this chapter will find the Seventh-Day Adventist argument fully and finely answered. I will note but a few points. Paul had just stated that we are not under the law. Chap. 6:14. Now he illustrates it. A woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives. She is under his law, his authority. If he dies, "she is free from that law." Verse 3. This is not the law of the state, nor the moral law, nor the law of Moses, but it is "the law of her husband," Verse 2, as Paul distinctly says. That law under which she has been living dies with her husband and she is freed from it, no longer bound to do his will, but is free to give herself to another.

Just so the Jews had been held under the authority of the Mosaic law. That he writes this to the Jewish believers at Rome is proved by the first verse. "I speak to them that know the law." But the law died and so the connection between them was dissolved and its authority was ended, This is Paul’s conclusion as stated by himself: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held."

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Verses 4, 6. No statement could be plainer: we are delivered from the law which is dead. And we are dead to the law. Now we can be married to Christ. Says Dr. Albert Barnes on verse 4: "The idea there is, that death dissolves a connection from which obligation resulted. This is the single point of the illustration. It is an error to make everything in this illustration fit something in the case of the Roman church. Like all parables, it has just one object and that is to show the dissolution of a connection before existing, the end of an authority once in force. The Jewish believers were once under the Mosaic law. That law is dead and they are freed from its authority. Now they can accept the authority of another, the Lord Jesus." Says Dr. Clarke: "AS LONG AS HE LIVETH. Or as long as IT liveth: law does not extend its influence to the dead, nor do abrogated laws bind. It is all the same whether we understand the words as speaking of a law abrogated, so that it cannot command; or of its objects being dead so that it has none to bind. In either case the law has no force." Surely the subject is clear enough if we want to understand it.

Viewed in the light of its many excellent precepts, the law was holy, just and good and even spiritual; yet failing to accomplish man’s salvation it was superceded by a better system which does what it could not do.

* Romans 14:5. One day above another. See page 297. * 1 Corinthians 7:19. The commandments to be kept. Paul says we must keep "the commandments of God," that is the ten commandments.

ANSWER: See how they always assume just what they ought to prove, viz., that this is the decalogue. Now let Paul in the same letter explain what he means by the commandants of God. "The things that I write unto you are the commandmants of the Lord." 1 Corinthians 14:37. So this has no reference to the decalogue.

* 2 Corinthians 3. The ministration of death done away. See Chapter XIX, page 356. * Galatians 3:19. The added law. "The law was added because of transgression." This was the ceremonial law added to the moral law. Hence the law done away in Galatians is only the ceremonial law.

ANSWER: This is what one party of the Seventh-Day Adventists says, while another party says that it is all the moral law and not done away at all! So they warmly contradict each other. But, 1. There is nothing said about any such distinction as moral and ceremonial laws in all the book. 2. We have proved that there is no such distinction in all the Bible. 3. All through Galatians it is "the" law without an intimation that there was another law from which it was to be distinguished. The law was the whole law. Even Elder Butler admits this. Hear him: "The term ’the law’ among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical and civil. This as a system these Judaizing teachers desired to maintain." Again: "There are no doubt, several references to the moral law in the epistle." Law in Galatians, pages 70,15. Good: that ends the matter; Galatians treats of the whole law. 4. That the moral law, as they call it, is included in "the law" is easily proved. Galatians 3:10, includes "all things which are written in the book of the law." That book contained the ten commandments. Butler admits this. "The book of the law * * * contained both the moral and ceremonial laws." Law in Galatians, page 39. Again: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." Galatians 3:13. This is the moral law, for there was no curse to the ceremonial law. This point is hard for them to meet. Butler makes this confession: "We are perfectly willing to admit that the curse brought to view in the text, from which Christ

redeems his people, principally includes transgressions of the moral law." Law in Galatians, page 40. This gives up the whole case. In Galatians 5:14, Paul quotes as "the law," "Thou shalt love thy neighbor." If any law is moral this is. 5. Now read carefully Galatians 3:15-19, and see that the law was added to the promise made to Abraham. "Was added to the promise," Wesley's Notes. So all their talk about this being the ceremonial law added to the moral law is a fallacy. It is the whole law and it all ended at Christ. Galatians 3:19-24.

* Ephesians 2:14-15. The law of ordinances. This shows that only the ceremonial law was abolished.

ANSWER: As the ceremonial precepts of the law were the greater part of it, and as it was largely on their account that the law was abolished as a burdensome system, they are naturally mentioned as the reason why it was abolished. In giving the cause for a man's death we naturally mention the diseased parts, though the whole man died. We say that Brown died of heart disease. Then Smith reports that all that is dead of Brown is his heart! That is a fair illustration of the Adventists argument on several texts. The apostles say that the law is dead, died of types, shadows and carnal ordinances. Then the Adventists report that only a part of the law is dead, just the most diseased parts and these have been amputated! Selah! Adventists say that there are no "ordinances" in the ten commandments, hence this can not apply to them. But this is a mistake. What is an ordinance? Webster says: 1. "An ordaining or establishing by authority; appointment. 2. A rule established by authority; a statute, law, edict, decree." This is exactly what the decalogue was, a law established by authority. Cruden's Concordance says: "Ordinance. 1. "Any decree, statute or law, made by civil governors. 2. The laws, statutes, and commandments of God." So then the statutes, laws and commandments of God are ordinances; specially was this true of the Sabbath to be kept on the seventh day. This depended wholly and only upon God's appointment; hence it was surely an ordinance, and so passed away with those ordinances.

* Colossians 2:14-16. Nailed to the cross. See Chapter XV. The Law in the Book of Hebrews. It is claimed by Adventists that the law which is here so distinctly said to have been "changed," "disannulled," etc., is only the ceremonial law.

ANSWER: 1. Not a word is said about a ceremonial law or that it is a particular one of two laws that is meant. It is simply "the" law without any qualification. If this two law doctrine was as clear to the apostles and as important as it is with Adventists, it is strange that they should not somewhere, at least once, say so plainly. But they don't. They just say "the" law and go right on. 2. The decalogue is distinctly referred to several times in this book, as in Chap. 8:9, "the covenant," (See Deuteronomy 4:13) "the tables of the covenant," Chap. 9:4, and the giving of the ten commandments on Mount Sinai. Chap. 12:18-21. Hence the book does refer to the whole law.

* James 2:8-12. Every point of the law binding. James quotes two precepts from the ten and says we must keep the whole law of which the Sabbath is a part.

ANSWER: 1. Again we remind the reader that "the law" is all the law given to the Jews, of which the decalogue is only a part. So if "the law" is binding now, then we must keep it all, sacrifices, feast days, etc. 2. If all the decalogue is binding because James quotes a part of it, then all the law of Moses is binding too, because he also quotes from that, verse 8, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor." This is from Leviticus 19:18. Is that whole chapter binding now? 3. James quoted so much as was

applicable to his subject, either from the decalogue or from the other books, without thereby binding either upon us. 4. "The law of liberty," verse 12, is the law of the New Testament. Wesley says: "Law of liberty - the gospel." Notes on verse 12. Adam Clarke says: "The law of liberty, the gospel of Jesus Christ." On verse 12. Every quotation in this text is taken from the words of Christ in the gospels. See Matthew 19:18-19.

* 1 John 2:3-6. This is the ten commandments. So Adventists always apply it, and then make all liars who do not keep the seventh day.

ANSWER: 1. Does it say that these are the ten commandments? This, as usual, is assumed. 2. The context plainly shows that the commandments of Christ are meant. Read verses 1 to 5 and notice that it is Christ who is spoken of. Hence "his commandments" are Christ's commandments. There is no reference to the decalogue.

* 1 John 3:4. Sin is the transgression of the law. From this text Seventh-Day Adventists claim that all sins of every kind are a violation of the ten commandments which is the law here meant.

ANSWER: 1. Does it say that this law is the ten commandments? No, nor any hint of such a thing. Here, as ever, they assume the very thing to be proved. 2. The decalogue was not given till Moses, 2500 years after the creation. Exodus 2 O; Deuteronomy 5:2-6. But sin existed all that time. The angels sinned, 2 Peter 2:4; Adam sinned, Romans 5:12; the Sodomites sinned, Genesis 13:13; "the Gentiles which have not the law," Romans 2:12-14, sinned; hence sin is something more than a violation of the decalogue. A neglect to do good is sin, James 4:17, but that would not violate the decalogue. Unbelief is sin, Romans 14:23, but that is no transgression of the decalogue. So, many are damned because they neglected to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, take in the stranger, clothe the naked, or visit the sick, Matthew 25:41-43, none of which are mentioned in the decalogue. John says, "All unrighteousness (unrightness, wrong) is sin." 1 John 5:17. There are scores of wrongs which the decalogue does not notice at all. 3. The decalogue ended at the cross, 2 Corinthians 3:7; Romans 10:4, so it can not condemn sin now. 4. In the original of 1 John 3:4, the word law does not occur at all. Thus: "Sin is lawlessness," Revised Version. "Sin is iniquity," Diaglott. "All sin is iniquity," Syriac. "Sin is wickedness," Sawyer's Translation. "Sin is the lawlessness," literal Greek. This is the correct idea. So a correct translation entirely spoils this text for Adventists. It simply affirms that all sin is iniquity, wickedness or lawlessness, a disregard of law, without any necessary reference to the decalogue.

* 1 John 3:22. The ten commandments again. The same old assumption again, viz., that "the commandments" are always the ten commandments. But the next verse explodes this hobby by naming what is meant. "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." This is not the decalogue at all.

* Revelation 12:17. The remnant keep the commandments. This text shows that the remnant, the last state of the church, will keep the ten commandments, hence the Sabbath.

ANSWER: 1. This occurs under the dragon, which Seventh-Day Adventists say is Pagan Rome. But Pagan Rome passed away more than 1,300 years ago, as they admit. So this, applies ages ago, not to the present. 2. Does it say that "the commandments" are the ten commandments? No, nor is there anything to intimate it. They assume this as usual. 3. Time and again, all through the,

New Testament, other things are called "the commandments." Thus the two great commandments," Matthew 22:36-40, the precepts of Christ: John 14:15; John 14:21; John 15:10; John 13:34; Acts 11:2; the Teachings of the apostles, 1 Corinthians 14:37; 1 Thessalonians 4:2; 2 Peter 3:2, etc. It is far more probable that these are referred to instead of the old law which was abolished.

* Revelation 14:12. See notes on Chap. 12:17, above. * Revelation 22:14. Do his commandments.

1. If the common version is correct, the remarks on Revelation 12:17, will apply here the same. 2. But in the correct reading there is nothing said about the commandments. The revised version gives it thus: "Blessed are they that wash their robes." So the, American Bible Union, the Diaglott, etc. Hence this text has no bearing on the subject.

Thus we have examined every text from Genesis to Revelations on which Sabbatarians rely for the perpetuity of the law and the Sabbath. 1. To say the very least, all these texts are capable of a different interpretation from what they give them; they do not necessarily mean what Adventists say. 2. I feel confident that we have fairly and conclusively proved that they do not teach what Adventists claim. For myself, I feel profoundly impressed that the Sabbatarian theory is built all the way through upon a narrow, forced, and unnatural interpretation of the Bible, one that cannot stand the test of fair criticism. The more I study it the more apparent these facts become to me. I am devoutly thankful to God that he has led me out of that error.

02.22. Chapter 22 - The Nature of Man

Chapter 22 - The Nature of Man

On this subject I shall make only a brief argument, simply calling attention to some of the main points. That man’s spirit survives the death of his body, and lives in a conscious state, has been so generally believed by all people in all ages that we may fairly call it universal. In this, the most barbarous and the most enlightened nations have agreed. Nor has the increasing intelligence of the advancing generations lessened this belief, but rather has confirmed it. The most profound thinkers of the race have held this faith. Though this fact is not decisive, yet it does have much weight. So this doctrine has been the universal faith of the Christian church in all ages. The exceptions to this have been few and always regarded as heretical. This fact is justly entitled to great weight. It should not be lightly regarded. The Jews who had for so many ages enjoyed the benefits of God’s revelations, also believe that the spirit lived after the death of the body. The Apocrypha gives the views of the Jews just before the time of Christ. Here are a few verses: The wicked shall "endure eternal torture by fire." 4 Maccab. 9:9. "The divine vengeance is reserving you for eternal fire and torments, which shall cling to you for all time." Chap. 12:12. "Let us not fear him who thinketh he killeth; for great is the trial of soul and danger of eternal torment laid up for those who transgress." Chap 13:14. Of the martyrs it is said: "Through which also they now stand beside the divine throne, and live a blessed life." Chap. 17:18. "The children of Abraham, with their victorious mother, are assembled together to the choir of their fathers, having received pure and immortal souls from God." Chap. 18:23. "The tyrant Antiochus was both punished upon earth and is punished now he is dead." Verse 5.

These plainly show that the Jews believed in the immortality of the soul, the conscious state of the dead, and eternal punishment. So the Jewish historian, Josephus, who lived when Paul did, plainly states that the body of the Jews believed in the immortality of souls. Of the Pharisees he says: "They also believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them." Antiquities, Book 18, Chapter 1. Again: "They say that souls are incorruptible: but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies: but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment." Wars, Book 2, Chapter 8. Of another Jewish sect, the Essenes, he says: "They teach the immortality of souls." Antiq., Book 18, Chap. 1. Further: "Their doctrine is that bodies are corruptible and that the matter they are made of is not permanent; but that the souls are immortal and continue forever; and that they come out of the most subtile air, and are united to their bodies as to prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement. But that when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount upwards." Wars, Book 2, Chap. 8. Of the Sadducees he says: "But the doctrine of the Sadducees is that souls die with the bodies." Antiq., Book 18, Chap. 1. Again: "They also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul and the punishments and rewards in Hades." Wars, Book 2, Chap. 8.

Josephus says much more in the same line, so that there can be no doubt as to the belief of the Jews at that time, for he was one of them and knew well their doctrines. He says that they believed

in the immortality of the soul, the conscious state of the dead, and eternal punishment. The efforts of annihilationists to deny this are uncandid and futile. The Faith of the Early Church The early Christian church held to the same doctrine. The martyrs are represented at death as going immediately to heaven. "They hastened to Christ," says Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. Book 5, Chap. 1. He says that another at death "received the crown of immortality." Same chapter. Again: "With peace they departed to God." Book 5, Chap. 2. Of one who died at the same time with another he says that it was "to attach himself to the former as his companion on the way to heaven." Book of Martyrs, Chap. 11. Of the martyrs who had died he says: "Being transferred to the heavens themselves and to the paradise of celestial pleasures." Book 10, Chap. 1.

Writing of the latter part of the second century, Eusebius says: "But about that time, also, other men sprung up in Arabia as the propagators of false opinions. These asserted that the human soul, as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of resurrection." Book 6, Chap. 37. It will be seen that these heretics held the same doctrine as the Adventists. They were set down in those early days as "the propagators of false opinions," the same as now.

Only a Sickly Plant

Occasionally, here and there, along in the history of the church, men have arisen advocating the sleep of the soul and the annihilation of the wicked. But the doctrine has not met with favor, has been received by but few, has had a sickly existence, and has soon disappeared. My long acquaintance with it convinced me that it does not bear the fruits which Adventists claim for it. They say that a belief in this doctrine will save men from infidelity, Spiritualism, Universalism, etc. I found it far otherwise. A larger proportion have gone into infidelity, Spiritualism, and Universalism from Seventh-day Adventists than from any other church with which I am acquainted. The number has been fearfully large and is increasing. Where they have converted one infidel, they have made several. I often noticed that infidels and opposers of the church were greatly pleased with our attack upon the orthodox faith and that they would go away strengthened in their unbelief and hatred of the church. This created doubts in my mind as to the utility of teaching that doctrine. I noticed also that such men as Wesley, Whitefield, Edwards, Spurgeon, Moody and others who have uncompromisingly preached eternal punishment, have been most successful in winning souls and converting skeptics to God.

I also saw that this doctrine in the hands of the Adventists led to strife, contention, discussion, and argument, to the loss of piety and devotion. It naturally catches men of that turn of mind, instead of the humble and devout. Hence, on the whole, I saw no good in it. The Adventists assert that the doctrine of the conscious state of the dead leads into Spiritualism. But, as stated above, facts refute this, as more in proportion to their numbers go into this error from the Adventists than from the evangelical churches. These churches strongly hold other doctrines which utterly forbid their embracing Spiritualism. Further, the Bible forbids seeking to the dead and states plainly that they know nothing of things on the earth. See Deuteronomy 18:9-12; Job 14:21; Ecclesiastes 9:5-6; Luke 16:19-31. Hence, after forty years’ effort, Spiritualism has made no more impression upon the church than other errors have, nor is there any prospect that it will be in the future. The Chief Strength Of The Doctrine That which weighs the most with believers in the sleep of the dead and annihilation is the rational argument. Many texts of scripture are decidedly against them and they

feel it; but these must be explained away because the orthodox doctrine is not reasonable. So far as we can see, nothing remains alive of the man that dies. Hence Adventists assert that death ends all. But this does not necessarily follow. The most powerful agencies in the universe are invisible. God himself is "invisible." 1 Timothy 1:17. Adventists believe that angels and devils are constantly around us; yet we never see them. Air envelops us on every side; yet we never can see it. Even water converted into steam becomes invisible. Take heat, electricity, and gravitation, the most powerful agents with which we are acquainted, and they are invisible. Who has ever seen gravitation? We see it pull the apple from the tree, the giant oak with a crash to the ground, and hold the vast earth in its place around the sun; but the thing itself we never see. What is light? None can tell.

After the study of ages, the profoundest scientists are unable to tell what life is even in its lowest form, in the simplest plant. We know it exists: we see its effects: and we see when it departs; but what it is, whence it came, and whither it has gone none can tell. Before these unsolved problems the greatest minds stand dumb and reverently acknowledge the unsearchable wisdom of God. But of all the profound mysteries of creation, the greatest is that of the human soul, the thinking part of man. What is thought! It can not be seen, nor heard, neither weighed nor measured. We can not say, it is so high, or so wide, or so long, or round, or square. How then can we affirm that the mind or the spirit can not exist separate from the flesh and bones simply because we can not see it go away! Such reasoning is only superficial guess-work. As we have seen, it would deny the existence of God, angels, devils and the greatest forces in nature, as heat, electricity, gravitation, the principle of life, etc. God only can tell us about the soul and its nature. Hence this is a question which can only be settled by the Bible. So the great argument for annihilation is that it is unreasonable that God should allow sin and sinners always to exist as a blot on his creation. But the same argument would prove that an Almighty God of purity and love would never have suffered sin to enter his fair creation; or having entered, that he would immediately annihilate it. But stubborn facts refute this reasoning. Sin and sinners are here. They have been here ever since the world began, age after age. God did not blot out sin nor sinners as soon as they appeared, nor has he manifested special haste to bring them to an end. Millions of sinners he suffers to live on, not only to no purpose so far as their own salvation is concerned, nor as a warning to others; but, as far as we can see, their example hardens others in sin and introduces millions more into the world as vile as themselves. Even the fallen angels, who are not on probation, whose lives can bring no good to themselves, but who live only to lead others away from God, these he has permitted to live on for thousands of years. Who can affirm that what God has thus permitted for thousands of years, ever since creation began, so far as we know, he can not permit for ages to come, and always? We can say that it would not be according to our ideas of wisdom and right. Well, has the past been according to our ideas? Is the present as we would have it? No; then this explodes that argument. Till we have infinite wisdom we had best be careful how we sit in judgment on God’s ways. Could we bring together and see in one place all the sinning, all the pain, suffering, woe and anguish, tears and misery in our earth to-day, it would be as horrible as hell itself. Yet God sees it all and permits it to go right on. Did we not know it to be a fact, we would pronounce it to be irreconcilable with the attributes of God. We simply and devoutly accept what we can not explain. Eternal punishment presents no harder problem, and hence may be true, all our finite reasonings to the contrary notwithstanding.

Adventists delight to picture hell with all the horrors of literal fire, roasting, torture, etc., and then represent that this is just what orthodox churches believe. But no one believes or teaches such things. Material things of earth are used to represent spiritual things of the other world. Hence, it is fire in one place, outer darkness in another, worms in another, banishment in another, to be cut in two or asunder in another, etc. We do not claim to know exactly what it will be, only that it will be a fearful state of eternal punishment.

Scripture Statements The Bible teaches that there is an intelligent spirit in man, which exists in a conscious state after the death of the body. What is a spirit? Jesus said, "God is a spirit." John 4:24; and, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones." Luke 24:39. Here, then, is one intelligent, conscious, immortal spirit which has neither flesh nor bones. Paul says that he is "the Father of spirits," Hebrews 12:9, in contrast with the "fathers of our flesh." If he is the Father of spirits, then, necessarily, these must partake of his nature. Hence Jesus says: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." John 3:6. Notice the marked contrast between flesh and spirit. They are of different natures. Isaiah says: "The Egyptians are men, not God; and their horses flesh and not spirit." As God is superior to man, so spirit is superior to flesh. God is the Father of our spirits but certainly not of our flesh. Hence Paul says: "We are the offspring of God." Acts 17:29. Our spirits, then, are from a different source, and of a higher nature than our bodies. So the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity, is an intelligent, immortal spirit, without flesh or bones. He appeared at the baptism of Jesus, Matthew 3:16, and at Pentecost, Acts 2:2-4; he teaches and guides us, John 14:26; John 16:10. Here, then, is another immortal spirit. The angels are conscious, intelligent persons, yet they are spirits. "Who maketh his angels spirits." Hebrews 1:7. So the devils are spirits; yet they are intelligent persons and do not die. See Mark 5:1-13. Here a man with an unclean spirit met Jesus and knew him. He talked with Jesus and said there were many of them in the man. Jesus sent them out of the man into the swine. This shows that they can exist in a body or out of a body and still be alive and intelligent in both cases. This shows that spirits are intelligent persons, not merely air, or breath, or an influence, as Adventists try to prove. So in 1 Kings 22:21-22, "There came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will persuade him," Ahab. The Lord told him to go.

We have seen from Josephus that the Pharisees believed in the immortality of the soul; and that the spirit lived after the death of the body. On this question Paul declared he was a Pharisee. "But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees: and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." Acts 23:6-8. The Pharisees believed in the resurrection, in angels and in spirits, and so did Paul. Adventists believe the first two and deny the third. Paul enumerates several things in heaven as "Mount Sion," "the heavenly Jerusalem," the "angels," "God the judge "Jesus," and, finally, "the spirits of just men." Hebrews 12:22-24. All these texts and many more like them, prove that a spirit is an intelligent being, without flesh or bones, living and acting the same as men in the body.

It is easy to show that man has a spirit like these. Thus: "There is a spirit in man." "The spirit within me constraineth me." Job 32:8; Job 32:18. "The Lord formeth the spirit of man within him." Zechariah 12:1. It is spoken of as a distinct entity, distinguished from the body. This spirit is not

dependent upon the body for life, but rather the body is dependent upon it. "The body without the spirit is dead." James 2:26. Everywhere the spirit is recognized as superior to the body. This spirit in man knows and thinks. "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?" 1 Corinthians 2:11. Then the spirit thinks, reasons, knows. Again: "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Matthew 26:41. So it is the spirit that wills. "My spirit made diligent search." Psalms 77:6. Then it is the thinking part of man. The spirit does not die with the body. Not once in all the Bible is it said or intimated that the spirit ever dies, while it is distinctly stated that it does not go down to dust with the body. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Ecclesiastes 12:7. This is plain enough. Again: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Ecclesiastes 3:21. Man's spirit, then, goes up to God. The body can be destroyed without destroying the spirit. "For the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved." 1 Corinthians 5:5. David says: "It is soon cut off and we fly away." Psalms 9:10. Yes, we fly away. The case of the thief on the cross can never be fairly harmonized with the sleep of the soul at death. "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'" Luke 23:42-43. All sorts of efforts are made to get around the plain meaning of this text. But they are futile. Jesus plainly said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." If he went to paradise that day, then all Christians go there at death. His body did not go to paradise, for it was buried. Hence his spirit did live and go there. Immediately after this Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," verse 46. His spirit went with the thief to paradise that day. So the dying Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts 7:59. This doctrine of the survival of the spirit is all through the Bible. The Bible represents the body as the tabernacle or temple in which the man lives. Jesus said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." "He spake of the temple of his body." John 2:19; John 2:21. So Peter said, "As long as I am in this tabernacle." "I must put off this my tabernacle." 2 Peter 1:13-14. Paul teaches the same doctrine. "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." 2 Corinthians 4:16. There is, then, an inward man and an outward man. The inward man is the substantial man, the one that does not perish. Paul proceeds: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: * * * Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight) : We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Corinthians 5:1-8. See how clear is Paul's statement: "Our earthly house," "tabernacle," "in the body," "absent from the body," etc. Adventists never talk that way. At home in the body, absent from the Lord; but absent from the body, present with the Lord. It is only by doing violence to the scriptures that this text can be made to harmonize with the idea of the sleep of the soul.

Again hear Paul. "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." 2 Corinthians 12:2-4. Then Paul believed a man could be out of his body

and go to heaven and hear words there. Adventists scout such ideas. The following text is so plain on the subject of the conscious state of the dead, that Adventists have been greatly perplexed over it. They have tried various explanations, all contradictory and none satisfactory to themselves. I have been there and know. Paul says: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." Php 1:21-24. "To die is gain," "a desire to depart and be with Christ," "I live in the flesh," "abide in the flesh" - this was Paul's faith. He was in a strait betwixt two, whether to remain in the flesh and preach Christ and aid his brethren or depart and be with Christ. How utterly contrary to Adventist ideas this is.

See the same doctrine so definitely taught in the case of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke 16:19-31. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, 'Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.' But Abraham said, 'Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou are tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence, to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.' Then he said, 'I pray thee therefore father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.' Abraham saith unto him, 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.' And he said, 'Nay, father Abraham but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.'

1) This is Christ's own teaching. 2) As we have seen, it was what the Pharisees believed with regard to the dead. 3) Jesus accepts and confirms their doctrine. 4) These events occurred between death and the resurrection, while the brethren of the rich man were yet alive on earth. 5) Hence immediately after death and before the resurrection the rich man is in hell and Lazarus is rewarded. 6) They are both conscious. 7) Abraham is alive over there. 8) Both think and talk. Hence the dead certainly know something. Had we no other text, this alone would disprove the sleep of the dead. Again Jesus said God is "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Matthew 22:32. Then those patriarchs are alive and not blotted out of existence at death. Once more: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matthew 10:28. If the body is all there is of the man, if the soul is simply the life of the body, then men can kill the soul. But Jesus says they can not kill the soul. It does not, then, die with the body. How squarely these plain texts contradict the Adventist faith; yet they claim to go by the Bible. So we find Moses on the mount with Jesus, though he had died and was buried fifteen hundred years before. Deuteronomy 32. "Behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him." Matthew 17:3. But why quote more? These are decisive.

Many of the texts quoted to prove the sleep of the soul refer only to the body. Thus Genesis 3:19, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This can not refer to the spirit which has neither flesh nor bones, Luke 24:39, but returns to God at death, Ecclesiastes 12:7. Read their proof texts. "David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." 1 Kings 2:10. Was David's spirit

buried? "So man lieth down, and riseth not. * * * Oh, that thou wouldst hide me in the grave." Job 14:12-13. Did Job's spirit lie down in the grave? Was it hid in the dust? Hardly. "If I wait, the grave is mine house." Job 17:13. Does the spirit go into the grave? "There is no work, no device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." Ecclesiastes 9:10. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth." Dan.. 12:2. "Lazarus sleepeth," "Lazarus is dead." "By this time he stinketh." John 11:11; John 11:14; John 11:39. Could this be said of the spirit? Did the spirit of Lazarus decay? Surely not. Take their favorite text, Acts 2:34. "David is not ascended into the heavens." The context shows plainly that this is said of the body.' "He is both dead and buried and his sepulcher is with us." "He spake of the resurrection of Christ." Verses 29, 31. So in 1 Corinthians 15, the several expressions about being asleep are all explained by the subject discussed - the resurrection of the body. 1 Thessalonians 4:13-16, is explained the same way. Paul is referring to the resurrection. That whole class of texts refers only to the bodies which go into the grave at death. As the spirit does not go there, these texts have no reference to it, and hence prove nothing concerning it. One simple text explains them all: "The graves were opened and many bodies of the saints which slept arose." Matthew 27:52. Yes, graves, bodies, slept - that is the whole of it. Adventists might go to our orthodox hymn books and select expressions about our friends being asleep and in their graves and thus prove that we all believe in the sleep of the soul. But it would be false, as we know it refers only to the body. So their main text, Ecclesiastes 9:5-10, "The dead know not any thing," is limited by the context to "any thing that is done under the sun," verse 6. Compare this with other texts where the same expression is used. "With Absolom went two hundred men * * * They went in their simplicity, and they knew not anything." 2 Samuel 15:11. Another: "But the lad they knew not anything; only Jonathan and David knew the matter." 1 Samuel 20:39. Of a self-conceited teacher Paul says, "He is proud, knowing nothing." 1 Timothy 6:4. Were all these absolutely without thought or consciousness? No. It simply means that they knew nothing about the things mentioned. So of Ecclesiastes 9:5. The context explains it. "Neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun." Verse 6.

Psalms 146:3-4, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." His thoughts, his purposes. The margin of the Revised Version reads "purposes." The Greek word for thoughts is DIALOGISMOI. Greenfield defines it "reasoning, ratiocination, thought, cogitation, purpose." If we rely upon earthly princes, when they die their purposes perish and we are left helpless. So this text is easily explained as are also the few remaining ones which are used to teach the sleep of the dead.

02.23. Appendixes

Appendixes

Appendix A

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., furnishes a good illustration of the failure of Adventism after a fair trial. Beginning in 1855, it was the headquarters of the denomination for about a half century. It was the home of Elder White and wife. For all those years it had the benefit of the labours of all their strongest men, and the influence of their great general conferences. Here were built, at immense cost, their great institutions, as their large publishing houses, their college, their great sanitarium of world renown, their large tabernacle, etc. When I withdrew in 1887, there were nearly two thousand Sabbath keepers here, all united. Often I preached in that great tabernacle when every seat, below and in the gallery, was full. In the college I taught one class of about two hundred, all young men and women preparing to work either as ministers or Bible readers. Now, 1914, the college is closed and lost to the cause; the sanitarium has revolted from the denomination, and nearly all the management, doctors, nurses and helpers are Sunday keepers; the publishing houses were burned and the remnant moved away; the church has dwindled down to about four or five hundred; the tabernacle is largely empty and an elephant on their hands; three separate companies of Sabbath keepers now meet every Sabbath, having no connection with each other. Worse still, large numbers have backslidden, lost faith in everything, and attend nowhere. It has been like a desolating cyclone.

About twenty years ago among the strongest men in the ranks, men of whom the whole denomination was proud, were Dr. J. H. Kellogg, head of the sanitarium; Elder A.T. Jones, editor, author, minister, orator; Elder E.J. Waggoner, editor, author, preacher; Elder Geo. Tenney editor, minister, missionary; Elder L. McCoy, minister, chaplain of sanitarium; with many persons in important positions as business managers, college professors, doctors, etc. All these are now out of the church, and all their influence is against the body.

What has happened here is constantly happening all over the field in their old churches. It is in new fields and foreign lands where their history is unknown, that their chief gains are made. I can name large numbers of churches all over the land, which were large, strong churches thirty and forty years ago. Now they are either extinct or only a little handful meeting in the corner of an old church. Such are Norridgewock, Maine, Danvers, Mass., Memphis, Wright, and Monteray, Mich.; Knoxville, Sigourney, Winterset and Osceola, Iowa, with scores of smaller churches in many of the states. The thing does not wear. If the past is any guide, twenty years hence many of their strong men now will leave and oppose them, and many of their best churches will go down. In 1912, the latest statistics available, with 4,000 workers in the field, with millions of money spent, they only gained 4,000 in membership in all the world, or only one for every labourer! The Review and Herald, April 23, 1914, says: "Take 1912 as a basis, and we find that it cost this denomination practically from $900 to $1,000 for every person added to the church membership."

How does this compare with the claims that theirs is the most wonderful message the world ever had and that the power of God is with them as with no other people? Cold facts are against them.

Appendix B The system of Seventh-Day Adventism rests for its foundation on the unsupported theories of an uneducated old farmer in his last days and the reveries of a totally uneducated, unread, sickly, excitable girl. Wm. Miller, the founder of Adventism, was sixty-one years old in 1843, the year he set for the end of the world. He died six years later, disappointed and confused. He had only a limited country schooling. He rejected all Biblical helps and depended solely upon his own ideas of the Bible. See "Life of Miller," by James White, pages 46, 48, 59. He accepted as infallibly correct the dates then found in the margin of the Bible. These were arranged by Usher according to the best information then obtainable. Later investigations have shown these dates to be incorrect by many years. Miller based all his figures on these old dates and fixed by these to a year, the beginning and ending of every prophetic period in the Bible! By this he set 1843 for the end of the world and all other periods to fit that date, such as the seventy weeks, the 2,300 days, the 1,335 days, the 1,290 days, the 1,260 days, the seven churches, seven seals, trumpets, etc. He said all were absolutely correct!

Then came the present Mrs. White, a mere girl, wholly unacquainted with history or chronology, and set her seal to all Miller's figures and dates, said not one must be altered. Hear her: "I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and that it should not be altered, that the figures were as he wanted them." "Early Writings," page 64, edition of 1882. By these dates the whole denomination must always abide, right or wrong! So their whole prophetic system rests upon the figures of an old farmer and an ignorant girl made seventy years ago! God pity them.

Appendix C The fanatical expectations of Adventists. For about seventy years Seventh-Day Adventists have predicted that a few months, or years, before the end, the Holy Ghost would be poured out upon them like Pentecost. They call it "the latter rain." Then will occur the "Loud Cry" to close up the work. Now, 1914, they preach and publish that all this has begun and the work is to close up quickly! Of this work Mrs. White says: "Miracles are wrought, the sick are heated, and signs and wonders follow the believers." "Great Controversy," page 430, edition of 1884. She devotes five chapters predicting the wonders to occur just before the end. Read them. I can only sketch a few items. Satan will appear personally and visibly to all, in dazzling glory, claiming that he is Christ come to earth. All the world but Adventists accept him as such. He smiles on them and blesses them. All shout "Christ has come." Then Satan tells them that Adventists are wicked blasphemers for working on Sunday and must all be killed. Pages 442, 443. Read it.

Spiritualism has taken possession of all the churches, pages 405, 422; church and state have united, pages 423, 424, not only in the United States, but "throughout all Christendom," page 444; Satan then moves all legislative bodies to issue an edict that all Sabbath keepers shall be killed and exterminated unless they recant by a certain day. "No man may buy or sell" who does not keep Sunday, page 422; whoever refuses "shall be put to death." Sabbath keepers "will be thrust into prison, some will be exiled, some will be treated as slaves." Page 426. "They are threatened with destruction." Page 427. Adventists will then flee from the cities and villages and associate together in companies, dwelling in the most desolate and solitary places." Page 445. "Many of all nations will be cast into unjust and cruel bondage and sentenced to be slain." Page 445. "In every

quarter companies of armed men, urged on by hosts of evil angels, are preparing for the work of death, with shouts of triumph, with jeers and imprecations, they are about to rush upon their prey." Page 452.

Just then Christ appears and 144,000 Seventh-Day Adventists are caught up in the clouds and saved. All the rest of mankind, worldlings, Methodists, Baptists, and all Sunday keepers, are utterly destroyed! This is what Adventists believe and teach. Read the above quoted book. Of all the wild, fanatical theories ever preached this is the climax. To bring this about the wheels of progress, would have to be turned back a thousand years. It would be the most miraculous revolution the world ever saw, and all within a few short years! It is to be world-wide" all nations." Page 445. India, China, Japan, where they care nothing for Sunday, will decree that all must die who work that day! The trend of the whole world is exactly the other way, separation of church and state, greater liberty of thought, greater toleration of all religious beliefs, and greater laxity of Sunday observance; a man is blind who cannot see this.

Appendix D THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE, not Sunday, is the ’MARK" of the papacy. The one supreme claim of the papacy, the one all essential TEST of the loyalty of every Catholic, the one thing which every Catholic must swear to when he joins that church, the one thing above all others insisted upon in all catechisms and doctrinal books, is the SUPREMACY OF THE POPE OF ROME. No one can be a Catholic and deny this claim. Subscribe to this, and all else follows. During the papal supremacy tens of thousands were martyred because they would not bow to the authority of the pope. It was this that brought on the great Reformation under Luther and originated the name PROTESTANT. It is what all Protestant churches have been warning against for three hundred years. The TEST, the MARK, of loyalty of a Mohammedan is to acknowledge the supreme authority of Mohammed as a prophet; of a Mormon, to acknowledge J. Smith as God’s prophet; of a Christian Scientist, to acknowledge the authority of Mrs. Eddy; of a Catholic, to acknowledge the authority of the pope of Rome as supreme. In this city we have several Catholic churches and scores of other churches which keep Sunday. Does anybody think of these churches as Catholic because they keep Sunday? No. Do Catholics think of them as Catholics on this account? No. Do these churches themselves ever think of themselves as Catholics because they keep Sunday? No. Is it then a MARK of a Catholic to keep Sunday? No, because no one, either Catholic, Protestant, worlding, or any one else, ever thinks of it as the mark of a Catholic. Hence as nobody in the church or out ever regards a person as a Catholic because he keeps Sunday, that cannot be the mark of a papist. But the moment any person acknowledges the authority of the pope as supreme, every one regards him as a Catholic, a papist. And the Catholic church so regards him. But if he simply keeps Sunday and denies the authority of the pope, will the Catholic church accept him? Emphatically no. Then what is the TEST, the MARK, of a papist? It is to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope of Rome. That MARKS him as a Catholic.

Thus "Johnson’s New Universal Encyclopedia" says: "Roman Catholic Church, that body of Christians which acknowledges the authority of the pope of Rome." The same article gives the creed to which every Catholic must swear obedience thus: "I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ."

Here you have the MARK of that church. It is not keeping Sunday, but the supreme authority of the Pope. Every Catholic catechism or doctrinal work has in bold letters this headline: "MARKS OF

THE CHURCH." Sunday keeping is never given as one of them, but the supremacy of the pope is always given. Mark well this fact.

Appendix E The following statement I drew up, and read to a leading Catholic priest of Grand Rapids, Mich., who readily signed it, as will be seen below:

"The Catholic doctrine of the change of the Sabbath is this: The apostles, by instruction from Jesus Christ, changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday to commemorate the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost, both of which occurred on Sunday. The change was made by the apostles themselves, and hence by divine authority, at the very beginning of the church. There are references to this change in Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; Revelation 1:10, etc. Yet these texts do not state positively such a change; hence Catholics go to the statements of the early Christian Fathers, where this change by the apostles is confirmed and put beyond doubt. Catholics also rely upon the tradition of the church which says that the change was made by the apostles. Catholics never teach that the change of the day was made by the church two or three hundred years after Christ. Such a statement would be contrary to all the facts of history and the traditions of the church.

"The Holy Catholic Church began with the apostles. St. Peter was the first pope. Hence, when they say that the church changed the Sabbath, they mean that it was done by the church in the days of the apostles. Neither the church nor the pope, two or three hundred years after the apostles, had anything whatever to do with changing the Sabbath, for the change had been made ages before. Catholics do not call the first day of the week the Sabbath, for that was Saturday; but they call it Sunday, or the Lord’s Day.

"The above statement by Rev. D. M. Canright is true and pure Catholic doctrine. Rev. James C. Pulcher, Pastor of St. James’ Church, Grand Rapids, Mich." In answer to my question Archbishop Ireland wrote me thus: "St. Paul, March 2, 1914. "MY DEAR SIR: In answering your question I would state that the Jewish Sabbath was simply a positive precept in the Mosaic law and lapsed with that law. The apostles and early Christians instituted the Sunday as a day of special prayer in honor of the great mysteries of the Christian religion: the resurrection and the coming of the Holy Spirit, both occurring on the first day of the week. "Very sincerely, "JOHN IRELAND."

I have carefully examined the "Catholic Encyclopedia,", the "Catholic Dictionary," a large number of Catholic catechisms, large and small, and all agree in locating the change of the, Sabbath in the time of the apostles and by the apostles. This is emphatically the doctrine of the Catholic church. Not a single Catholic authority ever locates the change anywhere else. Adventists are unfair in omitting this fact when they quote only a part of what Catholics say. The above Catholic authorities quote Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2; Revelation 1:10, the same as Protestants do as evidence that the observance of the Lord’s Day originated with the apostles.

sermon index

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net