

The African Division Outlook

VOL. XXII

KENILWORTH, CAPE, APRIL 15, 1924
(Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper)

No. 8

The Official Organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

THOSE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST MISTAKES

A review of a paper read by the Rev. Chas. Garratt, pastor of the Wale Street Baptist Church, before the annual assembly of the South African Baptist Union at Troyville, Tvl., September, 1923, and later published in "The Midnight Cry" and in tract form.

BY W. H. BRANSON

*Chairman of the General Conference of
Seventh-day Adventists (African Division)*

Extra copies of this "Special" 2d. each. 1/9 per dozen.

Our Apology

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS are always sorry to be drawn into a religious controversy. It is quite contrary to their teaching to ever start one. They are satisfied to quietly preach the gospel, as they understand it, and leave all other Christian churches at liberty to do the same. If others do not believe their teaching, and therefore teach differently, they do not, because of this, feel called upon to cry out against them, or brand them as lacking in scholarship. They believe that every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and should be permitted to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, a privilege which is so graciously granted by the great and good government of South Africa.

However, though Seventh-day Adventists are a peace-loving people, they are not content to sit idly by while their teachings are being bitterly and scurrilously attacked by others. This we offer as our apology to the public for indulging in this review of a paper read by the Rev. Charles Garratt, pastor of the Wale Street Baptist church, Cape Town, before the Baptist Union Assembly at Troyville, September, 1923, and lately published in *The Midnight Cry* (Baptist) and being circulated at present in tract form. We naturally expected better things of our fellow Christians than to be thus openly attacked by them, but since they have not hesitated to do so, we will no doubt be pardoned for publishing a reply.

The Mistakes of Seventh-day Adventists

In this paper entitled *Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes*, the Rev. Garratt takes serious exception to what he calls the Adventist teaching on the following points:

The Christian Sabbath; Who Changed the Sabbath; The Lord's Day; The Two Laws; Mrs. E. G. White's Work; Setting Time for the End of the World; The Scape Goat; etc.

He also indulges in some very unbecoming remarks regarding the scholarship of Seventh-day Adventist leaders. We wish, therefore, to deal with these various points and see whether what Mr. Garratt calls "mistakes" may not be found to be TRUTH instead of MISTAKES.

Elder White Sets Date for the Lord's Return

On page 7 of the Rev. Garratt's paper, as reprinted in tract form, appears the following statement:

"It would take too long to go into the whole detail of the story, but it all began in an unfortunate attempt to fix the date of the Lord's personal return. Elder White fixed 1844, but the Lord did not come."

Now, really, it is marvellous that a man should make a statement of this kind and rush into print with it, and yet hold up others to ridicule for a lack of accuracy in their statements and declarations. This appears to us to be a deliberate effort to saddle upon Seventh-day Adventists a stigma which rightfully belongs elsewhere. In the name of the whole community of Seventh-day Adventists in Africa, and in the world, we wish to emphatically repudiate this statement. It is both misleading and untrue. SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS HAVE NEVER SET THE DATE FOR THE RETURN OF OUR

LORD. Elder James White, who for years was the chairman of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference, never set the date for the coming of Christ. It is, and always has been, contrary to the fundamental teaching of the church to do so. Our Lord clearly stated: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but My Father only." Matthew 24: 36.

Now, we recognise that the year 1844 was fixed as the time for the Lord's return to the earth, and that there was a great disappointment resulting from the fact that He did not appear, BUT THE TIME SETTER WAS NOT JAMES WHITE BUT WILLIAM MILLER. I have a biography of William Miller in my library, and I find that his biographer states that MILLER WAS A MEMBER OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH TILL THE DAY OF HIS DEATH. Everyone who is at all informed in regard to religious movements, which have taken place during the past century, knows that the 1844 movement was known as the Miller Movement. It was not a Seventh-day Adventist movement, nor could it have been, since the Seventh-day Adventist Church was not founded until some years after that date.

One biographer of William Miller states:

"In 1833 Miller received a licence to preach, from the Baptist Church, of which he was a member. A large number of ministers of his denomination also approved his work, and it was with their formal sanction that he continued his labours."

We would have thought it discourteous to have flaunted in the faces of our Baptist friends, the fact that one of their leading preachers of those days went so far astray as to set a date for the Lord to come, and led hundreds, if not thousands, of other members of the church to believe this theory with him. But how much more so for the Rev. Garratt, a Baptist, to undertake to shift the entire responsibility from his church to the Seventh-day Adventists who were not in existence at that time!

The fact that some of Miller's followers later became Seventh-day Adventists is no evidence that the Seventh-day Adventist Church was in any way responsible for Miller's date setting, any more than the fact that many of them returned to the Baptist fold after the disappointment, is proof that the entire Baptist Church had imbibed their doctrines. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

Seventh-day Adventists do believe that our Lord will return in person to this earth, in harmony with his clear promise to do so. John 14: 1-3; Acts 1: 9-11. They also believe that the prophetic portions of the Scripture clearly point to the fact that His coming is near, "even at the doors." Matthew 24: 33. We are attempting, by the grace of God, to prepare our hearts and lives for that great day, and we lose no opportunity to urge others to do likewise; but never has the Seventh-day Adventist Church fixed a date for this great event to take place, and it never will.

We suggest, therefore, that on this point our friend, the Rev. Garratt, has made "a mistake."

Mrs. E. G. White and Her Books

The Rev. Garratt says on page 1 of his paper:

"Those who know anything at all of the Seventh-day Adventist cult know that its supreme Prophetess and High Priestess was Mrs. E. G. White. And those who know anything at all of Mrs. E. G. White know that she was a delicate, highly strung, young woman, when she began to have 'visions' and to receive 'revelations.' Those visions and revelations were

embodied in the various books supposed to emanate from Mrs. White's pen. . . . For those writings Mrs. White definitely claimed divine inspiration—a claim which Seventh-day Adventists have been expected to acknowledge. The Seventh-day Adventist Church declares that the Bible is inspired by God. It declares precisely the same thing of Mrs. White's writings. And it goes farther—it declares that the God-inspired writings of the prophets and apostles are to be interpreted by what Adventists claim to be equally inspired writings of their own human leader. "That is the source of half the Seventh-day Adventist mistakes. . . ."

"The Seventh-day Adventist says, with a great show of earnestness—and probably believes what he says in most cases—'Our appeal is to the Bible—we stand or fall by that.' But, as a matter of fact, the appeal is not to the Bible alone."—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* p. 3.

Well, then we must admit that we do not know anything at all about this "cult," for we did not know that these things were so. We do know that they are not so. The above is a gross misrepresentation of the work of Mrs. White and of the relation the church sustains to her writings. Now the truth is, that

1. Mrs. E. G. White never claimed to be a prophetess.
2. Seventh-day Adventists do not believe her writings to be on a par with the Bible.
3. Her writings are not regarded as being an addition to the Bible.
4. Belief in her writings is not a test of fellowship in the church, while belief in the Bible is.
5. The fundamental teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not originate with her. Their doctrines were being preached before she knew about them.
6. Mrs. White accepted the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist Church upon hearing it taught by others.
7. Not a single doctrine held by this people rests upon her writings for proof. Our ministers do not appeal to her writings to prove the doctrines they preach. Their appeal is to the Bible, and the Bible alone, notwithstanding the Rev. Garratt's statement to the contrary.
8. If any statement in Mrs. White's writings can be disproved by the Bible, Seventh-day Adventists stand ready to discard such a statement.

9. Seventh-day Adventists do believe that Mrs. White was used to do a great work, and she has done as much writing, perhaps, as any modern religionist. They believe that she was used of God as a messenger of truth, as He used Luther, Wesley, Calvin, Knox and others. Her writings speak for themselves. I challenge the Rev. Garratt, or any other person to read some of her books such as "Steps to Christ," "Patriarchs and Prophets," "Prophets and Kings," "Christ Our Saviour," "Ministry of Healing," "Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing," and "Desire of Ages," and then say that she was labouring under the handicap of hallucination. Her books are scholarly, reasonable and spiritual. They appeal always to the Bible for proof of every argument set forth. They were not written to reveal new truth in addition to that contained in the Bible, but to shed light upon the teachings of the Bible. Seventh-day Adventists have no apology, therefore, to offer in recommending these deeply spiritual books, to every seeker after truth.

In the light of the foregoing, it is evident that concerning this matter, the Rev. Garratt has made another serious "mistake."

The Scape Goat

Mistake, No. 7, made by the Seventh-day Adventists, according to the Rev. Garratt, is "the failure to distinguish clearly between the work of Jesus Christ and the work of Satan." To this he adds:

"That may seem a rather startling suggestion, but the fact remains that such a confusion stands as one of the most amazing errors in the Adventist system.

"In seeking to interpret the types and symbols of the Old Testament so that they would harmonise with the rest of her mixed beliefs, Mrs. White actually said that while the sin offering pointed to Christ as the sacrifice, and the high priest pointed to Christ as a mediator, the scape-goat pointed to Satan as the sin-bearer, the one on whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally be placed."—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* p. 7.

Now we would like to point out to the Rev. Garratt that Mrs. White is by no means the first person who decided that the scape-goat represented Satan. The original Hebrew word which is translated "scape-goat," is "AZAZEL." This word appears as the marginal rendering in Leviticus 16:8. Thus one goat was for the Lord, and the other for "Azazel."

On the annual day of atonement, two goats were presented before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle. Then the lots were cast. On one was engraved, "La Yehovah" (for Jehovah), on the other "La Azazel" (for Azazel, or the scape-goat). Thus one goat was to represent the Lord and the other Azazel.

The goat which represented the Lord was then slain, and its blood borne by the High Priest within the veil into the Most Holy apartment of the Sanctuary, and there he sprinkled it before the law that Israel had broken. Thus final and complete remission was secured for all their guilt, and the Sanctuary was cleansed from the sins which had been borne there during the year. Then, in his character as mediator, the High Priest took the sins upon himself and bore them out of the Sanctuary. These sins were then placed upon the scape-goat (in type), and it was led away into the wilderness. There it perished, and the sins with it. Leviticus 16: 21, 22.

Now what does the word "Azazel" mean? The scape-goat represented Azazel. Who is Azazel? The Rev. Garratt thinks it represented Christ. But we call attention to the fact that Christ was SLAIN for our sins, while the scape-goat was sent away ALIVE into a land not inhabited. It was not slain for their sins, to make an atonement for them. Who then is Azazel? Note the following statements:

"Hengstenberg affirms with great confidence that Azazel cannot be anything else than another name for Satan."—Charles Beecher, in *"Redeemer and Redeemed,"* pp. 67, 68.

Origen says:

"He who is called in the Septuagint (*Apopompaos*), and in the Hebrew *Azazel*, is no other than the devil."

The "Comprehensive Commentary," in the note on Leviticus 16: 8, has the following important remarks:

"Scape-goat: . . . Spencer, after the oldest opinion of the Hebrews and Christians, thinks Azazel is the name of the devil; and so Rosenmüller, whom see. The Syriac has *Azzail*, the angel (strong one) who revolted."

In Gesenius' Hebrew and English Lexicon, we find this word defined thus:

"Azazel, only found in the law of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16: 8, 10, 26) respecting which many conjectures have been made. By this name is I suppose to be understood originally some idol to be appeased by sacrifices (as Saturn and

Mars) and afterwards I suppose from the names of idols being often applied to demons. (see the book of Enoch, chapter 10) This name was used for that of an evil demon inhabiting the wilderness, who had to be appeased by sacrifices by this very ancient and Gentile rite. The name Azazel, is also used by the Arabs as that of an evil demon. (See Reland, *De Rel. Muhammed*, p. 189.)

We have looked up such Hebrew authorities as Rasli, Ebanesra, Ramban and Eliya, and find that none of these eminent men apply the word "Azazel" in this text to the Messiah. Some of them indicate that it had to do rather with Satan.

After reading the Rev. Garratt's statement, as given above, Rabbi Herwitz, of the Jewish Synagogue, Claremont, called at my office, and I asked him whether "Azazel" in this verse could possibly refer to Messiah, and he replied: "The scape-goat, or Azazel, of Leviticus 16:8, could not in any sense have represented the Messiah."

Now, here we have it upon the best of authority that "Azazel" represents Satan. Does Satan therefore atone for our sins? No. The sins were not placed upon the scape-goat in any propitiatory, atoning, or substitutionary sense. It is distinctly declared that the atonement had already been made when the High Priest came out of the Sanctuary. Leviticus 16:17. The scape-goat did not make the atonement. Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sins. Hebrews 9:22. It was the blood of the Lord's goat that made the atonement. Leviticus 16:15-19. This goat clearly represents the sacrifice made by Jesus Christ on the cross, when His blood was shed for the sins of the people.

Why, then, a goat to represent Satan? Just as in the type, when the atonement was made the sins were placed upon the head of the scape-goat, and he was sent away into a place uninhabited, so in the antitype, when our High Priest has finished the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, through the blotting out of the sins of His people, He, having taken these sins upon Himself, Jesus will place the sins of God's people upon Satan. He will be declared guilty of all the evil which he has caused them to commit. Thus it is written:

"His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealings shall come down upon his own pate." Ps. 7:16.

Satan, as the antitypical scape-goat, does not bear these sins in any atoning sense. It is his own culpability for these transgressions, the guilt of his own sins, that is placed upon Satan's head. HE IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL SIN.

As the scape-goat was sent away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness, into a land not inhabited (Leviticus 16:21, 22), so at the second coming of Jesus Christ, an angel from heaven binds Satan and casts him into the bottomless pit, the abyss, the earth laid waste and depopulated. There he will be confined, or "shut up," during the thousand years known as the millennium. Revelation 20:1-3. At the close of this period, Satan with all the wicked, will be destroyed in the lake of fire. Revelation 20:7-9; Ezekiel 28:18, 19. Then a sinless new earth will appear, in which the righteous will live forever. 2 Peter 3:10-13. Thus sin will be disposed of and wiped out of existence. Nahum 1:9.

This is the scriptural doctrine of the atonement. Christ makes perfect satisfaction for the sins of all who come unto God by Him; while Satan not only

bears the sins that are wholly his own, but is held and punished with the lost as principal in those he has tempted men to commit. In other words, Christ's death satisfies the demands of the divine law for all who avail themselves of His sacrifice. All other sins are expiated by Satan and his host of wicked men and angels, in the lake of fire.

The Two Laws

Ever since the beginning of their existence, Seventh-day Adventists have taught that there are two distinct codes of law set forth in the Bible; that one law comprising the decalogue, or ten commandments, constitutes the standard of God's moral government, and that by its precepts all men will be judged in the last day; that the other law deals with rites and ceremonies, pertaining to the Jewish economy, and fore-shadowed the death of Christ, the Lamb of God; and that this law of necessity came to an end at the cross.

Now, we learn from the Rev. Garratt that this is one of the great mistakes Seventh-day Adventists have made. He informs us that there are not two laws at all. The law of ten commandments written by God upon tables of stone and the law written by Moses in a book, which dealt with ceremonies such as offering sacrifices, etc., is all one and the same thing. Please note his exact words:

"There is nothing more amazing than the seemingly artless way in which the Seventh-day Adventist picks out the ten commandments and ignores all the rest of the Mosaic law. Nine times out of ten when the Scriptures use the term 'the law' it refers to the whole Mosaic dispensation. The Adventists hang up a chart on which is printed the ten commandments and constantly refer to that as 'the law,' or 'the law of the Lord,' or 'the law of God.' That is their great error on this particular question. Turn up the expression 'the law' in any good concordance and read the passages with an open mind. You will find that commonly the term included the whole of the first five books of the Bible. It was a general term, including in its scope, the whole Mosaic system, moral, ritual, typical, and governmental.

"We will not labour the point. Search the Scriptures and it will be found that they know nothing of the distinction Seventh-day Adventists make between 'moral' and 'ceremonial,' they do not speak of the ten commandments alone as 'the law.'"—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* page 5.

Note well the statement:

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES AND IT WILL BE FOUND THAT THEY KNOW NOTHING OF THE DISTINCTION SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS MAKE BETWEEN 'MORAL' AND 'CEREMONIAL.'"

Really, now, this is interesting. How foolish then for the Adventists to teach as they do that there are TWO laws!

However, the Rev. Garratt warns us against accepting assertion instead of proof, so perhaps we may not be considered uncharitable if we look up a few Bible texts on the subject before accepting his assertion.

It will be interesting to the reader, we are sure, to compare the following list of distinctions between the two laws with the above statement, that the "Scriptures know nothing of a distinction."

The moral law of ten commandments was written by God Himself after having been spoken in the hearing of all the people:

"And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, WRITTEN WITH THE FINGER OF GOD."

Exodus 31:18. "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Exodus 32:16.

There is no finger of man here. The rest of the Scriptures were written by MEN under inspiration of God. The ten commandments were written by GOD'S OWN FINGER on stone.

The ceremonial law was written by Moses through inspiration and in a book:

"And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests." Deuteronomy 31:9, first part. "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this LAW IN A BOOK, until they were finished." Deuteronomy 31:24.

Deuteronomy 33:2 declares, that:

"The Lord came from Sinai . . . from His right hand went a fiery law for them."

Verse 4 of the same chapter states:

"Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob."

The one law contained only the ten commandments:

"And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me." Deuteronomy 10:4.

When these were written upon the stone "He added no more." Deuteronomy 5:22. It deals only with moral duties.

The other law was wholly ceremonial, consisting of instruction given to the Israelites concerning the intricate and varied forms of service connected with the Aaronic priesthood. It specified how special offerings should be made for special occasions; how to prepare these sacrifices; who should minister in the sanctuary, and how; when the priests should wash their clothes; what portion of the flesh offered should be eaten by the priests, etc., etc. It "stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Hebrews 9:10. "This is the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering, and of the trespass offering, and of the consecrations, and of the sacrifice of the peace offerings." Leviticus 7:37.

The one law "is perfect converting the soul." Psalms 19:7. The other, "the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." Hebrews 10:1.

The moral law contains no types or shadows but only moral precepts. The other was a shadow of good things to come. Hebrews 10:1. The sacrifices offered pointed to the death of Christ.

The one law was holy, just, good, righteous, and true. Psalm 119:142, 151, 172. Romans 7:12. The other law was inferior. Ezekiel 20:25.

The moral law is a law of liberty. James 2:10-12. The ceremonial law is a yoke of bondage. Galatians 5:1.

There was one law "which, if a man do, he shall even live in it." Ezekiel 20:11. There was another law whereby a man should not live. Ezekiel 20:25.

The one law Christ did not destroy. Matthew 5:18. The other He abolished. Ephesians 2:15.

Of the one law Christ said that whoever should break one of its least precepts should be condemned. Matthew 5:19. The other was taken out of the way. Colossians 2:14.

The law of God, Paul delighted in. Romans 7:22. The law of Moses was a yoke which was unbearable. Acts 15:5, 10.

The moral law contains the whole duty of man. Ecclesiastes 12:13. The other dealt only with ceremonies. Hebrews 9:10.

One law is established by faith in Christ. Romans 3:31. The other was abolished by the cross of Christ and is "contrary" to the faith of Christians. Ephesians 2:15; Colossians 2:14.

The one law is eternal. Its principles apply to all time. It "stands fast forever and ever." Psalm 111:7, 8. The other was temporary, "imposed on them until the time of reformation." Hebrews 9:10.

Concerning the moral law Christ declares: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. Also, "Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." Matthew 5:18.

Now heaven and earth are still in existence. The same stars that Adam saw still shine in the heavens. The same sun and moon still rise and set. Though the earth is waxing old "as doth a garment," yet it has not passed away. This then is absolute evidence that not even a jot (the smallest letter), or a tittle (the smallest part of a letter), has passed from God's law. The other law, however, ended at the cross.

The moral law will be the standard of the final judgment, and it will be declared that those who have kept it have a right to the tree of life, and to enter through the pearly gates into the New Jerusalem, the City of God. James 2:10-12; Revelation 22:14. The other law will judge no man. Colossians 2:16.

All this! and yet the Rev. Garratt asserts that the Scriptures know of no distinction between the two laws. We are led to wonder whether it may not be possible that he is the one who had made a "mistake."

Perhaps I may not be thought egotistical if I make the assertion that the Rev. Garratt, though the pastor of a Baptist church, is not an orthodox Baptist. Now it so happens that the writer was once affiliated with the Baptist denomination, and therefore has some knowledge of their belief. It was while connected with the Baptists that I first learned of this distinction between the moral and ceremonial laws, and was taught that the moral law was still in force. The old Baptist church manual which I used to study and which, by the way, is still in use, makes the following declaration:

"We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government."—"Baptist Church Manual," article 12.

Also John Calvin, who was prominent in the movement which resulted in the establishment of at least certain branches of the Baptist Church, makes the following declaration:

"We must not imagine that the coming of Christ has freed us from the authority of the law; for it is the eternal rule of a devout and holy life, and must, therefore, be as unchangeable as the justice of God, which it embraced, is constant and uniform."—*Calvin's Comment on Matthew 5:17 and Luke 16:17, in "Commentary on a Harmony of the Gospels," Vol. 1, p. 277. Printed in Edinburgh, 1845, for the Calvin Translation Society.*

Now here is a marvellous thing! A Baptist clergyman reads a paper before a Baptist conference in which he holds up the Seventh-day Adventist leaders to ridicule because of their ignorance in supposing that the moral law continued to exist after the cross, and yet we find that the Baptist church manual and

men like Calvin teach exactly what the Adventists teach.

In commenting on 2 Kings 21:8, the Rev. Garratt declares:

"The real force of the verse is to emphasise that all Jehovah had commanded, and all that Moses had commanded, was one and the same."—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* p. 4.

Later in explaining another text he states:

"As a matter of plain truth this passage says that the whole of the ordinances were nailed to the cross and there dealt with."—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* p. 5.

But the Baptist manual states that the moral law was "eternal." To what conclusion then shall we come? Simply this: that the Rev. Garratt has been pressed to explain why Christians should keep Sunday, the first day of the week, (a day which is not commanded in the Bible), instead of Saturday, the seventh day, which is enjoined in the fourth commandment of the decalogue. Seeing that there was no other hope of getting rid of the Sabbath of God, he has been driven to the unfortunate position of finding it necessary to get rid of God's law in order to meet the issue. In trying to do so, he has placed himself not only in the unenviable position of opposing the fundamental law of the government of God, but also of being at variance with the fundamental teaching of his church.

Nor is the Baptist Church alone in this support of the Adventist position, that the moral law did not come to an end when the ceremonial law was nailed to the cross. In the "Presbyterian Confession of Faith," pp. 43-45, we read:

"The moral law is the rule of duty growing immediately out of the relations of rational creatures to their Creator and to each other. These relations being the product of the Divine purpose the law has its ultimate source in the will of the Creator. THIS LAW IS OF UNIVERSAL AND PERPETUAL OBLIGATION. It was sufficiently known to Adam to enable him to know and do the will of God. . . . After Adam's fall, and that of his posterity through him, a written form of the law became necessary. This was given in the decalogue, or ten commandments. . . . THIS LAW IS NOT SET ASIDE but rather established by the gospel. . . . It accordingly remains in full force as the rule of conduct. IT MUST NOT, THEREFORE, BE CONFOUNDED WITH THE CEREMONIAL LAW, which was abolished under the New Testament dispensation. . . . The penalties of this law are the natural and subjective sequence of transgression, and, unless set aside by the provisions of the gospel, MUST OF NECESSITY BE ETERNAL; and such they are declared to be by the Holy Scriptures."

Again in the "Methodist Church Discipline" edition of 1908, p. 38, we read:

"Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, NO CHRISTIAN WHATSOEVER is free from obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

We find that the "Wesleyan Discipline" and also that of the Church of England read the same as the above.

The Rev. Dwight L. Moody declared:

"The commandments of God given to Moses in the mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people. The Jews said the law was not given in Palestine (which belonged to Israel), but in the wilderness, because the law was for all nations.

"Jesus never condemned the law and the prophets, but He did condemn those who did not obey them. Because He gave new commandments, it does not follow that He abolished the old. Christ's explanation of them made them all the more searching. In His sermon on the Mount, He carried the prin-

ciples of the commandments beyond the mere letter. He unfolded them and showed that they embraced more; that they are positive as well as prohibitive."—*"Weighed and Wanted,"* Dwight L. Moody, p. 15. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1898.

"The people must be made to understand that the ten commandments are still binding, and that there is a penalty attached to their violation."—*Id.*, p. 16.

Now, the Rev. Garratt has a good deal to say in his paper about the lack of "scholarship" and "accurate knowledge" on the part of Seventh-day Adventist leaders because they are so simple as to believe that the decalogue is still in force. Will he make the same charge against the writers of the Baptist, Methodist, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian Church manuals and such men as Calvin and Moody? They believed exactly as the Seventh-day Adventists teach on this point. They taught the same. Was it because they also were simple minded men?

Will you, dear reader, stop a moment to reflect upon the appalling state of society that would prevail if the theory advanced by the Rev. Garratt, that the law of God is abolished, were to be accepted by the people of the world? If the law be abolished, then there is no need to observe its principles longer, "FOR WHERE NO LAW IS THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION," Romans 4:15, and "SIN IS NOT IMPUTED WHEN THERE IS NO LAW." Romans 5:15. If the law be abolished, it is legitimate to steal, swear, lie, commit adultery, bear false witness, worship images, murder, break the Sabbath, dishonour parents, and even worship other gods. What was once sin, now becomes virtue! May God spare us from the awful state of chaos, which would result from the acceptance of this theory on the part of the people! Personally, I much prefer to have my family surrounded by neighbours who believe that the law of God still condemns these vices.

Sin the Transgression of the Law

Again the Rev. Garratt remarks:

"Now take a passage from the New Testament. Look at the first epistle of John, chapter three, verse four: 'Sin is the transgression of the law.'

"Seventh-day Adventists assert that this is proof that Christians are bound by the Mosaic law, for they declare 'the law,' as the term is used in this passage means the ten commandments.

"Now, as a matter of fact, the expression 'the law' does not occur in the original of this utterance. What John wrote was 'SIN IS LAWLESSNESS.' Even a reference to the revised version would have saved some zealous proselytisers from making themselves rather ridiculous over this particular text.

"It will be found that this uncritical treatment of the text of Scripture runs through a great deal of Seventh-day Adventist writing and speaking."—*"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes,"* p. 4.

What a confusion this is! Seventh-day Adventists were never heard to assert that "Christians are bound by the Mosaic law." They teach the very opposite. The Mosaic law was nailed to the cross. It was blotted out. But the ten commandments are not a part of the Mosaic law. Moses' law was given by inspiration through Moses and was temporary. The decalogue, or ten commandments, was above inspiration, in that God spoke it to the people Himself, and wrote it with His own finger. Man's finger had no part in writing it. Moses repeated it often and so do religious leaders today, but that did not make it his law.

The law spoken of here, of which sin is the trans-

gression, is not the ceremonial law of Moses, but the ten commandment law of God.

The Rev. Garratt appears to have made a marvelous discovery. He says, sin is not "the transgression of the law" at all, but instead "sin is lawlessness!" Will some one who is educated, as he says Seventh-day Adventist leaders are not, please explain to us the difference? I must confess that I am not equal to the task. I always supposed that lawlessness, law breaking, transgressing the law, etc., had the same meaning exactly, but here we are told that there is a difference. Pray, tell, wherein is this difference?

Let it be remembered that SIN gave rise to the sacrificial system. It was to make an atonement for SIN and transgression. But "where no law is, there is no transgression," Romans 4:15, and "sin is not imputed when there is no law," Romans 5:13; for "sin is the transgression of the law," or "lawlessness." 1 John 3:4. A law existed then before sin, the violation and transgression of which is sin. It points out sin. Romans 7:7.

Now the sacrificial system was established to "offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Hebrews 5:1. That is, this system and the priesthood was established because the law of God, which condemns sin, has been broken, and to provide a remedy, in type, for the transgression of this law. Sin before priesthood and law before sin.

Now, when the priesthood was changed from the line of Aaron to Christ the law of the priesthood, which was wholly ceremonial, was abolished; but the law which points out sin, the transgression of which is sin, was in no way affected by the changing of the priesthood. Romans 3:31. By its transgression man lost eternal life. Romans 5:19, 12. Those who are candidates for eternal life in the world to come will be judged by it. James 2:10-12. And those who by the grace of God obey it, will be admitted into the city of God. Revelation 22:14.

The Sabbath not a Shadow

The Rev. Garratt quotes Colossians 2:14-17 to prove that the law and the Sabbath of God have been blotted out. The verses read as follows:

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

BUT THE SEVENTH DAY WEEKLY SABBATH WAS NOT A SHADOW. The shadows of the Old Testament were ordinances which had to do with the offerings and sacrifices pertaining to the Sanctuary services, all of which typified the death of the Son of God upon the cross for the sins of men. When a man sinned he brought a lamb, or some other animal, to the Sanctuary, confessed over its head his sins, thus transferring his sins in type to the lamb. The lamb was then slain and its blood borne into the Sanctuary and sprinkled before the law which the man had broken. But what did this service mean? It was a shadow of the cross. It was a type of the death of the Lamb of God on the cross when He would become man's substitute. It was their way of

expressing their faith in a Saviour to come, just as through baptism, and the Sacrament, we today express our faith in a Saviour who has come.

When a shadow meets its substance, naturally the shadow ceases. So with the sacrifices of the Jewish economy, when the real Lamb, Christ, died on Calvary. When His life went out, the "veil of the temple rent in twain," indicating that the sacrificial system had ended. It had been nailed to the cross. The good things which were to come, had come, and therefore the shadow of those things which pointed forward to them was no longer needed.

Now in the ceremonial law governing these sacrifices, there was instruction that several yearly sabbaths should be observed, upon which special sacrifices should be offered. We learn of these annual sabbaths in the 16th chapter of Leviticus. Thus we read:

"In the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you: For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. It shall be a SABBATH OF REST UNTO YOU, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever." Leviticus 16:29-31.

Now these sabbaths were shadows of good things to come. They were days for offering sacrifices which pointed forward to Christ's death. At his death they would naturally cease, just as all the other shadows did. This then is what Paul refers to when he says: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME; but the body is of Christ." Colossians 2:16, 17.

But the seventh day weekly Sabbath is not a shadow. It says nothing about offering sacrifices. It points forward to nothing. Instead it points backward. It is a memorial. It is set up to be an eternal reminder of some great event in the past. That event was the creation of the world in six days by the God of heaven. Exodus 20:11; Genesis 1:1-3. It was intended to form a barrier forever against the worship of other gods, and against such theories as evolution. Just as baptism is a memorial of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, so the Sabbath is a memorial of the fact that God is this world's Maker, that it did not come into being by chance, as many religious teachers today would have us believe, but that it is the handiwork of God. Note carefully the reason given in the fourth commandment for keeping the Sabbath.

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: FOR IN SIX DAYS THE LORD MADE HEAVEN AND EARTH, THE SEA, AND ALL THAT IN THEM IS, AND RESTED THE SEVENTH DAY: WHEREFORE the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

Besides, the sacrificial system was instituted after sin entered as a means of escaping sin. The Sabbath on the contrary was instituted before sin entered, and, therefore, is not an institution created because of sin. The ceremonial law which included these yearly shadowy sabbaths "was added because of transgression,"

and only till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. Galatians 3:19. But the weekly Sabbath was instituted before transgression, and is to remain for all time, even into the new earth, which will be the eternal home of the redeemed. Isaiah 66:22, 23.

We have the record of this institution of the Sabbath in Genesis 2:1-3:

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."

Here we learn that the Sabbath was sanctified in Eden. Now to sanctify means "to separate and APPOINT anything to an holy and religious use."—"*Cruden's Complete Concordance*," edition 1769. Thus the weekly Sabbath was set apart and appointed before sin, and therefore could not in any way become a shadow of something to take away sin. It is not a shadow, but a memorial.

The Sabbath Before Moses

The Rev. Garratt states:

"A careful reading of Scripture, with no particular theory to bolster up, makes it plain that the Seventh-day Sabbath was a part of the law given by God through Moses, and that it applied to the Hebrew people distinctively. There are two points that have not been sufficiently stressed in dealing with this Sabbath question. First, that there is no mention of a binding Sabbath law before the deliverance of the children of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. We do not build a case on that; we do not even assert that the patriarchs did not keep the seventh day as a day of rest; but we ask that the matter shall be considered in the light of Seventh-day assertions that the Sabbath law has been in force since creation and has never been abrogated. **IT HAS NOT BEEN IN FORCE SINCE CREATION—IT CAME INTO FORCE, AS A SPECIFIC LAW, AFTER THE DELIVERANCE FROM EGYPT,** and was an essentially Hebrew ordinance. There is no mention of a Sabbath law in the whole book of Genesis, or in the first fifteen chapters of Exodus."—"*Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes*," pp. 4, 5.

Now it seems to us rather peculiar that Seventh-day Adventists should be singled out as the only people who teach that the Sabbath has been in force since creation, for we find that this is the general teaching of the leaders of the various evangelical churches. Please note the following statements upon this point made by men of recognised authority in religious matters:

PROF. GEORGE BUSH:

"'And sanctified it.' Heb., *kadash*. It is by this term that positive appointment of the Sabbath as a day of rest to man is expressed. God's sanctifying the day is equivalent to His commanding men to sanctify it. As at the close of creation the seventh day was thus set apart by the Most High for such purposes, without limitation to age or country, the observance of it is obligatory upon the whole human race, to whom, in the wisdom of Providence, it may be communicated. This further appears from the reason why God blessed and sanctified it, viz., 'BECAUSE that in it he had rested,' etc., which is a reason of equal force at all times and equally applying to all the posterity of Adam; and if it formed a just ground for sanctifying the first day which dawned upon the finished system of the universe, it must be equally so for sanctifying every seventh day to the end of time. The observance of the day is moreover enjoined in the decalogue, which was not abolished with the peculiar polity of the Jews, but remains unalteredly binding upon Christians in every age of the world. . . . The sanctification of the seventh day in the present case can only be understood of its being SET APART to the special worship and service of God."—"*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book*

of Genesis," George Bush (Presbyterian), Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, New York City University, (2 vol. ed.) Vol. 1, pp. 48, 49, note on Genesis 2:3. New York: Mark H. Newman, 1843.

THE THEOLOGICAL COMPEND:

"By this is meant, 1. The day appointed of God, at the close of creation, to be observed by man as a day of rest from all secular employment, because that in it God Himself had rested from His work. Genesis 2:1-3. Not that God's rest was necessitated by fatigue (Isaiah 40:28); but He rested, that is, ceased to work, on the seventh day as an example to man; hence assigned it as a reason why men should rest on that day. Exodus 20:11; 31:17. God's blessing and sanctifying the day, meant that He separated it from a common to a religious use, to be a perpetual memorial or sign that all who thus observed it would show themselves to be the worshippers of that God who made the world in six days and rested on the seventh. Exodus 20:8-11; 31:16, 17; Isaiah 56:6, 7.

"2. The Sabbath is indispensable to man, being promotive of his highest good, physically, intellectually, socially, spiritually, and eternally. Hence its observance is connected with the best of promises, and its violation with the severest penalties. Exodus 23:12; 31:12-18; Nehemiah 13:15-22; Isaiah 56:2-7; 58:13, 14; Jeremiah 17:21-27; Ezekiel 20:12, 13, 22:26-31. Its sanctity was very distinctly marked in the gathering of the manna. Exodus 16:22-30.

"3. The original law of the Sabbath was renewed and made a prominent part of the moral law, or ten commandments, given through Moses at Sinai. Exodus 20:8-11."—"*Theological Compend*," Amos Binney (Methodist), pp. 169, 170. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902.

THE REV. J. EDWARDS:

"As a memorial of that fact (the creation of the world) He set apart the Sabbath, kept it, sanctified and blessed it, for the benefit of all. . . . Thus the keeping of the Sabbath makes God known, gives efficacy to His moral government. . . . It commemorates the work of God as Creator, Preserver, Benefactor, and Redeemer."—"*The Sabbath Manual*," Rev. Justin Edwards, D. D., pp. 16, 19, 22. New York: American Tract Society.

MARTIN LUTHER:

"Seeing the Scriptures mention the Sabbath before Adam, was not he then commanded to work six days and rest on the seventh? Doubtless so, for we hear that he should labour in Eden, and have dominion over the fishes, birds, and beasts."—"*Sermons on Genesis*," Martin Luther (Erlanger ed.) Vol. XXXIII, pp. 67, 68; Quoted in "*History of the Sabbath*," Andrews and Conradi, p. 27.

THE REV. HODGES:

"God instituted the Sabbath at the creation of man, setting apart the seventh day for that purpose, and imposed its observance as a universal and perpetual moral obligation upon the race."—"*The Day Changed and the Sabbath Preserved*," Archibald Hodges, D. D., pp. 3, 4. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1909.

FRANCIS WAYLAND:

"The division of time into seven days is moreover very common among all ancient nations. This seems to indicate that they all received this institution from the same source, although the religious observance of it had been gradually neglected.

"From these facts I think we may conclude that the Sabbath was originally given to the whole human race, and that it was observed by the Hebrews previously to the giving of the law; and that, in early ages, this observance was probably universal."—"*Elements of Moral Science*," Francis Wayland (Baptist), p. 91. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1873.

A. E. WAFFLE:

"The Sabbath was made for all men, and was designed to be a universal and perpetual blessing. It was not made for any particular class or race of men, but for MAN, the generic man, the whole human family."—"*The Lord's Day*," A. E. Waffle, p. 163. Philadelphia: The American Sunday School Union, 1885.

HENRY T. SCHOLL:

"The use of 'remember,' in connection with the fourth commandment, 'implies that the weekly rest day was not a new institution.' It was observed before Sinai was reached. The Sabbath was a recognised institution long before the days of

Moses. Traces of its strict observance in the ancestral home of Abraham are disclosed in the Assyrian records unearthed in these later days." (H. Clay Trumbull).—Henry T. Scholl, D. D., in *New York Christian Observer (Presbyterian)*, December 24, 1913.

RICHARD WATSON:

"The Sabbath was appointed at the creation of the world, and sanctified, or set apart for holy purposes, 'for man,' for all men, and therefore for Christians; since there was never any repeal of the original institution. To this we add, that if the moral law be the law of Christians, then is the Sabbath as explicitly enjoined upon them as upon the Jews."—*A Biblical and Theological Dictionary*, Richard Watson, (Methodist), p. 829. New York: B. Waugh and T. Mason, 1832.

ADAM CLARKE:

"This was the most ancient institution, God calls them to remember it; as if He had said, Do not forget that when I had finished My creation I instituted the Sabbath, and remember why I did so, and for what purposes."—*A Commentary and Critical Notes*, Adam Clarke, Volume 1, p. 402, note on Exodus 20: 8. New York: Phillips and Hunt.

Surely, more proof is unnecessary. The arguments set forth by these eminent men are sufficient to prove that the Sabbath was binding from creation, and that Seventh-day Adventists have made no "mistake" in so teaching the people.

The Sabbath in the New Testament

The Rev Garratt further states:

"The second point in this connection is that in the whole of the epistles there is no appeal to Christians to keep the Sabbath day, nor is there a single warning against neglecting the Sabbath day.

"This is surely strange if, as the Seventh-day Adventist literature would have people believe, the observance of Sunday instead of Saturday—that is, the substitution of a Christian Lord's Day for a Hebrew Sabbath day—is one of the most deadly sins possible. Contrast the silence of the epistles on this matter with the noise made about it by the Seventh-day leaders: contrast the silence of the first century leaders of the Church, with the noise of the twentieth century would-be leaders, and the difference is remarkable, to say the least of it.

"Here is the position in general outline. We have no Sabbath law before Moses; we have no teaching of a Sabbath law after Jesus Christ."—*Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes*, p. 5.

Here is an effort to make it appear that after the cross the seventh day Sabbath was no longer recognised by the disciples. Reference is made to the silence of the epistles on the matter of the Sabbath. Is it meant to infer that a doctrine that may be clearly proved by other portions of the Bible must also be restated in the epistles to be binding upon Christians? Does the Rev. Garratt discard the Gospels and the book of Acts?

But was the Sabbath not recognised after the cross? We assert that it was. The Sabbath of the New Testament is the Sabbath of creation. Sunday, the first day of the week, has not, as many suppose, been substituted for Saturday, the seventh day, on New Testament authority. No record of any such change can be found from Matthew to Revelation. The example and writings of both Christ and the apostles testify that no such change was ever made or contemplated by them. Those, therefore, who observe Sunday as a day of rest and worship, do so without any scriptural warrant whatsoever.

In fact, God never changes. His moral standard is always the same. Changing ages have no effect on the law of His kingdom. A new era in the affairs of men on this earth, is not of sufficient moment to

warrant a change of the moral standard of citizenship in God's kingdom. The first advent of Christ, His death, or His resurrection, in no way affected the great Sabbath institution which Christ as Creator had set up four thousand years before as a memorial of His creative power.

The resurrection was considered worthy of a memorial that would serve constantly to refresh the minds of men regarding that wonderful event, and the ordinance of baptism was chosen for this purpose. Baptism is a real burial and resurrection, and it very fittingly represents the burial and resurrection of Christ. But nowhere has Christ or apostle said that the first day should be sacredly kept in commemoration of these same events.

God does not thus overthrow one sacred memorial or institution and proceed to set up another on its ruins. He makes no mistakes, nor does He have to alter His plans; "for I am the Lord, I change not." Malachi 3: 6. With Him "is no variableness neither shadow of turning." James 1: 17. Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and today, and forever." Hebrews 13: 8. Solomon was led to exclaim: "I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him." Ecclesiastes 3: 14. How foolish, then, to suppose that Christ, during His earthly life, attempted to change the law or the Sabbath that He had originally given!

The first mention of the first day of the week in the New Testament is by Matthew, in connection with his record of the burial and resurrection of Christ: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." Matthew 28: 1. Surely no one would claim that this text teaches first day sacredness. It merely states that the Sabbath was closing when the first day of the week began to dawn.

The next text we will notice is much the same as this one:

"When the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint Him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Mark 16: 1, 2.

Here is a plain statement that the Sabbath is past when the first day of the week comes. Let it be borne in mind also that this statement was made by Mark some thirty years after the crucifixion of Christ, and is conclusive evidence that the Lord had given no instruction as to any change of the Sabbath after His death. Those, therefore, who persist in waiting until Sunday, the first day of the week, to keep the Sabbath, are one day too late. When Sunday comes, the Sabbath is past; and not until after six days will another Sabbath come. Those who, by labouring on Saturday, prepare to keep the Sabbath on Sunday, are, by that very preparation, breaking the institution they are preparing to observe. One cannot keep the Sabbath when it is past. A man may say: "I will work today (Saturday), and wait until the first day of the week to keep the Sabbath;" but the Sabbath will not wait for him. When the seventh day passes out, the Sabbath passes out; for the seventh day is the Sabbath.

Let us notice a text found in Luke's Gospel:

"That day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also which came with Him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Luke 23: 54-56; 24: 1.

This text is a powerful answer to those who claim that the New Testament teaches Sunday sacredness. Three days are here mentioned; first, the preparation day; second, the "Sabbath day according to the commandment;" third, the first day of the week. The preparation day is Friday, the sixth day of the week. This is shown in Exodus 16: 22, 23.

Hence these verses teach that the Sabbath is the day between Friday and Sunday; that Christ rested in the grave on the Sabbath from His labours, persecutions and struggles of the past week, and was raised up on the first day, to begin again His activities in behalf of the human race; that while Christ rested in the tomb on the Sabbath, His followers rested at their homes; that the commandments were regarded as still binding after the death of Christ; and that the Sabbath commandment had not been changed.

Now we are able to find abundant evidence that both Christ and the disciples regularly observed the Sabbath, and that no change whatever was recognised by them. Of Christ, it is said:

"He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up: and as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Luke 4: 16.

Thus we see clearly that it was not simply by chance that Christ, on this particular Sabbath, went to the house of worship; but such was "His custom." He was a Sabbath keeper, and made a practice of going to the house of worship on that day.

We have many references in the book of Acts, to the fact that Paul faithfully observed the Sabbath. We will briefly notice some of these. Acts 13: 14, 15 records the following incident:

"When they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and sat down. And after the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them saying, Ye men and brethren; if ye have any word of exhortation for the people say on."

This sermon, of course, was preached to the Jews in their synagogue; but by reading verses 42-44, we learn that the gentiles requested Paul to meet with them the next Sabbath:

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. . . . And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the Word of God."

The next record of Paul's Sabbath keeping is found in Acts 16: 12, 13:

"And from thence to Phillipi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony: and we were in that city abiding certain days. And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a riverside, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

Another interesting record of Paul's attitude to the Sabbath is given in Acts 17: 1, 2:

"Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of

the Jews: and Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."

This text clearly shows that it was not merely by chance that Paul met with those who worshipped God on the Sabbath, but that this was "his custom." In fact, he knew no other Sabbath. In speaking of his experience at Corinth, where he laboured in A. D. 54,—twenty-three years after the cross—Acts 18: 4, declares:

"He reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. . . . And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the Word of God among them."

Also in Hebrews 4: 4, the Sabbath is again mentioned as follows: "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works;" and verse 9 declares: "There remaineth therefore a keeping of a sabbath to the people of God." (Margin.) Verse 10 tells us that to enter into "His rest," we must cease from our work AS GOD DID FROM HIS. This was on the seventh day, not the first day. The first day is not God's rest day, and never will be. Therefore it never can be the Sabbath of rest.

Again in Mark 2: 27 we read: "The Sabbath was made for man." Now does this take in only the Jews? Are not Christians men? Do we not belong to the human race this side of the cross? If so, the Sabbath is for us.

The Rev. Garratt speaks of the silence of the epistles on this matter of the Sabbath. But we wish to call attention to the fact that the entire Bible from Genesis to Revelation is as silent as death in regard to Sunday being the Christian's Lord's Day. £200 has been offered for one such text. Why does not someone claim it?

Where is the text that says the ten commandment law is abolished?

Where is the text that says the weekly Sabbath belonged to the law of Moses?

Where is the text that states that Sunday became the Christian's Lord's day?

Where is the text that says Christ ever kept Sunday?

Where is the Scripture that says the disciples changed the day?

Where in the epistles is Sunday brought in?

Surely there should be some scriptural authority for it. But where?

On this question the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan states the following:

"Much has been made of the attitude of Christ in speech and deed toward the Sabbath. Some have imagined that by words He uttered and by deeds He did He relaxed the binding nature of the old command. This view, however, is to absolutely misunderstand and misinterpret the doing and the teaching of Jesus."—*The Ten Commandments*, G. Campbell Morgan (Congregationalist), p. 50. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1901.

Thus we see that the Bible teaching, and the example of Bible writers are in perfect harmony. The Bible, from Genesis to Revelation is one perfect whole; and one great standard of morality and righteousness runs through it all like a silver thread, without the slightest alteration. The Sabbath of the New Testament is exactly the same as the Sabbath of Eden and Mount Sinai.

The Lord's Day

The Rev. Garratt states:

"It is the confusion of the two covenants that leads to the amazing inability of Adventists to see the distinction between the Hebrew Sabbath and the Christian's Lord's Day."—*Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes*, p. 4.

We reply, How can we see a distinction where none exists? The inference here of course is that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Christian's Lord's day. But is Sunday the Lord's day? Note carefully the following Scriptures:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on MY HOLY DAY." Isaiah 58:13.

Again:

"The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28.

And again:

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: BUT THE SEVENTH DAY IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD THY GOD." Exodus 20:8-10.

Now these Scriptures clearly teach that the Sabbath is the Lord's day and that the Sabbath falls on the seventh day and not the first day. The Lord definitely claims to be Lord of the Sabbath. Where does He claim to be Lord of Sunday? Where does He state that Christians should so regard Sunday? When John the Revelator states: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day (Revelation 1:10), he does not say this was Sunday. He simply says on "the Lord's day," and the only Lord's day known to Scripture is the seventh day Sabbath. If the first day is so recognised in the Bible, we have never been able to find the text. In all his argument regarding the Lord's day, the Rev. Garratt does not cite a single text that in any way refers to the first day of the week being the Lord's day or Christian Sabbath. Why? Because the Bible is silent on this matter. There is not the slightest hint in the Bible that the first day of the week should be regarded as the Lord's day, but the Scriptures abound with declarations that the Sabbath is the Lord's day.

We wish to call attention to a remarkable statement by the Rev. E. T. Hiscock, the author of the Baptist Church Manual:

"There was and is a commandment to 'keep holy the Sabbath day,' but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will, however, be readily said, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges, and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I have studied for many years, I ask, Where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament—absolutely not. There is no scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week. I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is in my judgment, the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people."—*From an address before a Baptist ministers' meeting in New York City, as reported in the "Examiner," of November 16, 1893.*

Here, then, the Rev. Garratt has the answer to his Lord's day arguments by a very prominent leader in his own church, the man who wrote a church manual for them, setting forth the official doctrines of the church. He boldly declares, before a meeting of Baptist ministers, that there is no Scripture for Sunday. Now if this be true,—and it is—then

we inquire, Where then, is the authority for stating that Sunday is the Lord's day? If it is not based upon Bible authority, what other authority does the Rev. Garratt recognise?

Unless, therefore, we can be shown some Scripture which mentions Sunday as being the "Lord's Day," we shall have to conclude that the Rev. Garratt has made another "mistake."

Christ the Author of the Sabbath

But why is the Sabbath called the Lord's day? Because Christ is its author. He was the mediator between God and all His works of creation. He was the maker, not only of the Universe, but of the earth and all things therein. Note the following:

"But unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom. . . . And Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of Thine hands." Hebrews 1:8, 10.

Again we read:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him: and without Him was not anything made that was made." John 1:1-3.

In these verses it is expressly declared that the Son of God, or the "Word," is the one who made all things, and that without Him was not anything made that was made. In Colossians 1:12-17, we are informed that this included all things "that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."

Now, if Christ was the Creator of the earth, and all things, then He is the one who made the seventh day Sabbath as recorded in Genesis 2:1-3. The one who did the work, of course, did the resting. And this one was the Son of God, called the "Word" who, 400 years later "was made flesh and dwelt among us." John 1:14. Jesus Christ, therefore, is the author of the Sabbath, and hence the seventh day Sabbath is the "Christian Sabbath" or "Lord's day." This is why He declares that "the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28.

Not only so, but it was Jesus Christ who spoke the ten commandment law from the summit of Sinai and who accompanied the children of Israel in all their wanderings through the wilderness. He is the Mediator between God and man. God the Father speaks only through Him. The Father has never spoken to man directly, but only through the Son: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." John 1:18.

Now Paul clearly states in 1 Corinthians 10:1-4 that those who were led by Moses "drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was CHRIST."

In Stephen's apology, made before his executors, he declared that Christ, whom he had preached, was the one of whom Moses spoke, when he prophesied that "a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear." Acts 7:37. Then speaking further concerning the Christ, he said: "This is He, that was in the

church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Verse 38.

Here we have a definite statement that the Christ whom Stephen was defending was the one who spoke the "lively oracles" from the summit of Sinai. And when Christ spoke the law and wrote it on stone, He again declared that the seventh day was His holy day, and that it should be remembered and kept holy.

Later, when Christ was upon earth in the flesh He spoke again from a mountain. In Matthew the fifth chapter, we have His first recorded sermon, and in this, the beginning of His earthly ministry, He made it clear that no alteration was to be made in the law which He had given to Adam and spoken from Mount Sinai.

"Think not," said He, "that I am come to destroy the law." He knew that people might draw a wrong conclusion concerning this matter so he proceeded to place a safe-guard against such an error at the very outset:

"For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matthew 5:18, 19.

This, then, settles the question for all time. Christ did not destroy the law. As long as heaven and earth remain not a jot or tittle will pass from it. Those who break even one of the least commandments, and teach others to do likewise, are considered by the God of heaven as "the least" of all people upon earth, for the transgression of this law is sin. But those who do and teach them are counted as "great."

Now, personally, it matters little to me if I am counted simple and unlearned and "lacking in ordinary scholarship," by men who break the commandments and teach others that they are abolished, so long as I can have the assurance of being considered great by those in heaven.

Some will say, Why did not Christ enjoin the ten commandments in the New Testament if Christians were expected to keep them? I reply, that in the foregoing statements He clearly stated that every jot and tittle of this law would remain as long as heaven and earth endured, and that He had not come to destroy it, and this settled the matter. He here re-affirmed it in its entirety by this one statement. He had been its author; he had written it with His own finger; He had commanded it with His own lips; and now He declares it will remain forever. Thus the moral law, which included the seventh day Sabbath remained in full force in the Christian dispensation, and the Sabbath is therefore still the "Lord's day."

The Covenants

The seventh day is the Sabbath of the new covenant. "For this is the covenant that I will make. . . saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts." Hebrews 8:10. God's law written upon the heart is unchanged even in one jot or tittle, for thus Christ declares

in Matthew 5:18. All His commandments "stand fast forever and ever." Psalms 111:7, 8. So, when He writes this unchangeable law in our hearts, the fourth commandment still reads: "The seventh day is the Sabbath. Indeed, Sunday came too late to get into the new covenant, for when Christ died on Friday, the new covenant was sealed, or confirmed, by His blood. Luke 22:20. It was then forever too late to add to, or take from it. Galatians 3:15. Hence, as Sunday did not come into the church until after His death, it can have no part in the new covenant; and therefore Christians should not keep it.

Who Changed the Sabbath?

On this point the Rev. Garratt says:

"One of the chief assertions of the Seventh-day leaders—one out of which they make a good deal of capital—is that the ordinary Protestant Churches keep Sunday, because Sunday keeping was decreed by the Roman Catholic Church, and they are really under Roman Catholic bondage. . . .

"What we wish to point out is that Adventists seem incapable of drawing the distinction between the essential and the accidental, or incidental. They say, in effect, 'You keep Sunday: so does the Roman Catholic Church: therefore you are under the dominion of the Pope. . . .

"The fact that we keep the same day as the Romish Church may indicate the same origin, but that is as far as the matter goes. As far as present day positions are concerned, the essential thing is that Protestants differ from Romanists on many vital points: the fact that the two agree as to the day of public worship is incidental. **THE WHOLE OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ARGUMENT AS TO THE CHANGE OF THE DAY FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE FIRST IS A TISSUE OF MISREPRESENTATIONS. . . .**

"Then, it is simply not true to say that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day. Seventh-day Adventists have repeated that until a good many people seem to have believed it. But, here again, we find the characteristic failure to distinguish clearly between things that differ. Here there is a failure to distinguish between origination and adoption. **THE ROMISH CHURCH DID NOT ORIGINATE THE CHANGE.** The Roman Emperor, Constantine, did not originate the change. . . .

"As a matter of ordinary history it is simply false to say that the Roman Catholic Pope changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. . . .

"We repeat that what had really happened was that the first century Christians—freed from the Mosaic law by the acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ—**BEGAN TO KEEP THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK IN CELEBRATION OF THE NEW AND SPIRITUAL DELIVERANCE WROUGHT BY THE SAVIOUR'S DEATH AND RESURRECTION.** Then, when a Roman Emperor embraced Christianity nominally, and began to patronise it officially, he made a law enforcing upon all his people an observance that had become a fixed custom among the Christians."—"Some Seventh-day Adventist Mistakes," pp. 6, 7.

So, then, according to this, the Sabbath was not changed by the Roman or Papal power, but by the first century Christians! Let us suppose that this statement is true. What does it prove for Sunday? What authority did the first century Christians have for changing God's holy Sabbath? Where is the Scripture giving them authority to do so?

Why did not the Rev. Garratt give chapter and verse where they were instructed to make this change? Why? Because it is not there; and the early Christians had no more authority to change the divine commands and institutions of Jehovah than men have today. God has never delegated to men the right to change His precepts at will. Instead, He has emphatically stated that they cannot under any circumstances do so.

Thus Solomon wrote:

"I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him." Ecclesiastes 3:14.

Also David speaking for God, concerning Christ says:

"Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. If his children forsake My law, and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes, and keep not My commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. . . . My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips." Psalms 89:27, 30-34.

Then Christ declares:

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Matthew 16:17.

Paul corroborates these statements by saying that the law is not made void by the gospel, but rather established. Romans 3:31. A careful search of the entire Bible reveals no hint that the first century Christians, or any other Christians, were authorised to change this law which cannot be altered. If, therefore, it can be proved that the early Christians did discard the Bible Sabbath, or Lord's Day, and began to keep Sunday instead, what has that to do with this question? If men without Bible authority tampered with the law of the Most High God, should our relation to His law therefore be affected? In no wise. Those who thus substitute a man-made institution for one ordained by God would be fulfilling the words of Christ, where He said: "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Mark 7:7.

Now, Seventh-day Adventists have never claimed that some of the religious people of the early centuries did not keep Sunday before it was made the civil law by Constantine, and later enforced by the Papal Church. History states that this change began to be made by some, during the early centuries after Christ. But what Seventh-day Adventists do say is, that the first LAW for Sunday was made by Constantine in the year 321 A. D. THE BIBLE CONTAINS NO LAW ENFORCING SUNDAY, THE FIRST DAY. Neither Christ nor the apostles ever observed it, and it must therefore forever rest only upon a human ordinance.

That the Sabbath was not changed by Christ, or His apostles, many eminent Protestants agree.

Thus Luther Lee, D. D., says:

"There is no express commandment for observing the first day."

Lyman Abbott said:

"The current notion that Christ and His apostles authoritatively substituted the first day for the seventh is absolutely without any authority."—*Editorial in the Christian Union, June 26, 1890.*

Dr. Edward T. Hiscock, author of the Baptist church manual, asserts:

"There is no scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week."

Section 10, of part 2, of the "Augsburg Confession of Faith," a Lutheran document, as quoted in Cox's "Sabbath Manual," reads as follows:

"The observance of the Lord's day (Sunday) is founded not on any command of God, but on the authority of the church."

In Rose's Translation of Augustus Neander's "His-

tory of the Christian Religion and Church," on page 186, is this statement:

"The festival of Sunday was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church to transfer the law of the Sabbath to Sunday."

Even after the observance of Sunday began, the Sabbath was still kept as before. Listen to the historian Coleman:

"The last day of the week was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church."—*"Ancient Christianity Exemplified," chapter 26, section 2.*

In the same chapter, he also says:

"During the early ages of the church, it (Sunday) was never entitled 'the Sabbath,' this word being confined to the seventh day of the week."

Neander, one of the greatest of church historians, says:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect,—far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered labouring on Sunday a sin."

From "A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," we read:

"The notion of a formal substitution by apostolic authority of the Lord's day for the Jewish Sabbath, and the transference to it, perhaps in a spiritualised form, of the Sabbatical obligation established by the promulgation of the fourth commandment, has no basis whatever, either in Holy Scripture or in Christian antiquity."—*"A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," Smith and Cheetham, art., "Sabbath," p. 1823. London: John Murray, 1880.*

Dr. Peter Heylyn, remarks:

"Take which you will, either the Fathers or the moderns, and we shall find no Lord's day instituted by any apostolical mandate; no Sabbath set on foot by them upon the first day of the week."—*"History of the Sabbath," Dr. Peter Heylyn (Church of England), part 2, chapter 1.*

The Rev. Dale says:

"It is quite clear that, however rigidly or devoutly we may spend Sunday, we are not keeping the Sabbath. . . . The Sabbath was founded on a specific, divine command. We can plead no such command for the observance of Sunday. . . . There is not a single sentence in the New Testament to suggest that we incur any penalty by violating the supposed sanctity of Sunday."—*"The Ten Commandments," R. W. Dale, D. C. (Congregationalist), pp. 106, 107. London: Hodder and Stoughton.*

Also Canon Eyton declares:

"There is no word, no hint, in the New Testament about abstaining from work on Sunday. . . . The observance of Ash Wednesday or Lent stands on exactly the same footing as the observance of Sunday. . . . Into the rest of Sunday no divine law enters."—*"The Ten Commandments," Canon Eyton (Church of England). London: Thübner & Co.*

The Rev. Williams states:

"And where are we told in the Scriptures that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. . . . The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but the church, has enjoined it."—*"Plain Sermons on the Catechism," Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D. (Church of England), Vol. 1, p. 334. London: Longmans' & Co.*

The "Methodist Episcopal Theological Compend," page 180, says:

"It is true there is no positive command for infant baptism, nor is there any for keeping holy the first day of the week."

Albert Barnes, the great Presbyterian commentator, makes the statement:

"No precept for it is found in the New Testament."

The first recorded instance of Sunday observance which has any claim to be considered genuine is mentioned by Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, when some Christians met and read the writings of the apostles. He does not even intimate, however, that this day has any divine authority, either from Christ or from His apostles. It was about this time that the great apostasy set in, which is foretold in Acts 20: 29, 30; 2 Timothy 4: 3, 4; and 2 Thessalonians 2: 3, 4.

The pagan Romans who nominally accepted Christianity, generally remained unchanged at heart. The "mystery of iniquity" was working, and they began to remodel the religion of the apostles. The Baptist historian Robinson says:

"Toward the latter end of the second century, most of the churches assumed a new form; the first simplicity disappeared; and insensibly, as the old disciples retired to their graves, their children came forward, and new-moulded the cause."—*Ecclesiastical Researches*, chapter 6, page 51.

Since the converted pagans had heretofore held Sunday as a feast day in honour of the sun god, they now brought it into the church. Morer, a leading church historian, says that "the Christians thought fit to keep the same day, and the same name of it, THAT THEY MIGHT NOT APPEAR CAUSELESSLY PEEVISH, and by that means hinder the conversion of the gentiles."—*Dialogues on the Lord's Day*, pp. 22, 23.

The old Chamber's Encyclopedia, in its article "Sabbath," says:

"By none of the Fathers before the fourth century is it (the first day of the week) identified with the Sabbath; nor is the duty of observing it grounded by them either on the fourth commandment or on the precept or example of Christ or His apostles.

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the Sabbatical observance of that day is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine, 321 A. D., of which the following is a translation:

"Let all judges, inhabitants of the cities, and artificers, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But in the country, husbandmen may freely and lawfully apply to the business of agriculture; since it often happens that the sowing of corn and the planting of vines cannot be so advantageously performed on any other day."

"But it was not until the year 538 that abstinence from agricultural labour was recommended, rather than enjoined, by an ecclesiastical authority (the third Council of Orleans), and this expressly that the people might have more leisure to go to church and say their prayers."

In its article "Sunday," the Encyclopedia Britannica, says:

"It was Constantine who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; and who, according to Eusebius, appointed that it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire."

The Encyclopedia Britannica declares:

"The earliest recognition of the observance of Sunday as a legal duty is a constitution of Constantine in 321 A. D., enacting that all courts of justice, inhabitants of towns, and workshops were to be at rest on Sunday, (*venerabili die solis*), with an exception in favour of those engaged in agricultural labour.—

Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume XXVI, 11th edition, article "Sunday," p. 95.

Robert Cox says:

"He (Grotius) refers to Eusebius for proof that Constantine, besides issuing his well-known edict that labour should be suspended on Sunday, enacted that the people should be brought before the law courts on the seventh day of the week, which also, he adds, was long observed by the primitive Christians as a day for religious meetings. . . . And this, says he, 'refutes those who think that the Lord's day (Sunday) was substituted for the Sabbath—a thing nowhere mentioned either by Christ or His apostles.'—Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), *Opera Omnia Theologica*, London: 1679; cited in *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*, Robert Cox, Vol. 1, p. 223, Edinburgh: MacLachlan and Stewart, 1865.

Prof. Webster states:

"This legislation by Constantine probably bore no relation to Christianity; it appears, on the contrary, that the emperor, in his capacity of Pontifex Maximus, was only adding the day of the sun, the worship of which was then firmly established in the Roman Empire, to the other ferial days of the sacred calendar."—*Rest Days*, Professor Hutton Webster, Ph. D. (University of Nebraska), p. 122. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1916.

"What began, however, as a pagan ordinance, ended as a Christian regulation; and a long series of imperial decrees, during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, enjoined with increasing stringency abstinence from labour on Sunday."—*Id.*, p. 270.

The Rev. A. Stanley declares:

"The retention of the old pagan name 'Dies Solis,' or 'Sunday,' for the weekly Christian festival, is, in great measure, owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonising the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution."—*Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D., Lecture 6, par. 15, p. 184. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Neander states:

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden."—*General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Dr. Augustus Neander (translation by Joseph Torrey), Volume II, p. 300. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1848.

Bishop Seymour, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, is quoted in the book, "Why We Keep Sunday," on this question as follows:

"We have made the change from the seventh day to the first day, from Saturday to Sunday, on the authority of the one holy, catholic, apostolic church of Christ."

God Makes a Charge

In Daniel 7: 25, a charge is made that the power there represented by the "little horn" would attempt to change God's times and laws:

"And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

This power was also to make war with the saints (verse 21) and was to continue forty-two months, or one thousand, two hundred and sixty days. (Revelation 13: 5; 12: 6). Now the power here brought to view is Papal Rome. To this all students of prophecy agree. The Papacy was fully established in 538 B. C. and received its deadly wound in 1798 (Revelation 13: 3), a period of just 1260 years. During this period this power was not only to persecute God's people and put them to death, but it was also to attempt to change His LAW and His TIME. Now, the TIME

which belongs to God is the seventh day. He calls it "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God:" Exodus 20: 10, "My holy day," Isaiah 58: 13, and claims to be Lord of it. Mark 2: 28. Now in order to change this time and set apart some other time as holy, requires a change also of God's law since His law enforces the observance of His holy time. And although Christ declares that not a jot or a tittle shall in any wise pass from the law as long as heaven and earth remain, yet God charges that this little horn power—the Papal Church—will attempt to change it. He says this change which Rome would make would affect God's time. Therefore the charge is that it would change—or attempt to change—the Sabbath.

Does Rome Admit Her Guilt?

One who is the highest Catholic authority in America says:

"Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change was her act: it could not have been other wise, as none in those days would have dreamed of doing anything in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical and religious without her. And the act is a mark of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters."—*Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, Maryland.*

In a Catholic work called "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," page 58, is the following:

"Question: How prove you that the church has power to command feasts and holy days?

"Answer: By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday.

We have this further testimony:

"Question: Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

"Answer: Had she not such power, she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority."—*Doctrinal Catechism,* pp. 174, 352.

And the *Catholic Mirror*, the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons, in its issue of September 23, 1893, says:

"The Catholic Church, over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. . . . The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day, the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church; without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world."

Then to cap the climax of confession, Father Enright, a Catholic priest of Des Moines, Iowa, formerly of Kansas, U. S. A., offered a thousand dollars (about £200) to the one who would prove from the Bible that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep, and declared:

"The Bible says: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' but the Catholic Church says, 'No, keep the first day of the week,' and all the world bows down in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church."

Another catechism, "The Catholic Christian Instructed," page 202, says:

"Question: What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday preferably to the ancient Sabbath, which was Saturday?

"Answer: We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

"Question: Does the Scripture anywhere command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

"Answer: The Scripture commands us to hear the church . . . but the Scriptures do not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath."

On page 15 of Volume 4 of "Clifton Tracts,"

(Catholic) in an article on "A Question for all Bible Christians," this question is thus dealt with:

"We Catholics, then have precisely the same authority for keeping Sunday holy, instead of Saturday, as we have for every other article of our creed; namely, the authority of 'the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth'; whereas, you who are Protestants have really no authority for it whatever; for there is no authority for it in the Bible, and you will not allow that there can be authority for it anywhere else. Both you and we do, in fact, follow tradition in this matter; but we follow it, believing it to be a part of God's Word, and the church to be its divinely appointed guardian and interpreter; you follow it, denouncing it all the time as a fallible and treacherous guide, which often makes the commandment of God of none effect."

In the *Catholic Press*, of Sydney, Australia, in its issue of August 25, 1900, there is this statement:

"Sunday is a Catholic institution, and its claims to observance can be defended only on Catholic principles. . . . From beginning to end of the Scriptures there is not a single passage that warrants the transfer of weekly public worship from the last day of the week to the first."

Cardinal Gibbons, in his book "Faith of Our Fathers," edition of 1892, on page 111 says:

"You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorising the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify."

Again he says:

"They (the Protestants) deem it their duty to keep the Sunday holy. Why?—Because the Catholic Church tells them to do so. They have no other reason."—*The Ecclesiastical Review, February, 1914, Vol. 50, No. 2, p. 236.*

The following questions and answers will be found in "The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine," by the Rev. Peter Geiermann, C. SS. R., page 50, 3rd edition, 1913, a work which received the "apostolic blessing of the Pope Pius X, January 25, 1910:

"Question: Which is the Sabbath day?

"Answer: Saturday is the Sabbath day.

"Question: Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

"Answer: We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 336), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday." (The date usually given for this council is 364.)

The *Kansas City Catholic*, of February 9, 1893, said:

"The Catholic Church by its own infallible authority created Sunday a holy day to take the place of the Sabbath of the old law."

Thus it will be seen that God deliberately charges the Roman Church with the crime of tampering with the divine law in changing the observance of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. The voice of history deliberately testifies to the truth of the charge. The Roman Church deliberately confesses itself guilty as charged. And thus the Roman Church stands before the world convicted of laying impious hands upon the Sabbath of the Lord, and tearing from its place in the very heart of the law of God, the fourth commandment, substituting instead, a spurious and counterfeit sabbath, which is no sabbath at all, as it rests solely on the traditions of that church, and not in any sense upon the Word of God.

But, let it be noticed, the Roman Church is more consistent in the observance of Sunday than are the Protestant Churches. The Roman Church does not base its teachings on THE BIBLE ALONE, but on THE BIBLE AND TRADITION, holding that tradi-

THE AFRICAN DIVISION OUTLOOK

Published semi-monthly by the

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, African Division

Subscription price, five shillings

W. B. COMMIN, Editor
 MISS P. E. WILLMORE, Asst. Editor
 Grove Avenue, Claremont, Cape

tion is the safer guide of the two. But the Protestant belief is, that the Bible and the Bible alone is the foundation of truth. And the Sunday institution can be found only in tradition. IT CANNOT BE FOUND IN THE BIBLE.

It is evident, therefore, that the Protestant Churches, in observing Sunday, have left the true ground and basis of Protestantism, the Bible, and are following the Roman Church in accepting doctrines and practices which are not founded upon the Bible. On this point Catholics can truthfully accuse Protestants of inconsistency.

The duty, then, of every true Protestant is to cast away this unscriptural practice and doctrine of Sunday observance and to follow the Bible, Jesus, and the apostles, in the observance of the true Sabbath, the seventh day of the week.

The Rev. Garratt speaks of a "rather surprising failure in ordinary scholarship" on the part of Seventh-day Adventist leaders. Now it has not been the policy of Seventh-day Adventist clergymen to parade their degrees (though most of them with whom we are acquainted have from one to three from recognised colleges and schools of theology) since it has not seemed in keeping with their profession to do so. But we inquire, wherein, after all, is the real lack of scholarship? We have proved our positions by a "thus saith the Lord" and by the most eminent authorities in the world. We have not dealt in vagaries. We have cited the text and reference for the statements we have quoted. Perhaps our friend, the Rev. Garratt, will be good enough to do the same, and thus establish his self-appointed position as a critic of the scholarship of his colleagues.

All that Seventh-day Adventists desire is truth. Worldly wisdom is not everything. In the struggle to gain eternal life, scholarship is not the all important consideration. The great question is, "What is truth?" What does the Bible say? If the Bible is not a safe guide then we are all lost. There is no other guiding star. There is no other anchor for the soul. There is no other ground for faith. Upon this old Book, which has weathered the storms of the ages, we take our stand, and by the grace of God, we look forward with all confidence to the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Dear Reader:

If the matter in this paper proves to be a blessing to you, please pass it on to a friend, and, better still, order a supply for all your friends and neighbours, that they may thus share the blessing with you. Order from the Sentinel Publishing Company, Rosmead Avenue, Kenilworth, Cape. Price 2d. per copy; 12 copies, 1/9; 100 copies or more, 14/- per 100.

Read the "Signs of the Times; Africa's Ppophetic Monthly." 2/6 per year, postpaid. Send subscriptions to the Sentinel Pub. Co., Rosmead Avenue, Kenilworth, Cape.

The Law of God's Kingdom

Thou shalt have no other Gods before Me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep My commandments.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Thou shalt not kill.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's.

Busy Man's Library

To those desiring further reading matter upon some of these important questions, we heartily recommend the following splendid volumes:

"CHRIST THE DIVINE ONE"	by Shuler
"THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH"	by Haynes
"HERALDS OF THE KING"	by Bollman
"THE BIBLE MADE PLAIN"	by Shuler
"OUR LORD'S RETURN"	by Haynes
"STEPS TO CHRIST"	by White
"THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH"	by Haynes
"SPIRITUALISM"	by Haynes
"WHAT IS COMING?"	by Haynes
"OUR PARADISE HOME"	by Lane
"SATAN"	by Haynes

These volumes contain 128 pages each, and can be had from the Sentinel Publishing Company, Rosmead Avenue, Kenilworth, Cape, at 1/6 per copy, postpaid. Order today.