

"Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." —Rom. 3, 4.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

WHENCE IT IS—WHAT IT MEANS

WHITHER IT TENDS

An Exhaustive Examination of their Doctrines and Writings

BY DAVID ANDERSON-BERRY,
M.D., F.R.S. (Edin.)

Author of "Seven Cries from the Cross," "Unfinished Work of Jesus,"
"After Death," &c.

With Introduction

BY J. R. CALDWELL, Editor of "The Witness."



GLASGOW:
PICKERING & INGLIS, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS.
LONDON: ALFRED HOLNESS, 14 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
NEW YORK: D. T. BASS, 54 WEST TWENTY-SECOND STREET.
May be Ordered through any Bookseller.

BOOKS BY DR. ANDERSON-BERRY.

SEVEN SAYINGS OF CHRIST ON THE CROSS:

A Series of Studies on the ever-memorable last words of our Lord Jesus Christ. Cloth, 1/. Blue cloth, bevelled boards, 1/6. Presentation Edition in Half-Morocco, 2/, post free.

"The solemn scenes of Calvary are vividly brought before us in these pages. They remind one of the expression used by Paul in his writing to the Galatians, 'before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified.' And surely that which helps us to realise the glory of the Person and the perfectness of the character of the Lord of Life, who there endured the Cross, must be for edification, and must tend to sanctify."—J. R. C.

THE UNFINISHED WORK OF JESUS: A Series of "Pictures from the Acts." Picture I. "His Resurrection." II. "His Ascension." III. "His Coming Again." IV. "The Gift of the Comforter." V. "Stephen, the First Martyr." VI. "A Young Man named Saul." VII. "The Beloved Physician." 1/6, post free.

[In the Press.]

AFTER DEATH; or, The Destiny of the Soul.
Deals with Man's Creation—Body, Soul, Spirit—Immortality—Sheol, Hades, Paradise—Christadelphians and Seventh-Day Adventists—Annihilation and Universalism, &c. 64 Pages Clear Type. 2d. 6 for 1/, post free.

GLASGOW:

PICKERING & INGLIS, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS.
LONDON: A HOLNESS. NEW YORK: D. T. BASS.

PREFACE.

DECEIT is characteristic of error. That which is the truth is characterised by simplicity. Satan beguiled Eve by his subtlety, and his workings through his ministers ever since have been after the same order. His method in most cases is not an open denial of the Word of God; it is not the propounding of a bald, obvious lie, but rather the casting of doubt upon what is written, or the misinterpreting of the Word, or the misapplying of it, or the mixing of it with error. So early as the date of 2nd Corinthians the apostle states that there were already *many* who corrupted (that is by mixing it with error as in adulteration) the Word of God (see chap. 2. 17). Again, in chap. 4. 2, he speaks of others "walking in craftiness" and "handling the Word of God deceitfully." Again, in chap. 11. 3, he fears lest the Corinthians should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ, and in verse 13 refers to "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ; and no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." Writing to the Galatians (1. 7) he says, "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ." Then follows the awful warning, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

In Colossians 2 there are five distinct warnings against the teachings of men, and against being made a spoil of by their "philosophy and vain deceit, the traditions of men and the elements of the world" (verse 8). In Ephesians 4. 14 we read of "winds of doctrine," "sleight [literally dice-playing] of men," "and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." We might multiply scriptures to prove the statement already made that "deceit is characteristic of error." But such is fallen man that he has a positive bias towards the false; he is readier

Preface.

to believe a lie than the truth, as the Lord Himself testified, "Because I tell you the truth ye believe me not" (John 8. 45). The time is coming when the truth-rejectors, borne on the current of a mighty delusion, will believe in the great Satanic lie, the masterpiece of subtlety, the Antichrist.

It is not therefore to be wondered at that the doctrines so ably, and at the cost of so great labour, exposed and refuted in this pamphlet should be found to be a mass of deceits, and that notwithstanding this they should be propagated with Satanic energy and received by myriads among many nations. That such deceptions should have such a circulation is a solemn evidence of the general ignorance of the Word of God that prevails even in so-called Christian lands.

The money, and labour, and enterprise that is at work to propagate these errors render it absolutely necessary that a stand be made against the inflowing flood. It is with satisfaction we find that Dr. Anderson-Berry has tackled the monster with unsparing grip—has exposed the true character of the teachings of this sect, and so written that no candid lover of truth who has patience to read it through could remain any longer in the power of the error.

That the pamphlet may have a very wide circulation, and that it may be abundantly owned of God in delivering souls from "error's chain" is the prayer of

JOHN R. CALDWELL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	5
Cause of Writing—Fair Representation—Sources of Information—Works of Reference.	
II. HISTORY OF WILLIAM MILLER, THE FOUNDER, - - - - -	7
God's Method, Man's Method, and Miller's Method—The Shield by the Fountain—The Letter and the Spirit.	
III. IDEAS AND DOCTRINES OF THE ADVENTIST FOUNDER, 13	
Falling Stars—Did Christ come in 1847?—The Sanctuary—Satan as Scapegoat—Sabbath Observance—Mrs. Eddy <i>versus</i> Mrs. White—Four Fallacies.	
IV. ADVENTISM IN HISTORY—ITS FAILURES, - - - - -	21
Early Ecstatic Visions—Tenth and Seventeenth Century Adventists—Irvingites—Miller Among the Prophets—When did the Seventy Weeks Begin?—The Mistakes of Miller—Seventh-Day Adventistic Arithmetic.	
V. THE EVOLUTION OF ADVENTISM, - - - - -	30
"Ascension Robes" on the Roof—October, 22, 1844! What Happened?—What Sister White Saw in Heaven!—Three False Assumptions.	
VI. THE PROPHETESS OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS, 34	
The S.-D.A. Plan of Salvation—Satan, not Christ, the Saviour.	
VII. "THE SANCTUARY" THEORY OF ADVENTISM, - - - - -	36
"The Day of Jesus Christ" not "The Day of the Lord"—A Puerile Plea—What is Azazel?—Is Satan the Scapegoat?	
VIII. THE ADVENTIST TEACHING ABOUT "THE SABBATH,"- - - - -	43
Ancient History on the Point—The "Confession of Faith"—Who Changed the Day?—The Adventist Teaching—The Scripture Teaching—How to Keep the Fourth Commandment—Sister White's Sabbath—"Parlour Magic"—Two Day's Difference.	
IX. THE FIRST DAY OR THE SEVENTH DAY, - - - - -	50
First Day <i>versus</i> Sabbath—No Return to Sabbath Gloom—Paul and the Adventists.	
X. THE ADVENTIST SABBATARIAN POSITION EXAMINED, 53	
What is the Law?—Sabbath Keeping in the Temple—Why the Sabbath was given—When was the Sabbath Abolished?—Gentile Christians must become Jews.	
XI. SUNDAY—THE SIGN OF THE BEAST, - - - - -	59
Lord's Day or Sunday—Origin of Sunday—Meaning of Lord's-Day—Adventists' Foolish Statements—Honest Witnesses in the Box—Testimony of Thirteen Ancient Historians.	
XII. THE PROPHETESS AND "REVELATIONS FROM GOD,"- - - - -	74
Mrs. White's Guarantees—A Typical "Revelation from God"—Facts and Scriptures Convict Mrs. White of Lying—Startling Signs and Wonders!	
XIII. THE ADVENTISTS AND ANNIHILATION, - - - - -	82
Eschatology—Mrs. White Looks into the Ark—The S.-D.A. Gospel—"The Sorrows of Satan"—Satan, the Substitute for All—Crisp Conclusion.	

24 Pages—ONE PENNY.

Issued for 35 Years.

The Witness:

An Unfettered Monthly Journal of Biblical Literature.

Edited by JOHN R. CALDWELL.

Contains Bible Papers by Accredited Writers, Expositions, Suggestive Articles, Practical Papers, Correspondence, Questions and Answers, Reviews, Intelligence from Five Continents.

Rates for year—1 copy, 1/6; 2, 2 6; 3, 3 6; 4 or more at 1/- each, post free anywhere.

Specimen Copies free to any address.

PICKERING & INGLIS, "WITNESS" OFFICE, GLASGOW.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM.

CHAPTER I.

" Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Paul, Col. 2. 8).

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM—whence it is, what it means, and whither it tends—is the subject of this little book.

Conscious of my own shortcomings, and of the difficulties that thickly strew my path when I attempt to express my thoughts and to convey the meaning of others, I have long hesitated over my task since the day Douglas Perry paid me a visit to set it before me. Others also agreeing with him have sustained me by prayer, by active co-operation in obtaining for me supplies of literature, and by persistently pressing upon me the clamant need of the Church of the living God for warning, instruction, exhortation, and undeceiving as to the nature of this American heresy.

The fellowship of my friend, John R. Caldwell, in this work has been of the greatest help to me, especially in the days that have been darkened by the close and necessary study of scores of pamphlets, leaflets, magazine numbers, as well as the larger and more exhaustive (and exhausting) treatises, dealing with the subject. Not only has he read the MS. (his valuable suggestions have been embodied in the work without further acknowledgment), but he has also written an introduction at my request, because "the witness of two men is truth."

Rejoicing in such fellowship and practical co-operation, I cast myself on the living God for guidance, inspiration, help, and strength.

To me it appears His work. Before publishing it for the edification of His saints, it has first been offered to Him, and unless I were conscious that He had accepted it as a defence (with all its imperfections) of His truth, it would have remained buried in oblivion, in spite of all encouragement to the contrary.

It is fit that I should state here the grounds upon which I construct the description of Seventh-Day Adventism, as I do not propose burdening my pages with references. All the extracts from their writings, or the writings of others, I have made personally.

Where the substance of lengthy passages has been given, I am responsible for its being a fair representation in each case of the writer's meaning.

Apparently simple statements are often the outcome of days of close application. There has been first the discovery and compilation of many passages, all bearing on the same point. Then there has been the comparing of statement with statement, until one at length saw that of which the various writers from different standpoints had given differing descriptions. Finally, the statement of the matter in my own words has been considered with a view to simplification as far as possible. If I have failed, or if discrepancies have crept in, it has not been from want of trying or from *malice prepense*. I can honestly say that my conscience is free from any attempt at misrepresentation or desire to make my task an easier one by any appeal to the vulgar passions.

To prevent anyone suggesting that I have not gone to the right source for my information, I make the following statement as to the nature of the first book on my list. A young believer in Wales was persuaded by the Seventh-Day Adventists to buy a book called "The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan during the Christian Dispensation," by Mrs. E. G. White, and published by the International Tract Society—the publishing department of the Seventh-Day Adventists. This large octavo volume was sent to me for my perusal, and it is from its seven hundred pages that many of my quotations have been made. A passage quoted from the publisher's preface will prove that I could not have gone to a better source—

"We have the clearest assurance that the author possesses peculiar qualifications for such a work. From her childhood she has been noted for her reverence and love for the Word of God, and her piety

and devotion to His service. . . . The blessing of the Holy Spirit has been vouchsafed to her in large measure. And as one of the offices of this Spirit was declared to be to show unto the followers of Christ 'things to come' (John 16. 13), working through that prescribed channel which, as one of the endowments of the Church, is described as the gift of prophecy (1 Cor. 12. 9, 10; 14. 1), so we believe she has been empowered by a divine illumination to speak of some past events which have thus been brought to her attention, with greater minuteness than is SET FORTH IN ANY EXISTING RECORDS, and TO READ THE FUTURE WITH MORE THAN HUMAN FORE-SIGHT." [Capitals mine as they are elsewhere.]

Besides this book I may mention—

"Bible Readings for the Home Circle," "History of the Sabbath" (by J. N. Andrews), "Which Day Do You Keep? and Why?" "Can We Keep the Sabbath?" and numerous other booklets on the same question; "The Signs of Christ's Near Coming," "Here and Hereafter, and is Man Immortal," "The Law and the Gospel," "Bible Students' Library" (various numbers), "The Present Truth" (various numbers), "The Great Second Advent Movement" (just published). In all, numbering about one hundred and fifty items.

From the works of reference open to me I understand that the spread of this heresy has been fairly rapid in recent years, whilst the wealth accumulated at the headquarters and used for the propaganda is enormous. This seems to be a specialty of American religions, of which Dr. Dowie's and Mrs. Eddy's may be taken as fair illustrations.

CHAPTER II.

"Then said I, O my Lord, what are these? And the angel that talked with me said unto me, I will show thee what these be" (Zech. 1. 9).

SINCE the world began there have been many William Millers, each playing his part on the stage of life to more or less the best of his ability.

In the days of my youth I knew one, a humble yet excellent man, whose memory is still fragrant in spite of the long years that have passed since then.

Ere this friend of my childhood's days was born, across the broad Atlantic another William Miller arose, casting a potent and baleful influence over the people of the United States.

His history must be briefly told. Born of humble parentage and in poor circumstances his mind was early directed by a pious mother to the study of the Bible. As he grew up to manhood, like many another in similar circumstances,

these early impressions were obliterated by the rising tide of scepticism and unbelief. Coming into contact with Deists, puzzled by the apparent contradictions which they made haste to find for him in the Bible, ignorant of his own ignorance and of the frequent fallacies inherent in so many of our mental processes, impressed as young men of twenty-one are apt to be with a notion of his own powers, and judging the Divine Book not by its contents but by the meanings men are so ready to force upon them, William Miller ceased to believe in the God who is revealed by the Lord Jesus Christ as a tender Father, and for twelve years wandered amidst the cheerless solitudes of Deism. To him God was but a Being who had made the world and all its inhabitants merely to leave it and them to be the sport of Chance or the Laws of Nature—a God who either could reveal Himself but would not, or could not if He would.

In such a belief the human heart can find no satisfaction, the human mind no rest. "Thou hast made us for Thyself," cried the great Augustine, "and we cannot rest until we rest in Thee."

The great problems of Life, Death, and After Death, cannot be solved by such a philosophy, and coming face to face with the fact of Death, as all men do as they grow older and realise that the portion of all is their portion, he turned again to the Bible he had despised and forsaken. Thus at the age of thirty-four he betook himself to the daily reading of the Word of God.

Now, whatever evolution is as a hypothesis, it has taught us this great lesson that a man is what he becomes through the interacting of two great forces—an inner and an outer. He is the product of what he is and of what he is not; of heredity and of environment; of action and re-action of that which is himself and of that which is not himself. Thus we see in the after history of William Miller the results of his mother's nature, of her early training, of his sceptical companions, of his lack of education, of his hard life as a small farmer, of the strenuous strivings of an uncultured mind, of a close contact with nature without a knowledge of her laws; hence every occurrence out of the common seemed a miracle, nay more, the elements of wonder and of mystery which a mind like his supplies as a setting to such occurrences transform them into veritable signs from heaven, awful indications of the mind of the Most High, singular seals provided by the Almighty to attest the validity of

human documents as revelations of His most secret designs, of which the Son of Man even disclaimed all knowledge.

Now this man came to the study of the Bible in the same self-confident spirit in which he rose from it thirteen years before to reject it utterly:

"Endeavouring to lay aside all preconceived opinions, and dispensing with commentaries, he compared scripture with scripture by the aid of marginal references and the concordance."

This sounds very well; and there are many who make it their boast that they too have done or are doing the same.

Yet observe that in all this we have two evils—pride and self-confidence; and two errors—the refusal to follow God's method of instruction and the neglect of God's Instructor.

1. From beginning to end of the Bible we find that God has one method of instructing men, and that method is the one in use all the world over from the beginning of time—by teachers.

Does He wish to instruct the antediluvians in the ways of righteousness? He sends Noah to them. Does He wish to instruct the children of Israel? He sends Moses to them. Does He wish to instruct His people all down the ages that preceded the coming of our Lord? He sends prophets to them to teach them the way wherein they should walk. Of the Lord Jesus we read that "they found Him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them and asking them questions . . . And Jesus advanced in wisdom" (Luke 2, 46, 52).

The mission of the Holy Spirit is that of the teacher; and the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church is "thirdly teachers" of whom it is written that "God set" them "in the Church" (1 Cor. 12, 28).

Ananias is sent to Saul (Acts 9); Apollos, a learned man and mighty in the Scriptures, has yet to learn of Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18); and it is written "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom. 10, 14, R.V.).

Thus we see God's method of instruction is by human instrumentality. The cry of humanity is voiced in the answer of Candace's sable courtier to Philip's question, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" when he replied, "How can I, except some one shall guide me?" And that cry God answers by supplying human teachers even though

He should have to take them from flourishing fields to lie in wait for a lonely traveller issuing from the spacious silences of the desert, returning from worshipping at Jerusalem, reading the Word of God, perhaps reading aloud in hope that the spoken words might convey more sense to his mind than the written word, and startled by the question of the God-sent teacher: "Understandest thou?" This great man showed no pride. He did not reply that he was much obliged, but he had the Word . . . ! No, this great courtier and Queen's confidant replies with the *naïveté* of a little child: "For how should I be able unless some one should guide me?" and beseeches Philip to come and sit by him.

It is the same in the great book of nature that lies open around us. God might have so arranged it that he who runs along life's highway might read His wonders and spell His Name with the utmost ease. But it is far different. To behold the wonders of His creative wisdom and perceive the miracles of His providing love in the common things of daily life has taken man myriads of laborious days and wakeful nights. Were I to lift my eyes to the starry vault of heaven and seek to understand the evolutions of the planets and the slow procession of the stars without a guide, or without any knowledge of the discoveries of Kepler, Galileo, Herschell, Adams, La Place, Newton, and hundreds of others who have given their lives to the study of God's handiwork in the heavens, would you not call me a fool, and prophesy the mistakeness of my conclusions? Were I in a similar fashion to investigate the wonders of the body, failure would be my portion. No, in these sciences of astronomy and anatomy, as well as in all other sciences, we do not scoff at what others have discovered before us, and have carefully handed down to us, as "traditional views." We do not expect to find in them all the truth, but we look to discover in them treasures of wisdom and knowledge with which we may purchase further advances into the kingdom of truth.

There is one ancient science in which men have sought to gain fame by knowing more than their neighbours by putting themselves into the state of nescience, or "knowing nought." That science is philosophy, and the method of discovery mentioned is as old as the ancients who sat in perfect silence contemplating the tips of their noses and trying to make their minds a perfect vacuum, in order to discover the basal facts of being. Naturally, the results

have been as abysmal as the method. In one instance all being is reduced to pure thought—that is, thought without a thinker! And in another it is reduced to simple matter, with thought as much a secretion of brain cells as perspiration is of the sweat glands.

But there is no science in which men seek to acquire knowledge beyond their fellows by examining *papier-mâché* models of the human body to become anatomists, or artificial flowers to become botanists, or clock-work models to become engineers. Yet William Miller not only emptied his mind of all he had been taught about the Bible, and set deliberately aside all that Christian scholars after ages of prayer and meditation and dependence upon the Spirit of truth had discovered as to the meaning of the Scriptures, but sat down to the study of the Word of God by means of an imperfect (for all the works of men, even at their best, must lack perfection) translation.

The Word of God is *theopneustic*—God-breathed or inspired, but let us be plain with ourselves, and admit that the English version is not *theopneustic*. The Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek originals were fully inspired. The English translation was made by fallible men, biased by the commands of a very fallible king (as may be seen in the introduction they wrote to their work), from imperfect copies of the inspired originals. William Miller sat down to this version as if it were the inspired original, and neither sought to make himself master of Hebrew, Chaldee, or Greek, nor to learn what the Christian men of his own day could teach him as to their true meaning.

Note then what William Miller really did. He took an imperfect translation and placed it in the place of the inspired original. He confined himself strictly within the limits of this translation by using only a concordance and the marginal references. By doing this he multiplied the imperfections of the version a hundred-fold, for his action really meant his re-translating the version by means of the imperfect knowledge and biased vocabulary of the bishops of King James; for a concordance to an imperfect version must not only be imperfect, but must also emphasise the imperfections of that version.

Remember, therefore, this initial fallacy, for we shall ere long see how greatly he erred and how grievously he stumbled thereby.

2. William Miller not only refused to follow God's

method of instruction, but he also neglected God's Instructor—the Holy Spirit. From all I can gather from his own words, and the descriptions given by others who claim to have practically an infallible knowledge of the facts, he was guilty of this. Occasionally he refers to the Holy Spirit, but it is only to endorse his previously conceived ideas of what the Word teaches.

Paul writes: "Which things also we speak, not in words which men's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Often people imagine that they are obeying Paul's words to the letter when they use marginal references and various concordances more or less complicated. But that is not what the apostle means by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." The literal meaning of the words he wrote is: "Combining spiritual things with spiritual words." That is to say, not only did the Holy Spirit teach Paul the great truths He would have him utter, but He supplied him with the words which fittingly give expression to these truths. Therefore not only do we require to know exactly what these words are, but we need the power of the Spirit to discern the truths of which these words are but an expression, for it pertains to the nature of all things earthly to be imperfect, and the special imperfection of language is that it is capable of more meanings than one. A speaker may desire to make himself clear on a certain point, but when his speech appears in cold type, without the guidance of his voice and facial expression, his readers are often in danger of misunderstanding him. Suppose he be Prime Minister, and it is necessary that his meaning should be clear, what ought his readers to do? Apply to the speaker of course. In the case of an author, should a discussion arise as to what is his meaning in a certain important passage of his book, what is the best thing to do? Apply to the author of course.

If Paul were the real author of the books that bear his name in the New Testament, such a simple method would be inadmissible, for he is dead. But the true Author (as he indicates in the passage quoted) is the Holy Spirit, and He is present. Nay, His very mission is to lead us into all truth.

That William Miller erred here is clear from two facts. Firstly, he does not lay any emphasis on the interpreting work of the Holy Spirit; secondly, he does lay much stress on taking the words literally; that is to say, literally in the sense in which he used that much abused word.

This has always been a danger with mankind. Says our Lord to the Jewish rabbis, who knew the text of the Old Testament Scriptures, the only Bible then, letter perfect: "Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me; and ye are unwilling to come unto Me" (John 5. 39, 40). And what writes the apostle to the Corinthian believers: "God . . . hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not [ministers] of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. 3. 6).

A shield hung from the bough of a tree that stretched over a fountain. Two knights approaching from opposite directions stopped to refresh themselves and their steeds at the fountain. Says the one to the other, "I wonder who left this golden shield hanging here?" To which the other replied, "I, too, wonder; but please observe that the shield is not golden but silvern." And it was only the timeous discovery that the shield was golden on the one side and silvern on the other that saved these two knights from shedding each other's blood.

It is well to remember this traditional illustration of the fact that every truth has more than one side to it, for in (1) I dwelt on the necessity of knowing the very letter, and in (2) of being instructed by the Spirit. And I would say again both are necessary, for before the Spirit can teach me the truths hidden under the letter it is absolutely requisite that I should know the letter under which the divine truths lie hidden, for it is by the Spirit that the letter and the truth have been combined.

CHAPTER III.

"How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the Name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him" (Deut. 8. 21, 22).

IN 1831 Miller began to preach that Christ was coming soon! In 1833 there was a series of meteoric showers over the United States of America, causing great wonder

and much alarm amongst people ignorant of the explanation of such a phenomenon. Looked at as "falling stars," they presaged the propinquity of the Coming Judgment. Political events, that are seen now to be of no significance, appealed to the same minds as the fulfilment of prophecy. Such occurrences, with certain other influences, led Miller and others to proclaim far and wide that the Lord would return to the earth at the latest in the autumn of the year 1844. Above all, certain chronological calculations (which any schoolboy can see are faulty in their arithmetic, and any student that they are wrong in their data), upon which Miller prided himself, made him venture his all upon that definite promise. The date he first adventured passed, and Christ came not. So did the second date, in spite of all his solemn assurances that he could not be wrong.

All confidence in him was shaken. After all, William Miller but belonged to a well-known class—that of false prophets, of which we have such examples in the early days as "Theudas boasting himself to be somebody," and "Judas of Galilee" who "drew away much people after him" (Acts 5. 36, 37); and in later times such well-known examples as Prince of the Agapemone, James Biden, and Joanna Southcote and Emanuel Swedenborg, who sought to secure the fulfilment of their prophecies by the gradual assumption to themselves of the Name of Him whose coming they had proclaimed.

There are no dupes amongst men like religious dupes, and as all dupes cling like the proverbial drowning man to the last straws left after the utter collapse of their hopes, so the dupes of William Miller clung to the new discovery made for him by his colleagues that Christ did come in 1844—but not to the earth. That being too obvious to need re-statement, the fundamental doctrine of the Millerites or Seventh-Day Adventists runs: "Christ came in 1844 to the Sanctuary"; a subsidiary but almost as necessary a discovery being that "the sanctuary" is not on earth but somewhere else, say in heaven.

Reader, whoever thou art, thou canst easily see the genesis of this doctrine. Unless Miller be admitted a hopeless liar it MUST be granted that "Christ did come in 1844." These are the alternatives—either Christ came in that year or Miller is but one more to add to the growing list of false prophets. His disciples were on the horns of a dilemma. Believe in Miller, and they must believe in Christ's

coming in 1844. If Christ did come in 1844, it was not to the earth; and here again the alternative faced them, if not earth it must be heaven. But would it not be irrational to say that Christ in heaven (for where else could He be?) came in 1844 to heaven? It is equal to saying, "I am coming to where I am," which, contradicting the axiom that "the same body cannot both be and not be in the same place at the same time," is nonsense.

But suppose we find another name for heaven. Let it be called the "sanctuary." Then may it not be said without an open contradiction in terms, "Christ came in 1844 from heaven to the sanctuary"? Now find some verses in the book of Revelation about there being a temple, and an ark, and a golden altar in heaven; take these passages in an absolutely literal sense, and we have scriptural authority for saying "there is a sanctuary in heaven." Having supplied this straw for his dupes to grasp, William Miller,* aided by his lieutenants, proceeded to build upon it an impressive edifice of doctrine. Why did Christ come in 1844 to "the sanctuary"? To proceed with the "investigative judgment." And what is this? The examination by Christ of all the sins committed by His people. He does not excuse them, but (it is said) by showing their penitence and faith He prevails upon His Father to blot these out. To such a procedure Satan offers a profound resistance, consequently (here is an example of poetic justice!) when Jesus is finished investigating He takes all these pardoned sins and puts them upon Satan, because He has in the course of His investigation discovered that Satan is "the author of them." Satan, then, has to bear all these pardoned sins as a scapegoat into the land of oblivion, where he is annihilated with them still upon him.

Do not say that I am cruelly misrepresenting Miller and his collaborators, for I shall presently give extracts which will bear out all I have written, and more!

This final disappearance of Satan as scapegoat occurs when our Lord really comes to the earth. When this is to occur they very carefully abstain from saying,

*I am told on good authority that Miller opposed the whole idea of the sanctuary; that only a mere handful out of the great mass of Adventists in 1844 accepted the new discovery, and amongst these were no men of note. Further investigation leads me to believe that the "sanctuary" notion began with Crosier, who published it in an extra double number of the *Day Star*, Cincinnati, O., in February 7th, 1849. Then Mrs. White propagated it by means of her visions. The text, however, represents the S.-D.A. view of the occurrence so far as I can make out from their books, so I allow it to stand.

However, as "Jesus is in the sanctuary," these are the "last days." And finding that in the "last days" the Seventh-Day or Sabbath would anew be observed,* Miller evolved another of his doctrines: That the Law given on Sinai was never abrogated, consequently that the Fourth Commandment, "Remember the Sabbath Day," is as binding upon us as it was upon Israel when it was given by the hand of Moses.

Perhaps this is the doctrine by which the Millerites are best known in this country; hence their name of Seventh-Day Adventists.

In conclusion, it is always well to find the rationale of any system of doctrine. We see how Roman Catholicism is a well-planned instrument to put all power in the hands of the priesthood. In the system we are studying we see how the exigencies of the case caused the growth of the "sanctuary" dogma. We shall see how the "investigative judgment" conducted there is a whip to stimulate laggard disciples to greater efforts in propaganda and faithful sending in of tithes to the headquarters, for their final salvation depends on their "penitence and faith." And to mark them out from other of the numerous sects they are put under the Law, not only because a gospel of works is delightful to the human heart, but from the fact that the keeping of the Seventh or Sabbath Day is a distinctive feature that smacks of supreme self-sacrifice in literally keeping that which other religious parties only pray God to help them to keep—on the wrong day!

Can we wonder, then, that Seventh-Day Adventism spreads like wildfire across America into Europe and beyond when we have these three essentials to success in this world present—the claims of expediency satisfied; the propulsive power of the fear of judgment; a method of salvation peculiarly palatable to the human heart.

I must be candid, and admit that according to the most recent statistics that have come to hand Millerism, whilst spreading in new fields, is losing ground rapidly in the districts in which it first started. There are many reasons that might be given for this retrogression, this dying at the roots. One that suggests itself strongly to my mind after a careful study of the movement is—that as there are fashions in diseases, so there are fashions in religions, and the new prophetess, Mrs. Eddy, has overshadowed and taken the

*The same remarks hold good here. See further on this point, page

wind out of the sails of the older prophetess, Mrs. White. Mrs. Eddy proclaims freedom from pain, sickness, and death, by mysterious means which have gained a vogue because it appeals to the mind; whereas Mrs. White only promises health to her followers on such inconvenient terms as abstinence from tea, coffee, cocoa, tobacco, bacon, ham, pork, wines, spirits, beers, and liqueurs, and threatens them with destruction should they be found indulging in swine's flesh when the Lord comes. Therefore, as the day of Materialism is for the time giving place to the day of Idealism, Mrs. White's appeal to the stomach appears vulgar and strangely inefficient compared with Mrs. Eddy's higher appeal to the mind.

This leads me to notice that both these sects are American to the core; they started in neighbouring States. Seventh-Day Adventism is distinctly American, as shown (to take one instance out of many) by the peculiar interpretation put on the 13th chapter of Revelation. The Adventists teach that the first beast is the Papacy, but the second is the United States of America. Some of my readers may think this too astounding to be true, so I give a few verbatim extracts from their great catechism called "Bible Readings for the Home Circle":—

"Has the United States 'come up' sufficiently to warrant the application of the prophecy to this country?

"The 'Centennial History of the United States' says: 'The extent of the conceded domain of the United States' . . . &c.

"What do 'the two horns like a lamb' represent?

"A horn represents a kingdom. . . . Lamb-like horns would indicate youthfulness, innocence, and gentleness. . . . The 'two' horns . . . twoleading principles of the Government—civil and religious liberty."

Further on we read: "It is evident from the foregoing scriptures that the mark of the beast is something directly opposed to the commandments of God. In the preceding reading it is shown that as the first beast itself had enforced the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, by the secular power, so the two-horned beast (the United States of America) will, in making an image to that beast, enforce the same observance by the same means."

I should say here that the Seventh-Day Adventists teach—

1. Sunday is the "mark of the beast."

2. The "National Reform Association" of the United States is the "image of the beast" because we are told that the N.R.A. "particularly demand of the Government" of the U.S.A. that it should "stop all Sunday trains, discontinue all Sunday papers, and prohibit all manner of work on Sunday, so that their devotions may not be hindered."

3. The United States itself being the "second beast" that "cometh up" and has "two horns like a lamb," but in spite of its "youthfulness, innocence, and gentleness," speaks "as a dragon" for it will keep promulgating "Sunday laws" in spite of all the Seventh-Day Adventists can do or say.

4. The papacy is the "first beast" because according to the S.-D.A.'s (but NOT according to historical fact) we owe "Sunday" to it.

Thus have I shown in this chapter William Miller to be only one more of the already numerous class of False Prophets; that his system as we know it sprung from his False Prophecy by the force of circumstances; that whilst spreading in new ground by its suitability to the desires of the fallen human heart it is dying at the centre because it is overshadowed by a rival next door which appeals more forcibly to the fallen human intellect, and that it is a distinctly American product with an interpretation of Scripture pandering to the boastful nature of the typical Yankee.

CHAPTER IV.

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; BELIEVE HIM NOT."

ONLY twenty years elapsed since our Lord Jesus Christ left this earth in the attitude of blessing when the Apostle Paul had to deal strenuously with a party proclaiming that the Lord's arrival to judge the world was due if not overdue. This statement was backed up by prophetic utterances by individuals in the assemblies, utterances that they claimed to be divine revelations; by statements falsely affirmed to have been made by the Apostle Paul in his oral teachings; and by forged letters professing to have been written by him (2 Thess. 2. 2). The result of this action was disastrous in the case of those who accepted such teaching. They ceased to work and fell into idle habits. Their days were spent no longer in prayer, meditation, and labour, but in going about, hindering others from attending to their work, and continually talking, talking, talking! (2 Thess. 3. 10-12).

Hardly had a hundred years passed when another party arose in the Church repeating the same performance. Like the Seventh-Day Adventists they had strict regulations about clothes, diet, and (as in the case of Mrs. White) their

leaders had "ecstatic visions announcing the approach of the Second Advent of Christ," and these visions (as in her case) "were set forth as divine revelations."

Many were led away by this movement, which extended rapidly in the region where now the North Africa Mission finds it so hard to bring men and women to Christ. After lasting for about a century it sank into utter oblivion.

A similar movement arose in Europe in the tenth century. Any reader of the history of that time will remember how the notion of the immediate return of Christ to judgment produced terrible agitations, universal panic, and fearful impressions of terror and dismay amongst all classes. One writes, "Public and private buildings were suffered to decay, and were even pulled down, from an opinion that they were no longer of any use, since the dissolution of all things was at hand."

Then in the seventeenth century, the Fifth Monarchy men "believed that the time was at hand when to the four great monarchies of Daniel's prophetic vision was to succeed the fifth, which was to break in pieces all others and itself to stand forever." Cromwell was dreadfully troubled with these doctrines as they permeated everywhere, leading astray even some of his old comrades in arms. I do not doubt but that the spread of these doctrines helped greatly in the downfall of that halcyon time of decency and sobriety in the history of England, for many thought that by the overthrow of all government they would succeed in setting up this Fifth Kingdom.

Then comes Edward Irving, the great student of prophecy in the Church of Scotland, declaring "the speedy coming of Christ" and the return of the Apostolic days with "revelations," "tongues," "gifts," and "miraculous healings." Any one reading the interesting but sad *Life of Edward Irving* will see how a man of great gifts by venturing too far in the study of prophecy and so committing himself to predictions that excite and agitate the human mind is forced on by the inexorable concatenation of consequences to commit himself to statements and teachings that are repugnant to any healthy-minded student of the Word of God. In spite of the failure of their leader's "prophecies" and his early demise in darkness, there are many Irvingites to be found throughout the world.

I have already referred to Joanna Southcote, who regarded herself as the actual "bride of the Lamb," through whom

the Messiah was to come on October 19th, 1814. Her disciples, numbering many thousands, continued after her death in the close of that year to expect her speedy resurrection and to keep the Jewish Sabbath. So far as I can ascertain, there still remain believers in the domestic servant who spelled her name Southcote or Southcott, and wrote "The Book of Wonders," and, like Mrs. White, had ecstacies and visions.

Thus, when William Miller, an illiterate farmer, born in Massachussets in 1782, and reared in the neighbouring state of New York, began in 1831 to proclaim the speedy coming of our Lord Jesus Christ to judge the world, it was no new thing. Many had done it before, many have done it since. All have shared the same fate—their calculations have deceived them. William Miller, like his predecessors, laid much stress on the study of prophecy. He says: "Another evidence that vitally affected my mind was the chronology of the Scriptures. I found that predicted events, which had been fulfilled in the past, often occurred within a given time." The one hundred and twenty years to the flood (Gen. 6. 8); the seven days that were to precede it, with forty days of predicted rain (Gen. 7. 4); the four hundred years of the sojourn of Abraham's seed (Gen. 15. 13), and so on. Here we have the expression of a mind warped by his years of Deism. He is still seeking for evidences that will satisfy his uneasy mind that the Bible is indeed the Book of God, and what more convincing evidence is there than the fulfilment to the day of chronological prophecy?

Now he finds many such fulfilments occurring in the Old Testament, and immediately his mind, perhaps almost unconsciously, seeks for some such striking example of the same thing in the days in which he is living. What a turning of the tables on his old friends who were now laughing and jeering at him would it be if he could discover some method of computing the date of some great event in the immediate future from the Bible! Now Miller, in reading the New Testament, had at once discovered what lies patent to any unbiased reader that the greatest event that could take place had been expected since the Apostolic days when Paul wrote, "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." Ignorant of the many who had set forth to accomplish this task before him, therefore undeterred by their failures, William Miller entered the company of the prophets. As in the case of those who had

failed, he took as his foundation fact, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Ignorant of Hebrew, and led astray by his concordance, he failed to see that the word translated "day" in this passage is a totally different word from that translated "day" in such passages as:

Numbers 14. 34.—"After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years."

Ezekiel 4. 6.—"Thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year."

Literally it reads as given in the margin, "a day for a year, a day for a year." Ignorant of the fact that the word in the Daniel passage cannot be used in the way it is used in these two passages, Miller at once jumps to the conclusion that "two thousand and three hundred days" mean "two thousand and three hundred years." Apart from the linguistic difficulty, any mind obedient to the Spirit would never dream of changing "days" into "years" without a direct warrant from the Most High, seeing that this is given with so much emphasis in the passages to which he turns us as his warrant for doing so on his own account.

Having thus begun by changing the times, Miller proceeds to change the divinely-given starting-point of these two thousand three hundred days. That divinely-given starting-point is given in the eighth chapter in which the passage occurs (verse 14). The two thousand three hundred "evening-mornings" clearly begin with the desecration of the sanctuary and the cessation of the daily sacrifice brought about by Israel's great enemy, "the Prince of the People that should come," i.e., the Romans; but such a starting-point suits no "day-year" theory. Some starting-point must be found that permits of the "two thousand three hundred years" ending in Miller's lifetime, or else he would not be there to enjoy the fulfilment of his own prophecy. Hence you will never find such prophets fixing the period too far away.

Let us see how Miller gets over the difficulties in his way. In the next chapter of the Book of Daniel he discovers another period—"seventy weeks." Now this word "weeks" is the plural of a Hebrew word that signifies "a period of seven." It may be seven days, months, years,

centuries, or what not. Clearly from the whole context these "weeks" are "weeks of years." Therefore the whole period is four hundred and ninety years. Notice, however, that the whole period is divided into a trinity of periods—forty-nine years, four hundred and thirty-four years, seven years. Without going into minute details and entering on matters of controversy, we have here expressed two eras of four hundred and eighty-three years and seven years. The first era begins with the issuing of the Edict to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, and closes with the cutting-off of Messiah the Prince in humiliation. The second era begins with the making of a covenant by the Prince of the People that is coming to destroy both the Holy City and the Holy Temple; clearly the Romans, who did so. This covenant he makes with the Jews, that is to say, the Holy Nation, but breaks in the middle of this era of seven years, that is to say the covenant lasts but a time, times (dual plural), and half a time, or one thousand two hundred and sixty days which form three-and-a-half prophetic years of three hundred and sixty days each, as we find clearly stated in Scripture. The breaking of the covenant marks the middle of this era which runs on to its close in blood and carnage and a reign of terror such as the world has never seen or ever will see again (so our Lord tells us plainly in Matthew 24. 21), when the oppressor is destroyed and the oppressed are delivered by our Mighty Lord from heaven. And this grand and glorious culminating triumph of Good, whose hosts are led by Jesus our Lord, over Evil, whose hosts are led by this lawless prince to whom Satan hath given the kingdoms of this world, our Lord Himself calls "the consummation of the Age."

I repeat, the prophecy of the seventy weeks is concerning the holy nation, the holy city, and the holy place; and any attempts whatsoever to apply it to the Gentiles is to pervert Scripture and end in corrupt doctrine.

This is what Miller did, for he makes his imaginary period of two thousand three hundred years commence not with the central event in the second era of seven years, when the lawless prince desecrates the holy place (Daniel 8. 13; Matt. 24. 15) and abrogates the daily sacrifice, but with the commencement of the seventy weeks themselves. Now we know exactly when that was, and know therefore without a doubt that Miller was wrong in the date he gave. In fact had he dated his

period of 2300 years from the commencement of the seventy weeks they would not have closed until he had been in his grave five years.

Let us enquire then (1) when do the seventy weeks begin; and (2) what is Miller's reason (beyond his usual ignorance) for fixing upon a different date?

1. As we have seen, the seventy weeks began with the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem.

Now on searching Scripture, we find that there were three decrees:—

(a) The decree of Cyrus recorded in Ezra 1. 3: "Build the house of the Lord God of Israel (He is the God) which is in Jerusalem."

(b) The decree of Darius recorded in Ezra 6. 8, *et seq.*: "I make a decree what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews for the building of this house of God."

(c) The decree of Artaxerxes recorded in Nehemiah 2, which is very specially dated "in the month Nisan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king . . . letters given . . . may give me timber to make beams for the gates of the palace which appertained to the house and for the wall of the city, and for the house that I shall enter into."

Now notice particularly that this decree was granted in response to Nehemiah's petition "that Thou wouldest send us unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchres, that I MAY BUILD IT!" Also notice particularly the description of the beginning of these seventy weeks. "Know therefore and understand," said the Angel to Daniel, "that from the going forth of the commandment to RESTORE and to BUILD Jerusalem . . . the street shall be built again, and the wall, EVEN IN TROUBLOUS times.

Once more I ask you to observe carefully how Nehemiah carried out Artaxerxes' decree to restore the palace, to build the wall, and to build habitations. Here is his vivid description: "Half of my servants wrought in the work, and the other half of them held both the spears, the shields, and the bows, and the habergeons, . . . they which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held a weapon. . . . So neither I, nor my brethren, nor my servants, nor the men of the guard which followed me, none of us put off our clothes saving that every one put them off for washing."

Noble, courageous, strenuous Nehemiah! Certainly he was lost in the obsequious king's cupbearer and carpet knight. So doing God's-work is certain to bring us many foes and lead us into many conflicts, but it brings out what is best in a man, as never the service of man does. Why, this reads more vividly than the story of the great siege of Lucknow. Above all, if these were not "troublous times," I know not what "troublous times" can mean.

After considering these various points, it hardly requires that I should sum up beyond saying that the dated decree of Artaxerxes is the commandment referred to by the angel, and the commencement of the seventy weeks.

Then comes the question—Can we express with accuracy the date of this decree, "the month Nisan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes," in the terms of our modern chronology? We can.

The murder of Xerxes, and the beginning of the reign of Artabanus, the usurper, which lasted seven months, was in July, B.C. 465. We know this date with exactitude, because history dates from that period. Herodotus, the father of history, was the contemporary, and visited the court of Artaxerxes, whose accession he gives with much care (February, B.C. 464). Not only so, but we have the testimony of Thucydides, the prince of historians, who also lived in this period, when the history of Persia and Greece had become closely interwoven.

But does the reign of Artaxerxes date from the time he became *de jure* king through the death of his murdered father, or when he became monarch *de facto* through the overthrow of the usurper Artabanus?

Here Scripture comes to our aid. Nehemiah, the court official, mentions both Chisleu (*i.e.*, November) and Nisan (*i.e.*, March) as being in one and the same year of his master's reign. That being so, it is clear that to him that reign began in July, and not in February.

Therefore the "twentieth year" began in July, and not in February; consequently the date of the decree in our chronology is "March, B.C. 445." This then is the starting point of the seventy weeks.

2. It is an interesting point to discover Miller's reason for fixing upon a different date that has no foundation in history, for it throws (ignorance apart) light upon his vaunted methods of chronological research.

They assume that their period of 2300 years and the

scriptural period of 490 years are synchronous, commencing with the same epoch, "the 20th year of Artaxerxes." They next assume that the period of 490 years runs on without a break, which we have already seen is false, and ends in some decided event, which is true.

Now, if the prophetic period of 490 years began in B.C. 445 (Miller ignorantly calls it B.C. 444), they would end in A.D. 44 (here again Miller is in error, and, ignorant of the fact that the change from B.C. to A.D. entails the dropping of a year, gives the terminal date as A.D. 47), and there is no noteworthy event in that year. Is it not easier then to fix the terminal date and calculate back?

So Miller determining that the crucifixion is a noteworthy event, and that it occurs in the middle of the last seven years of the prophetic period, fixes the date for that in his usual arbitrary manner as A.D. 31.

"The crucifixion in A.D. 31, in the midst of the last week, is sustained by a mass of testimony which cannot be easily invalidated."

Now, if it had not been for that word "easily," this could have been relegated to our growing list of lying statements, for by the science of chronology based on astronomy we know that A.D. 31 is one of the years in which the crucifixion could NOT have occurred. But A.D. 31 on their own showing is not the termination of the 490 years, but three and a half years before that. Now what happened in A.D. 34 to make it a noteworthy year? Let the Seventh-Day Adventists answer:

"As the seventy weeks must [why must?] terminate in A.D. 34, unless the seventh of Artaxerxes is wrongly fixed, and as that cannot be changed without some evidence to that effect, we enquire, what evidence marked that termination? The time when the apostles turned to the Gentiles harmonises with that date better than any other which has been named."

Now notice these errors, for they are instructive:

- (a) Daniel 9. 26 distinctly states that it is at the end of the 69th week that "Messiah shall be cut off, but not for Himself."
- (b) Daniel 9. 27 distinctly states that the Prince of the People who destroy the Temple (consequently not the Lord Jesus, as Miller falsely affirms) "shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease," and that "in the midst of the" last of the seventy weeks of years.

- (c) Daniel 9. 27 distinctly states that the end of the seventy weeks shall be signalled by an end being made "of the Desolator" [margin].
- (a) Seventh-Day Adventists take no notice of the end of the 69th week.
- (b) Seventh-Day Adventists place the crucifixion in the middle of the last week of years.
- (c) Seventh-Day Adventists suggest that the turning of the apostles to the Gentiles (which was not done until A.D. 63—see Acts 28) is what is meant by the angel's terrible words to Daniel.

I labour this point, as Miller and his followers take especial credit to themselves for finding out all about everything by using concordances and marginal references only, aided by the inspired testimonies of Mrs. White, which they place on a level with the Scriptures, as I shall show further on. I ask you, reader, to consider these three statements of Scripture, and compare with them the three statements of the S.-D.A.'s.

But what about "the seventh of Artaxerxes"? Look it up in the 7th chapter of Ezra, and you will find that it was no decree, but simply a letter mentioning that he had decreed that the Israelites might return to the land, and commissioning Ezra to obtain materials to decorate the temple and to supply sacrifices. There is nothing whatever in it about building the city. Hence the date B.C. 457 cannot be the starting point for the seventy weeks. Not only so, but that date for the seventh of Artaxerxes is wrong. As we see, Scripture dates his reign from July, 465, which makes the date of this letter B.C. 458, and as Ezra left Babylon on the first day of the first month of that seventh year, the letter would probably be dated the sixth year, or B.C. 459. Read that seventh chapter of Ezra carefully, and you will note these points: (a) It was a letter to Ezra dated probably B.C. 459, at anyrate B.C. 458; (b) it mentions that the king decrees that any of the people who liked could return to the land; (c) it contains an order (called a "decree") on the king's treasurers beyond the river for materials up to a specified amount for the House of God.

All this is very different from the decrees recorded elsewhere and noticed above, and simply cannot be "the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," mentioned by the angel when speaking to Daniel (Daniel 9. 25).

Hearken now to their arithmetic:

"As the 70 weeks and the 2300 days have a common starting point, the calculation of Mr. Miller is verified at a glance by subtracting the 457 years B.C. from the 2300. Thus:

$$\begin{array}{r} 2300 \\ - 457 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

1843 A.D."

Having proved that the two figures 2300 and 457 are wrong, it necessarily follows that 1843 is wrong.

When a boy at school I never was a good arithmetician, and therefore I always doubted the correctness of the results of my calculations. Consequently I was very glad when I found any way to prove my sums. Having grown up, this distrust of myself in this field has often saved me making grave mistakes in the calculation of lenses, &c. Yet I find that although never very good at the mere figuring, the errors are most likely to occur in the initial measurements, and a slight mistake in one of these vitiates correct calculations filling pages, with the result that in practice the lens is utterly useless for the work for which it was made. In this case a useless lens proves the presence of an error somewhere in its calculation.

How often do such errors occur in daily life. A slight error, and the carpet you thought would cover the floor so beautifully leaves a nasty bare patch just in a spot where it is most noticeable. Overlook one measurement, although all the others are correct, and the dress you purchased has to be given away. You cannot wear it. An error of a sixteenth of an inch, and the whole morning's work is spoiled. Nay, the error, amounting to only a hundredth part of a grain, has cost a life. It is so very easy to err; but be sure your error will find you out.

I have gone to some pains to prove the errors in Miller's figures, yet it was scarcely necessary. He made them to show that our Lord would come in A.D. 1843 to cleanse the earth. Our Lord did not come. That incontrovertible fact stamps "wrong" over all his figures, and proves his data to be erroneous.

CHAPTER V.

"Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him" (Prov. 27. 22).

THE slowly-moving hand of time passing over the dial of this dispensation pointed to each promised date in vain. Here is an account of one such date written by one of themselves :

"The tenth day of the seventh month, Jewish time (October 22, 1844), at last came. It found thousands upon thousands who were looking to that point for the consummation of their hopes. They had made provisions for nothing earthly beyond that date. They had not even cherished the thought, 'If it doesn't come,' but had planned their worldly affairs as they would if they had expected that date to end the period of their natural lives. They had warned and exhorted the wicked to flee from the wrath to come, and many of these feared that the message might prove true. They had counselled and prayed with their relatives, and had bidden good-bye to such of them as had not given their hearts to God. In short, they had bidden adieu to all earthly things with all the solemnity of one who regards himself as about to appear face to face with the Judge of all the earth."

There was great disappointment. Everywhere the Millerites had gathered together waiting for the Lord to come. It is said, although strongly denied by the Adventists themselves, that in some places Miller's disciples had prepared "ascension robes," and, when the last possible date according to him had arrived, that they donned these long white gowns and climbed to the summit of their roofs. Be that as it may, it is admitted on all hands that the failure of Miller's prophetic calculations produced intense disappointment, and threatened to wreck the movement utterly.

They read the prophecy to mean that our Lord was coming to cleanse the sanctuary, and that the sanctuary was the earth. This I need hardly remark is an utterly erroneous interpretation, but if I stay to point out the errors in every statement of theirs I shall never reach the end. Even after the disappointment, Miller and many of his leading followers clave to this interpretation. Hear what George Storrs writes in the *Midnight Cry*, April 25, 1844—that is, before the final disappointment noticed above:

"What is the sanctuary to be cleansed? My previous views have been that it was the whole earth.

"That it is a part of the earth I still believe. But what part?"

I am told that Miller himself opposed the Seventh-Day Adventists' new idea of the sanctuary, the Sabbath, and the

third angel's message. According to them, William Miller was sent by God to do a work, to bear a message to the children of men; but we now see that he did it wrong, got it wrong, and finally opposed them that got it right—as they affirm.

Had Moses opposed Joshua, had John the Baptist opposed the Messiah, had Paul opposed the older apostles and spread it about that Peter had made a mistake in his message on the Day of Pentecost, what would you have thought? what would you have said? whom would you have believed? And you are thinking of believing what these people say, who have got their messages into such a tangle that my brain almost whirls when I try to disentangle them, and get it clear as to who agrees with whom, and who contradicts whom, and how many times each contradicts himself or herself—for a change.

But gradually some kind of order comes out chaos. To cover the apparent falseness of the prophecy a change is made in the location of the sanctuary, and the evolution of this change is most interesting. I think it best to use their own words as far as possible, lest some sensible reader should imagine that I must either be exaggerating or trying to be funny at their expense, which, God forbid!

"Hiram Edson, of Port Gibson, New York, told me," writes one, "that the day after the passing of the time in 1844, as he was praying behind the shocks of corn in a field, the Spirit of God came upon him in such a powerful manner that he was almost smitten to the earth, and with it came an impression, 'The sanctuary to be cleansed is in heaven.' He communicated this thought to O. R. L. Crosier, and they together carefully investigated the subject. In the early part of 1846 an elaborate exposition of the sanctuary question from a Bible standpoint, written by Mr. Crosier, was printed in the *Day Star*. . . . In that lengthy essay it was made to appear that the work of cleansing the sanctuary was the concluding work of Christ as our High Priest, beginning in 1844 and closing just before He actually comes again in the clouds of heaven as King of kings and Lord of lords."

Now, the great type upon which this doctrine was founded is the entrance of the High Priest into the Holiest Place on the Day of Atonement, consequently they came to these conclusions:

i. When Christ entered into the sanctuary in 1844 the door of mercy was closed, and NO MORE SINNERS COULD BE SAVED. I have many passages to prove this statement. In "The Present Truth," vol. I., No. 6, December, 1849, James White has a leading article on "The Shut Door Explained," in which he plainly shows

that when the High Priest entered the Most Holy there could be no more pardon for sin—"On this Day of Atonement He is a High Priest for those only whose names are inscribed on the breast-plate of judgment."

2. As no work was to be done on the Day of Atonement, so many Adventists logically held that after October 22, 1844, no more work was to be done; that it was a sin to work, but time starved them out.

I ought to notice here that the Seventh-Day Adventists have changed their views as to the salvation of sinners after 1844. It was an impossible doctrine to hold that NO sinner could be saved after that date, for, if that were so, only those who were believers in Miller then COULD BE saved. Having been compelled to abandon that view, they taught that anyone honestly seeking for light (such light as comes from the S-D.A. lamp) on "the sanctuary" might be saved. Then, as steady declension at home compelled a world-wide propaganda, it was discovered that the door of mercy is open to all. In connection with "the sanctuary," therefore, there are four different views all supported at various times by the infallible heaven-sent prophetess, Mrs. White:

1. The sanctuary was this earth.
2. The door of mercy closed against all sinners in 1844.
3. The door opened to those who accepted the heavenly sanctuary dogma.
4. There is mercy for all who will listen to the Seventh-Day Adventists.

I have already mentioned the fact (supported by a sample quotation—readers will please understand that I only use one out of many passages I have collected to support each statement to save space and needless iteration) that they teach that "the sanctuary" is the earth. This was necessary to support their view that the Lord was coming to cleanse the earth. That being so, is it not remarkable (it would be so in any teaching marked by the least consistency) that they point to the smallest portion of the tabernacle (ten feet square) as "the sanctuary," and that they limit "the sanctuary" in heaven to a similar part of a structure of which the tabernacle on earth was supposed to be an exact copy? When "the sanctuary" was supposed by them to be the earth, it was the whole earth. Now that it is the heaven, why not the whole heaven? Because it would be palpable nonsense to talk of Christ, who, they admit, was in heaven, coming to heaven in 1844. So they

suppose that in heaven there is an actual tabernacle, of which the one built by Moses was a copy, and into this tabernacle Christ entered on the 22nd October, 1844. You will remember that they do not build this statement on any passage in the Bible (for there is none), but on an impression a farm labourer had amongst the sheaves of corn. In the "Early Writings," pp. 114, 115, we read how Mrs. White was taken to heaven and shown it all—a building similar to the one on earth (how she knew, seeing she had never seen that building, puzzles me—and doubtless a great many more!) containing a candlestick, a table of shewbread, altar, curtains, ark, and, "in the ark were tables of stone containing the Ten Commandments." Elsewhere I read:

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

I must, however, tell you the interesting circumstance which led up to this vision by a hysterical, cataleptic, neurotic female. She had been on a visit to New Bedford, where she met Elder Bates. This leader refused to believe* in her ecstasies and visions, but urged on her the necessity of keeping the Sabbath in which she at that time (1846) did not believe. She, on her side, refused to believe that God meant us to keep the fourth more in prominence than the other nine commandments. Elder Bates kept on urging upon her the great and unique importance of the fourth commandment, with the result that she had this vision. As she is the prophetess of the Seventh-Day Adventists, whose writings are their scriptures—like Mahomet's Koran or Joe Smith's Golden Book of the Mormons—she shall have a chapter to herself and her mistakes.

The Seventh-Day Adventists cannot deny that the temple in Jerusalem is the only sanctuary on earth, but it is asked:

"Has the new covenant no sanctuary? Turning again to the book of Hebrews, the seekers for truth found that the existence of a second, or new-covenant sanctuary, was implied in the words of Paul: 'Then

* This spelt danger as the Elders have silenced several other "sisters" who saw visions and dreamt dreams.

verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.' And the use of the word also intimates that Paul has before made mention of this sanctuary. Turning back to the beginning of the previous chapter, they read: 'Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a Minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.' Here is revealed the sanctuary of the new covenant. The sanctuary of the first covenant was pitched by man, built by Moses; this is pitched by the Lord, not by man. In that sanctuary the earthly priests performed their service; in this, Christ, our great High Priest, ministers at God's right hand. One sanctuary was on earth, the other is in heaven, . . . the sanctuary in heaven, in which Jesus ministers in our behalf, is the great original, of which the sanctuary built by Moses was a copy.

"The question, What is the sanctuary? is clearly answered in the Scriptures. The term sanctuary, as used in the Bible, refers first to the tabernacle built by Moses as a pattern of heavenly things, and secondly, to the 'true tabernacle' in heaven, to which the earthly sanctuary pointed. At the death of Christ the typical service ended.

"The 'true tabernacle' in heaven is the sanctuary of the new covenant. And as the prophecy of Daniel 8. 14 is fulfilled in this dispensation, the sanctuary to which it refers MUST be the sanctuary of the new covenant. At the termination of the 2300 days, in 1844, there had been no sanctuary on earth for many centuries. Thus the prophecy, 'Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,' unquestionably [why not MUST?] points to the sanctuary in heaven."

Note: 1. Nothing is here said about the earth or part of the earth being the sanctuary, for these are representative extracts from their latest writings.

2. They distinctly state that the sanctuary spoken of in the Hebrews is the sanctuary into which the Lord Jesus entered into in 1844. Upon this observe:

(a) When our Lord Jesus ascended into glory nineteen hundred years ago, we are told that He "is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a Minister of the sanctuary" (Heb. 8. 1). Now, in Leviticus 16. 2, Numbers 7. 89, 1 Samuel 4. 4, 2 Kings 19. 15, we are told that the throne of the LORD is between the cherubim; that is His dwelling-place. Therefore, our Lord Jesus entered the sanctuary when He ascended.

(b) "Within the veil" is the most holy place (Ex. 26. 33).

When our Lord Jesus ascended we are told "which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil, whither the Fore-runner is for us entered, even Jesus" (Heb. 6. 19, 20). Therefore, our Lord Jesus entered the sanctuary when He ascended.

Notice the false assumptions:

- (a) "The prophecy of Daniel 8. 14 is fulfilled in this dispensation." Here we have an instance of "wrongly dividing the Word of Truth."
- (b) "The sanctuary to which it refers MUST be the sanctuary of the new covenant." But there is no "must" about it.
- (c) "Because there had been no sanctuary on earth for many centuries, thus the prophecy, 'Unto the 2300 days . . .' unquestionably points to the sanctuary in heaven." Had there been a sanctuary on earth, you will observe, they would not have to bring in "the sanctuary in heaven." But as we have seen, they strongly held that the earth, or a part of it, was the sanctuary. This argument sounds queerly from their lips.

In fact, their statements are all false assumptions, guesses, suppositions, works of their own imaginations, without coherence, self-contradictory, and, when tested by events, shown to be lies.

I do not honestly believe that any statement of this character made by the Seventh-Day Adventists which can be tested by observable facts will be found to be true. This statement is based on my own researches, of which I have given some specimens already.

And this, reader, is the religion you thought of exchanging for that based on the Word of God and tested by the experience of nineteen centuries. Truly, if you remain in the same mind, after carefully considering what has been put before you, and join yourself to such dupes as Seventh-Day Adventists are, . . . well, it must be because judicial blindness has fallen upon you, and you are doomed to "believe a lie." You think that too hard a statement? Not a bit of it.

You have heard these witnesses. Their own words have been put before you. Such as can be tested by facts within our sphere of observation have every one been found false; they do not even agree among themselves; they even make statements at different times that are contradictory; but when they tell you things (about what occurs in heaven, &c.) which are beyond the scope of your own observation, you immediately believe them. Forget not this solemn fact, that it was upon the testimony of such witnesses that our Lord Jesus was condemned, "for many bare false witness against Him, but their witness agreed not together."

CHAPTER VI.

"They sacrificed unto devils which were not God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up" (Deut. 32, 17, marg.).

"Jesus answered, I have not a devil: but I honour My Father, and YE DO DISHONOUR ME" (John 8, 49).

READER, consider carefully the following passages from the writings of the Prophetess of the Seventh-Day Adventists, Mrs. Ellen G. White:

"Important truths concerning the atonement are taught by the typical service. A substitute was accepted in the sinner's stead, but the sin was not cancelled by the blood of the victim. A means was thus provided by which it was transferred to the sanctuary. By the offering of blood the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed his guilt in transgression, and expressed his desire for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come; but he was not yet entirely released from the condemnation of the law. On the day of atonement the high priest, having taken an offering from the congregation, went into the most holy place with the blood of this offering, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, directly over the law, to make satisfaction for its claims. Then, in his character as mediator, he took the sins upon himself, and bore them from the sanctuary.

"Placing his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, he confessed over him all these sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the goat. The goat then bore them away, and they were regarded as for ever separated from the people. . . . The ministration of the priest throughout the year in the first apartment of the sanctuary, 'within the veil' which formed the door and separated the holy place from the outer court, represents the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at His ascension. . . . So did Christ plead His blood before the Father in behalf of sinners, and present before Him also, with the precious fragrance of His own righteousness, the prayers of penitent believers. . . . For eighteen centuries this work of ministration continued in the first apartment of the sanctuary. The blood of Christ, pleaded in behalf of penitent believers, secured their pardon and acceptance with the Father, yet their sins still remained upon the books of record. As in the typical service there was a work of atonement at the close of the year, so before Christ's work for the redemption of men is completed, there is a work of atonement for the removal of sin from the sanctuary. This is the service which began when the 2300 days ended. At that time, as foretold by Daniel the prophet, our high priest entered the most holy to perform the last division of his solemn work—to cleanse the sanctuary. . . . in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ, and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary. . . . so the actual cleansing of the heavenly [sanctuary] is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out of the sins which are there recorded. But, before this can be accomplished, there must be an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of His atonement. The cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigation—a work of judgment. . . . while the sin-offering pointed to Christ as a sacrifice, and the high priest represented Christ as a mediator, the scape-goat typified

Satan, the author of sin, upon whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally be placed. . . . When Christ, by virtue of His own blood, removes the sins of His people from the heavenly sanctuary at the close of His ministration, He will place them upon Satan, who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty. . . . Satan be for ever banished from the presence of God and His people, and he will be blotted from existence in the final destruction of sin and sinners."

This, then, is the kernel of the Seventh-Day Adventist Plan of Salvation—SATAN IS THE SAVIOUR, NOT CHRIST!

Paul, writing to the believers in Galatia, uses some strong, stern language. They were in danger of being led to put themselves under the Law again. What says the apostle to this? "If any preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

Now these modern legalists attempt to do the same. They would put children of God under law and make them signify the fact by keeping the Sabbath. What does such a line of conduct eventuate in? This damnable doctrine that Satan is our Saviour, through whose sufferings on our behalf our sins are expiated; and that not only we but (oh, blasphemous thought!) Christ also is thereby delivered from sin's heavy burden.

Just as in a former chapter we saw that the doctrine that Christ must come in Miller's lifetime was upheld at the cost of all Scripture, so here, to avoid the tremendous thrust through the failure of Miller's predictions to the fulfilment of which they had pinned their whole faith we have the choicest doctrine of the Gospel, justification by faith, utterly contemned and set at naught.

Nay, more, as if that were not enough to damn their doctrine, they dare to substitute for Christ's finished work on the Cross, Satan's vicarious suffering in bearing away the sins of the people of God into the land of utter annihilation. It does not lessen the blasphemous grossness of the idea to say that it is wholly imaginary, the figment of the addled brain of a hysterical woman. *It merely explains it.*

This, then, is their Plan of Salvation: Believers' sins are laid on the heavenly sanctuary and become its; the heavenly sanctuary's sins are laid on Christ and become His: Christ's sins (when He comes) are laid upon Satan and become his, so that when he is annihilated, they are too.

Friend and reader, if thou canst believe in this rigmarole, that it is God's Method of Salvation, I fear lest thou be beyond the pale, so prithee lay down the book, not that I

condemn thee utterly, for as the wholly leprous man was to be pronounced clean, so there is salvation for idiots and young children.

CHAPTER VII.

“How long shall be the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (Daniel 8. 13, 14, R.V.). “When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place . . .” (Matt. 24. 15, R.V.). “And upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate . . .” (Daniel 9. 27, R.V.). “As that the Day of the Lord is now present; let no man beguile you in any wise; for it will not be, except the Falling Away [the Apostasy] come first, and the Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the Sanctuary of God, setting himself forth as God” (2 Thess. 2. 2-4, R.V., margin).

THE Day of Jesus Christ (Phil. 1. 6) in which our Lord and Master is set down on the Judgment-seat of Rewards, after the resurrection from among the dead of His sleeping saints and the instantaneous change of His living saints, is matched on earth by the Day of Antichrist when He is set down in the Sanctuary of God, presenting Himself falsely as the Christ who refused the gifts of Satan and the price of them—the worship of Satan. Now this Day of Antichrist is the last of the Seventy weeks of Daniel’s prophecy. That is, this Day lasts seven prophetic years of 360 days each, or 2520 days altogether. This is the period mentioned in Daniel 8. 14. There it is given as 2300 days. Is there then a mistake? No, not a mistake but a shortening, the secret of which the Lord Jesus lets us into when He said: “For then shall be the Great Tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect’s sake those days SHALL BE SHORTENED.” Of what period is He speaking? Of the same the beginning of which He describes in the fifteenth verse, quoted at the head of this chapter, “When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place.” And where does Daniel speak of this abomination of desolation? Both in his eighth and ninth chapters, whilst in all probability he refers in his eleventh chapter to Antiochus Epiphanes, who was the type of Anti-

christ. Consequently the 2300 days of Daniel is the period of 2520 days, or seven years, or Seventieth Week, shortened by the Mercy of God “for the elect’s sake.”

Not only so, but the sanctuary referred to is clearly an earthly one. That there has been no temple at Jerusalem for nineteen centuries is no argument against there being a temple in Jerusalem in the future. God’s plan is clearly the restoration of Israel to the Land in unbelief, the rebuilding of the Temple by the Nation in unbelief, and the Coming of their King to prevent their final and complete destruction through unbelief.

Both our Lord and His apostle are clear on this point; there is a Temple in Jerusalem before the Day of the Lord, and after the departure of the Church. The apostle points to that fact as an unanswerable reason against the Day of the Lord, as some of the Thessalonians asserted, being NOW present. But more than that: whilst not seeking to controvert what the Seventh-Day Adventists assert, that in some mystic way the Tabernacle erected under the supervision of Moses in the wilderness was the representative of things in heaven, yet I would point out that that being admitted, they cannot go on to change their ground and point to the Book of Revelation, in which we see a temple with an ark and an altar in heaven, as their authority for saying that our Lord Jesus left His throne to enter the sanctuary, for the tabernacle of Moses was a tent, not a temple. Yet as the rabbis held that in heaven there is a tabernacle or temple only on a grander and more gorgeous scale than the one on earth, some may be prepared to read the passages in Hebrews and Revelation literally and believe in there being both tabernacle and temple in heaven, with all their furnishings of arks, curtains, veils, altars, and lavers. To such I say—The proof or disproof of the Seventh-Day Adventist position does not depend on the existence or non-existence of these things, yet they must decide which of the two sanctuaries (if such be the case) is the correct one, and not carelessly quote a “temple” passage to support a “tabernacle” position, or *vice versa!*

Remember, however, that both tabernacle and temple were divided into two parts—holy and holiest. These were separated by a veil, and when our Lord died on the Cross, the veil of the existing temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. In the holiest were the ark, the mercy-seat, and the cherubim. There God dwelt: His throne being between the cherubim. Thither the high priest went in

A Puerile Plea.

but once a year with blood. Bearing these facts in mind, read the following: Hebrews 9. 24—"Christ is not entered into the holy places [mark the plural as including both divisions], which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself, NOW to appear in the PRESENCE of God for us." Hebrews 6. 19, 20—"Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that WITHIN THE VEIL, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an High Priest for ever."

Doubtless some Seventh-Day Adventist puts forward (as Mrs. White does, p. 34) the puerile plea that this veil* is the veil dividing the holy place from the court. To such it might be insufficient to point out that "within the veil" corresponds to "in the presence of God," but we have the scripture, "Having therefore, brethren, liberty to enter into the HOLIEST by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us THROUGH THE VEIL, that is to say, His flesh; and having a High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near . . ." (Hebrews 10. 19-22).

Just as "the river" in the Old Testament always means the Euphrates, so "the veil" in the New Testament always means or refers to the curtain which hid the Holiest from the eyes of those who ministered in the holy place.†

Again I ask what is to happen at the end of the 2300 days? The Scriptures reply, "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Here are two words of the greatest interest: "sanctuary" and "cleanse."

Koh-desh, sanctuary, is a noun meaning apartness, separateness, therefore sacred. It is applied to (1) God; (2) places set apart as sacred by God's presence; (3) things thus set apart; (4) persons thus set apart; (5) times thus set apart; and (6) things and persons ceremonially cleansed, and so separated as sacred. Under (2) the word is applied to the interior of the tabernacle as a whole, so we read: Leviticus 16. 2—"That he come not at all times into the holy [place] WITHIN THE VEIL before the mercy-seat." Both places are called "*koh-desh*," but the inner apartment is designated as the "*koh-desh* within the veil," or *koh-desh h.i-kah-dashim*, "the Holy of Holies," or "the Holiest." Therefore in Daniel it may mean the whole temple, consisting of the two apartments viewed as one, or the outer apartment only. It cannot mean the inner apartment by itself.

*Hebrew—*pah-rah'-cheth* comes from root meaning *to lay, to shut off* (compare Assyrian *parakku*, a shrine), and is used in the O.T. of this curtain only—the veil that barred the way into the Holiest of All.

Justice...Right *versus* Holiness...Sacrifice. 39

Tzah-dok, be just or righteous, is a verb occurring in the Niphal in this passage only, and strictly meaning "shall be put right." It has no connection at all with cleansing by blood—that is altogether another word. Hence the Hebrew phrase here in Daniel 8. 14 literally rendered is, "The holy place shall be put right." Now if we turn for a moment to John 2. we find the Lord Jesus putting the temple to rights, and when His authority for doing such a thing is demanded by the Jews He replies that His resurrection is the seal of His ministry. Now, why does He point to such a sign as His seal of authorisation? Because it is the visible outcome of the rightness of all His ways. The resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ was the mark of distinction that set Him apart as the altogether Righteous Man. That is to say, a Man RIGHT in all His words and ways at all times and in all places, and in every relationship of life. This, then, was a righteous as distinguished from a sanctifying act. He cleansed the temple by vindicating His Father's right to it and in it. Hence Rotherham very correctly renders the phrase in Daniel, "Then shall the sanctuary be vindicated." Remember, I am speaking of the word *tzah-dok* at this present moment; it is not under consideration whether *sanctuary* in Daniel is the same as *temple* in John. I am emphasising the fact that what happens to the sanctuary at the close of the 2300 days is an act of Justice based on RIGHT, and NOT an act of Holiness based on SACRIFICE. And I justly adduce the action of the Lord Jesus in John 2 as an illustration where this distinction is seen clearly. There He does not base His act of cleansing the temple on His Death, but on His Resurrection. Thus the Seventh-Day Adventists' contention that this "cleansing of the sanctuary" is connected with the act of the high priest on the day of atonement is fundamentally wrong. The use of the special word rendered "sanctuary" shows that God looks upon the place already as His; like the people it has been redeemed by bloodshed long ago on Golgotha, whilst the special word translated "cleansed" shows that the cleansing is the entering into possession by power of that which has been purchased by blood. The RIGHT is itself based on SACRIFICE, and the act of Justice is the due outcome of the act of Holiness.

There remains but one more thing to be done in this connection—the dealing with their treatment of the statement

in Leviticus 16. 8: "One lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel."

In reminding you of the circumstances, I deal preliminarily with an important point, upon which much stress is laid by the Seventh-Day Adventists, and which they make a link in their chain of salvation; the removal of the sins of the people from the sanctuary.

Leviticus 16. 20: "And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy [place], and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat . . ." Verse 16: "And he shall make atonement for the holy [place], because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness."

Hebrews 9. 21-23: "Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost ALL things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Notice what follows: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, NOW to appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others, for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but NOW once in the end of the world hath He appeared to PUT AWAY SIN by the sacrifice of Himself." These passages are sufficient to show how absolutely without any scriptural foundation is the teaching of the Seventh-Day Adventists.

On the Day of Atonement, amongst other offerings two goats were taken, the goat speaking especially in type of substitution—Christ taking the sinner's place. Lots are cast, and the goat "upon which the Lord's lot" falls is slain. Now the high priest first slays a bullock as a sin-offering for himself, making "an atonement for himself." The blood of this bullock he takes and sprinkles upon the mercy-seat within the veil seven times. Having thus made atonement for himself, his sins covered, his transgressions purged, he proceeds to make an atonement with the blood of the goat for the holy place, for the tent of meeting, for

the altar, and for the congregation of Israel, for it is distinctly said in verse 17: "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy [place], until he come out, and have made an atonement for HIMSELF, and for his HOUSEHOLD, and for ALL THE CONGREGATION OF ISRAEL." It is called the "holy place," for on that day the veil is drawn aside; there is no division between the two apartments, for once a year "the way into the holiest" is open. Hence no other may be there. But see how the presence of the sinner contaminates. Because sinners minister in the "holy place" it must be atoned for with blood. Because the tent of meeting stands in the centre of a host of sinners it must be atoned for with blood.

There was nothing so loudly sounded in the ears of Israel as this—the pollution of sin. All through the law we read of the horrid contagion of uncleanness. Stones, bones, garments, coverings, vessels, beds, chairs, insects, fish, birds, animals, women, men—all could be unclean, and the merest touch thereof be pollution.

Hence the absolute necessity to make atonement for the House of God in the midst of such capacity for uncleanness, for the very room in which the priests, members of the same race, ministered, and for the instruments of their ministry. But beyond that there needed atonement for the people themselves—the high priest, his household, and the congregation of Israel. Notice, however, something remarkable in the case of the latter. Two goats were taken, and the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell was offered for a sin-offering "to make an atonement FOR [cannot be translated with] HIM," i.e., the live goat which is consequently "presented alive before JEHOVAH" and afterwards "let go alive into the wilderness." Much error follows from not observing this, and not understanding what the margin of the A.V. reads: "The other lot for Azazel." Now, the Seventh-Day Adventist enquires: "Is not Azazel Satan?"

It is true that the most extreme of the higher critics would have us understand that here is a recognition of the leader of the *seirim*, or demons who are supposed to inhabit the wilderness. One goat, according to this reading, was presented to reconcile Jehovah, the tribal God of Israel; and the other goat was to propitiate Azazel, the king of the demons of the wilderness. But Seventh-Day Adventists ought neither to pay attention to what is put in the margin

or what higher critics say, for in their writings it is written: "Whatever is not made clear in the English translation is of no account whatever, . . . the only course for those who really care to know the truth is to drop all notions about 'mistakes in translation,' 'critical study,' 'higher criticism,' 'interpretations,' &c., and take and believe the Bible as it reads"—that is, in the authorised English version.

Then why try to make capital out of "Azazel"? In the very translation they swear by, it is translated correctly "the scapegoat." For although we know no root in Hebrew *'azl*, yet we have the Arabic *'azala*, meaning "remove," "place far apart"; hence *az-azel* is "the goat for removal," or "escape-goat." As in the case of the two birds (Lev. 14), one of which was killed over running water, whilst the other bore the blood towards* the open heavens, so in the case of these two goats—the death of the one set the other free to bear away the sins of the people confessed over him into a land of "never return." In every other case where an animal is thus identified with a sinner it dies; how much more should this "escape-goat" have perished, seeing it was identified with the sins of a whole people? But his fellow had made atonement for him, and consequently through him for the whole nation. And the visible proof of this is that he is allowed to depart alive.†

See how this cuts at the very root of the Seventh-Day Adventist doctrine. They imagine that the sins of the repentant are transferred to Christ by faith, that they are then transferred to the heavenly sanctuary, that "by virtue of His blood" they are re-transferred to Christ, from whom they are transferred to Satan, who bears them away to utter annihilation (*vide pp. 34, 35*).

But you will have observed that there was no such transference as this on the Day of Atonement. The sins of the people were put on the living goat, but he died not, because his fellow-goat had made atonement for him by dying in his place; and it was this goat who lived because his fellow died that bore away the people's sins to a land of utter forgetfulness.

In New Testament language the Lord Jesus Christ, the Antitype of both goats—for it takes two birds, a living and a dead; two goats, a living and a dead, to represent Him in the completeness of His work—was "delivered for our

*+As the air is the native element of the bird, so the wilderness is the natural habitat of the goat.

offences, raised again for our justification." In other words: "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the DEATH OF HIS SON [hence the Lord's lot fell on the goat that died], much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved BY HIS LIFE."

As Robbie Flockhart, the famous Edinburgh street preacher puts it: When he was in the army a comrade was condemned to death for some military offence. He gave Robbie his share of the loot. Pardoned, he claimed it again. Thus Robbie lost his treasure.

When he was a preacher an old lady left Robbie a legacy to enable him to carry on his work. Unfortunately her children disputed the will, and before the lawyers were done with it, the whole legacy had been swallowed up in costs. Robbie quaintly applied it thus: In the first instance I got nothing, for my comrade lived. In the second instance I got nothing because the lady died. Had he died, I should have had rich booty; and could she have lived to see her intentions carried into effect, the lawyers had not robbed me of what she left me.

Jesus died that Robbie might receive the greatest gift of all—eternal life. Jesus lives to see that no one robs poor Robbie of the gift He died to give him. Such is the simple Gospel of His grace that connects all my hopes with Himself: my sins forgiven because Jesus died—my salvation secured because Jesus lives. Hallelujah!

CHAPTER VIII.

"Jesus said unto them: The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of Man is LORD also of the Sabbath" (Mark 2. 27, 28).

SABBATARIANS—that is to say, people who believe in keeping Saturday as the Sabbath—have existed since the Apostolic age. But this act of theirs has always coincided with a denial of the free grace of the Gospel, therefore I need not burden these pages with a history of the movement through the nineteen centuries of the Christian era.

When we come to study the writings of men who lived in the centuries immediately following the Apostolic times, we shall see that two days were kept—the Saturday, Sabbath; and the Sunday, Lord's Day. It is foolish of people to rave about the paganism of using the term "Sunday." Were such to be consistent, they would have

to give up using a great many words they use every day and could not very well dispense with, unless they proceeded to make a new vocabulary and got others to learn it. The Apostolic age coincided with the universal dominion of the Romans over the then known world, and where these wonderful people went, they took their customs, laws, and calendar. A Jew might speak of his Sabbath, but who knew, and what was more, who cared to know that it meant the space of time between sunset on Friday and sunset on Saturday? It is true that the Resurrection day is called in the Scriptures "the first of the week," but as that style of denominating the days of the week is cumbersome, the term was soon dropped, and either the term "Lord's Day" given to it, or what we do to-day was done then—in common speech understood of the people, it was called by its name in the calendar, "Sunday." The hold these old Roman calendar names have over the world to-day is seen in the facts that although the Quakers attempted to name the days of the week by numbers, and the French at the Revolution combined this with new names for the months (we know how their decimal system brought into existence then has become world-wide in its use), yet neither the one nor the other succeeded in ousting the old Roman names eked out (in our case) by Saxon terms.

But in later days it began to be thought that it was wrong to speak of the Lord's Day by its vulgar name—Sunday. And so after the Reformation a new term was introduced. It was called "the Sabbath Day." This arose from the idea that the Lord's Day was "the Christian's Sabbath." Instead of the old levity of the Roman Catholic Church—which we see amongst Anglicans to-day—in dealing with the Lord's Day and encouraging men and women to spend it in games and idle sportings, provided they attended mass in the morning, the Reformers introduced a more decent observance of the Great Day of the Church—our Lord's Resurrection Day. And to aid them in doing so they sought to impart to it the character of the Sabbath Day. That they were not so strict as their successors is seen in the fact that John Knox encouraged the playing of golf on that day PROVIDED the players had attended "divine service." But gradually as the gulf betwixt Papacy, with its illegitimate offspring Prelacy, and the Reformed Church in all lands waxed wider and deeper,

so more and more the strictness in the observation of the Lord's Day as Sabbath grew.

This is well illustrated by its history in a land beloved of many—Scotland. Instead of the comparative laxity of John Knox and his fellow-reformers there succeeded a strictness that sought to vie with the strict observance of the true Sabbath by Israel in the hey-day of its Theocracy. I remember when it was counted sinful for men to shave on Sunday, for women to look out at the windows, so the blinds were drawn and the shutters closed, or for boys to whistle on that day. And as Sunday was the name in popular use with Papists and Prelatists, so its very use was banned and we spake only of Sabbath schools, Sabbath services, and Communion Sabbaths.

Thus grew in intensity the opposition of Sabbath to Sunday, whilst its scriptural name of "the first day of the week," and the name most in use in the early centuries, "the Lord's Day," were utterly displaced, and the latter sounded strange when it was used on some solemn occasion.

Hence gradually the true Sabbath was forgotten in its imitation produced by the art and strife of men.

For instance, thus speaks the Confession of Faith constructed at Westminster in the seventeenth century :

Chapter XXI., Section 7. "As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in His Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him; which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath."

Here the Sabbatarian strikes in with his questions: Where do we read in Scripture of such a change? Who changed it? The first the Seventh-Day Adventist answers with "Nowhere," and the second with "The Pope of Rome." No such change is to be found in Scripture. Read carefully through the Acts and you will find both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, or first of the week, existing separately and quite distinct.

When Paul desires to address his Jewish countrymen he knows when and where to find them gathered together—on the Sabbath in the Synagogue. When he wishes to find his fellow-believers gathered together he knows when and where to find them—on the first day of the week in some hired

room or upper chamber belonging to some believer a degree less poor than his fellows.

I have read carefully through the writings of the great teachers of the Christian Church when Popes were unknown and East and West were one, and there I find the same clear distinction between Sabbath and Lord's Day, only we slowly begin to find the Sabbath called Saturday and the Lord's Day Sunday.

Now, before we enquire, What do the Scriptures teach as to the Sabbath? Let us enquire, What do the Seventh-Day Adventists teach?

1. The observance of the Sabbath from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday.

2. The non-observance of this is the "mark of the beast."

3. There is no hope of salvation for those who will not keep the Sabbath.

4. "Through the two great errors, the immortality of the soul and Sunday sacredness, Satan will bring the people under his deceptions."

5. Sabbath-keeping is the great sign of loyalty to God, for it is written: "It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel for ever."

6. Believers who fail in observing the Sabbath are lost, for, writes Mrs. White, "If it is seen that though running well for a time, they did not overcome (*i.e.*, kept not the Sabbath), then instead of confessing their names before the Father and His angels, and blotting out their sins, Christ will blot out their names from the Book of Life . . . after which Christ will come to take to Himself those who are found to be loyal to Him." See, therefore, the importance of keeping the Sabbath, for if you do not keep it you are disloyal, and if you are disloyal Christ will blot out your name from the Book of Life, and you will be lost eternally. Here, then, is salvation by works. Well may we ask, Can this be true? Must we keep the ancient Jewish Sabbath or be lost?

To lighten this gloomy page I quote a question and answer from their great catechism:—

Q.—In Exodus 35. 3 we read: "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." How are we to understand the fourth commandment in reference to this and like passages?

A.—In that climate fire was not needed for warmth; and the very fact that one was kindled indicated that unnecessary labour was to be performed.

Here is another example of their crass ignorance. For this they have no excuse, for the information is contained in the very Book they profess to study exclusively:—

John 18. 18: "And the servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals, FOR IT WAS COLD; and they WARMED themselves; and Peter stood with them, and WARMED himself."

The answer they give is somewhat difficult to be understood, but one thing is clear from it—we need only keep the fourth commandment when it is convenient or agreeable.

I understand the question, for in America life in winter would not be endurable without fires; and this reminds me of another difficulty they had with this Sabbath question. Israel kept the Sabbath from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday, and could do so with the utmost regularity in their own land. But what happens in lands where at certain seasons of the year there are no sunsets? The law is clear upon the point, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath."

That this is not an imaginary question, is shown by the fact that in 1886, because of the difficulty in northern Sweden and Norway, it was seriously discussed in conference whether a fixed hour such as six o'clock should not be substituted for sunset, seeing that in such places in winter the sun is never seen, and in summer the sun is never lost sight of. Mrs. White was there and favoured the change, but the conference decided against her. You will remember that Mrs. White did not agree with keeping the Sabbath for some years after it was started, and apparently only then because a leading elder threatened to oppose her visions otherwise. As several other women who started having visions were soon brought to their right senses by the elders, it was necessary that this elder should be propitiated, or he might soon have put a stop to Mrs. White's visions also. That she never adopted Sabbath-keeping, beyond being a measure of expediency, is clear from this fact that in direct opposition to the law of Moses and in compliance with expediency, she proposed making it a matter of human measurements of time instead of the divinely-appointed divine measurement.

Under the law of Moses a man was condemned to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath, but the Seventh-Day Adventists would have acquitted him on the plea that he was cold, so cold, and needed a fire to warm himself, and

start afresh the stagnating current of his circulation in those cold and trembling limbs!

So when Seventh-Day Adventists ask, By what authority do you worship God on the first rather than the seventh day of the week? I may reasonably reply, "By what authority do you alter the law of the Sabbath, and permit on grounds of expediency what is forbidden under penalty of death by the law of Moses?"

Things are brought to a worse pass when we study further their doctrine of the Sabbath:

Mrs. White in her spiritual gifts (Vol I. page 118) says: "I saw that the Sabbath would never be done away, but the redeemed saints, AND ALL THE ANGELIC HOST, will observe it in honour of the great Creator TO ALL ETERNITY."

Elder Uriah Smith in his Biblical Institute (p. 145) says: "We infer that the higher orders of intelligences keep the Sabbath also." And again: "The Sabbath of each of His creatures will be the Sabbath of all the rest, so that all will observe THE SAME PERIOD TOGETHER for the same purpose." Another writes: "When the sun set on Friday evening and I began keeping the Sabbath, the Lord and the angels began keeping it too."

In this connection it is interesting to quote from Mrs. White in regard to the inhabitants of other worlds. I have mentioned Elder Bates' scepticism. Fortunately for Mrs. White, Elder Bates had a great opinion of himself as an astronomer. So Mrs. White began to have astronomical visions. Now the remarkable part of these visions is that they reproduce prevalent ideas and statements given in the popular astronomical books of her day. I need hardly add that her visions are not up to date. In other words she merely repeated what was known or believed in then. Curiously enough my next extract illustrating this is taken from a book just issued by them (December 1905), for it reveals Mrs. E. G. White as a self-deceiver (like all hysterical females), or a religious impostor, or a mixture of both. I give it at length:

"Sister White was in very feeble health, and while prayers were offered in her behalf, the Spirit of God rested upon us. We soon noticed that she was insensible to earthly things. This was her first view of the planetary world. After counting aloud the moons of Jupiter, and soon after those of Saturn [elsewhere the number of Saturn's moons is given, and it was the number known then! exactly the same mistake with the number of Jupiter's moons!!], she gave a beautiful description of the rings of the latter. She then said: 'The inhabitants are a tall, majestic people, so unlike the inhabitants of the earth. Sin has never entered here.' It was evident from Brother Bates' smiling face that his past doubts in regard to the source of her visions

were fast leaving him. We all knew that Captain [he was the captain of a Yankee 'wind-jammer'] Bates was a great lover of astronomy, as he would often locate many of the heavenly bodies for our instruction. [Clearly here is one source of 'Sister White's revelations,' but I imagine the 'tall, majestic people' was an added touch of her own.]

"When Sister White replied to his questions, after the vision, saying that she had never studied or otherwise received knowledge in this direction [oh! Sister White, what about the captain's 'instruction'?], he was filled with joy and happiness. He praised God, and expressed his belief that the vision concerning the planets was given that he might never again doubt."

I have given this incident to show that the Seventh-Day Adventists believed that other worlds are inhabited beside our own.

When I devote a chapter to "Sister White" I will give some more illustrations of her "parlour magic," so do not think I have been too suspicious to be just to her. Remember, I am fighting for your soul's sake; and this woman is the prophetess of Seventh-Day Adventism, whose writings they place upon a par with the Holy Bible.

Now committed to the doctrine that all God's creatures keep the Sabbath, and "observe the same period together," see what a strange pass this brings them to. How long is the day in Jupiter? Exactly nine hours, fifty-five minutes, thirty-five seconds. So that the "tall, majestic people" [I am supposing she places them on Jupiter] cannot "observe the same period together." But supposing they are on Saturn, then their Sabbath will last ten hours, fourteen minutes, four seconds. If she had had these astronomical visions to-day she would have been sure to have placed people on Mars, whose Sabbath would then be half an hour longer than ours; but on Venus, according to the latest observations, the Sabbath would last 225 days, or, according to others (including the two evenings), many years.

Take our own world, that grain of sand on the shores of space. Every traveller knows time alters as we travel east or west. Suppose two of the strictest sect of the Seventh-Day Adventists start from London, or your own city, town, or village, and one travels east and the other west, until they meet again in London, or wherever the starting-place was. They have kept the sunset Friday to sunset Saturday (Sabbath) according to their watches and calendars. What happens? When they meet they will be two days apart.

CHAPTER IX.

"Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. . . . And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, but they found none" (Exodus 16. 26, 27).

SEVENTH-DAY Adventists base their observance of the Sabbath on the Fourth Commandment. Some of them as a preliminary attempt to carry back the observance of a Sabbath to Eden, but the first mention we have of the day is when the manna fell, as recorded in Exodus 16.

Now you will observe that the observance of the Sabbath is first provided for BEFORE it is enjoined. The Lord first removed the necessity for work on the seventh day before He commanded the cessation of work. This is very different from the observance of the Sabbath under the Law. The necessity for work might remain (as in the matter of firing, &c.), but all abstinence from work must be observed under the pain of death—"in it thou shalt not do any work."

As to the supposed observance of the Sabbath in the garden of Eden, I cannot see how that could be, for man having been created on the sixth day, God's seventh day was his first day; and so it has remained ever since WHEN MAN ENTERS INTO GOD'S REST. God's grace might discover some mode of providing a kind of rest for poor, labouring man on the anniversary of His own day of rest, as in the case of the manna, but God's rest having been broken (for what saith the Son? "My Father worketh hitherto and I work"), there could be no communion of rest and rest in communion betwixt God and man, which was found on that first seventh day which was man's first day, until He of whom God said, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," could say, "IT IS FINISHED!" and rest from His labours. Thus He is Lord of the Sabbath; apart from Him there can be no rest; as He is the manna, "the bread from heaven," without which they could not rest, so without Him cannot we. But when do we rest in communion with Him? Not on the seventh day, for that He spent resting in the tomb, but on the First Day of the Week when He rose from the dead and came to give His disciples rest from all their fears; on the First Day of the Week when the Holy Spirit came to give His disciples rest from all their doubts.

Keeping the Jewish Sabbath (to distinguish it from its imitation the so-called "Christian Sabbath") is a sign that we are still under the Law, still doubting and fearing like those disciples on the seventh day their Master was sleeping in the sepulchre, still under the bondage of the old world with its fundamental law of "Do this and live."

Would not that be our condition, fellow-believer, had the Gospels broken short off at the graveside of Jesus? Had all the Gospel "first days of the week" with their blessed news CHRIST IS RISEN! The PARACLETE promised is COME! never existed or been buried in oblivion, what comfort would there have been in the Sabbath? That it pointed us back to the seventh day of Creation? That it reminded us of the Law from Sinai? That it left us with a dead Christ?

Why, the Sabbath is the mark of the end of ALL things, hope amongst them.

But look at the First Day—the Beginning of all Things! The seventh day was the First Day of God's Rest.

The First Day of the Week is the Resurrection Day—the first day of Jesus' new Life!

The First Day of the Week is the Day of Pentecost—the first day of the Holy Spirit's new work!

The First Day of the Week is the Day of Worship—the first day of the New Dispensation: the Church's weekly birthday!

The First Day of the Week is the Day of days—the central point in every believer's existence, for on it he looks back to the Cross, upwards to the Crown, and forwards to the Coming whilst standing by the empty tomb in the garden now filled with a heavenly effulgence and, like the plains above Bethlehem, with the music of angels' voices.

The First Day of the Week is the believer's Birthday, Deathday, Burialday, and Resurrection Day all rolled into one. When he is born again it is the first of days, of weeks, of years to him. When he dies (should he die) it is the first day of his being with Christ. When he is buried it is in the hope of the first day of the week, the sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection. And when he rises (as he shall rise) it is because Christ rose on the First Day of the Week.

Ask me not, then, to go back to the gloomy Sabbath under the Law threatening death with Christ in the tomb, because "it is a sign between Me and the Children of Israel

for ever." I am not a child of Israel. I am a child of God with a place in the Body of Christ where no national distinctions are known—"neither Jew nor Gentile."

Think not to frighten me into a base acquiescence by such texts as "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. 22. 14)—the last words in one of their pamphlets.

What "commandments" am I asked to keep? Jesus said: "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me: and He that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him." Where did Jesus command us to keep the Sabbath? Was it not one of His "crimes" in the eyes of the Scribes and Pharisees that He kept neither the Sabbath nor encouraged His disciples to keep it? How! how! may mutter some, was He not then a Lawbreaker? So those Jews said, but how could He be, seeing He was "Lord of the Sabbath"? The king can do no wrong—so saith the Law! And the paradox here to many minds reminds us that there is no such distinction in Scripture as "moral law" and "ceremonial law." It is, however, a distinction in the nature of our minds, and shows that "the Sabbath," although part of the Ten Commandments usually called the "moral law" really belongs to the "ceremonial law," for see, could we believe that our Lord would act thus towards any other of the ten commandments? No; our minds shrink from the thought. That is to say, what belongs to the eternal law of Right and Wrong cannot be altered, for 'tis of the nature of things spiritual, that is, of God. So we are to understand the argument our Lord adduces from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and from the fact that He is "Lord of the Sabbath." It did not belong to the category of Right and Wrong. It was a ceremony become through an ordinance a sign. So He said that "the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath."

The use of such a passage as Revelation 22. 14 in such a connection intimates that what is implied in the text, "They that do not His commandments are not blessed, and have no right to the tree of life, and shall not enter through the gates of the city" is true of them who keep not the Seventh-Day Adventist Sabbath. Thus is not the use, but the abuse, of Scripture.

For what saith the apostle? "A man is justified by faith WITHOUT THE DEEDS OF THE LAW" (Romans 3. 28).

Whom will you believe, reader, the Apostle Paul or the Seventh-Day Adventists?

Are you under Grace or under Law?

Are you trusting to the Lord Jesus Christ and His finished work for your salvation or to the keeping of the seventh day as a Sabbath?

Remember, trusting in the Lord Jesus and something else for salvation is a practical rejection of Him, for it must be HE or nothing! Blessed be God, I no longer keep the Sabbath, for God no longer speaks to me from Sinai, saying, "Do this and live." But I keep the Lord's Day because Jesus my Lord speaks to me from the Upper Room, saying, "Live and do this in remembrance of Me."

CHAPTER X.

Jesus saith: "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" (Matthew 5. 18).

I HAVE said that the Seventh-Day Adventists base the binding nature of the Sabbath ordinance upon the Law. And they define the Law as contained in the Ten Commandments which God gave to Moses on Sinai engraved on two tables of stone. "They saw, as never before, the force of the Saviour's words, 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law'." And they stop here, for it is not convenient for them to finish His sentence, "till all be fulfilled."

Now, what does "fulfil" mean? I am not concerned as to what the American lexicographer Webster thinks; but what does the word mean which the Holy Spirit chose out of all other possible words to represent the Saviour's mind? It is the oft-used word "ginomai," meaning *become* or *come into being*, and the aorist tense in which it is here used points to an immediate coming into being or becoming. Thus, whilst the phrase, "Till heaven and earth pass," indicates a point in the expanse of time so distant that there is, as it were, a haze around it, the verb "fulfilled" refers to a realisation that is even now beginning. The understanding

of what "law" means will make this clear. As I have already pointed out the Seventh-Day Adventists by constructing a division which does not exist in Scripture immediately produce a confusion of thought that shrouds the fallacy of their argument in a cloud of words impenetrable to the ordinary reader. Where in the Bible, I ask again, do they find the words "moral" and "ceremonial"? At once allow them to do this, and place certain commands under the category of moral, and others under the category of ceremonial, and by a process of inexorable logic they will prove that moral commands can never cease to be binding. It is unthinkable that a time will come when the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," will become effete, and it will cease to be wrong to do so.

Allow them to assert that the ten commandments alone are the law in the moral sense, and place the fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy," on a level with the sixth, "Thou shalt do no murder," then the argument runs easily to the end desired by them. But is it so? When "the law" is referred to in the New Testament is there any recognition of this division into moral and ceremonial? and acknowledgment that the "ten commandments" are "moral" and all the rest are "ceremonial"? that what God wrote on the two tables are permanently and universally binding in comparison with the rest written by Moses which are ceremonial, and therefore local and temporal in their scope? Listen:

Women "are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law" (1 Cor. 14. 34). Where does the law say this? Genesis 3. 16. Therefore Genesis is the law.

Romans 7. 7: "The law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet'." Where does it say this? Exodus 20. 17. Therefore Exodus is the law.

Matthew 22. 36: "Master, which is the great commandment in the LAW?" Notice how the Lord makes two quotations in reply:

(a) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

From whence is this? Deuteronomy 6. 5. Therefore Deuteronomy is the law.

(b) "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

From whence is this? Leviticus 19. 18. Therefore Leviticus is the law. And notice what the Lord says about these quotations from Deuteronomy and Leviticus:

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Matthew 12. 5: "Have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are ARE BLAMELESS?"

From whence is this? Numbers 28. 9, 10. Therefore Numbers is the law. Ah! here we come to the root of the matter; not only do we find the Lord calling all the books of Moses the law (Luke 24. 44), but here we have portions of each book called "the law," and we have Him stating distinctly that "the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless"—could He have said that IF the Sabbath command were a "moral" command in the sense they give to it? Take any command that is moral and therefore immutable—say the Seventh of the Ten Commandments—would the fact that that was broken in the temple render the breaker thereof blameless? You throw up your hands in righteous indignation and reply, "It would make the foul deed fouler!"

The rabbis have a saying, "There is no Sabbath-keeping in the temple." Could they have said that if they considered it a *moral* and not a ceremonial command? Never! Once more, divide the Law if you like into Ceremonial, Moral, and Civil precepts, and you will find each of these divisions called the *Law* in the New Testament:

(a) Ceremonial—Luke 2. 27: "The parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for Him after the custom of the law."

(b) Moral—I Timothy 1. 9: "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers . . ."

(c) Civil—Acts 23. 3: "Sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?"

To sum up this appeal to the Bible: The law includes the five Books of Moses. There is no division of it into moral and ceremonial; but, if there were, the Sabbath-commandment would not be included under the moral category, because:

i. According to the nature of the act, Sabbath-keeping is a ceremony.

Futile Arguments.

2. According to the direct testimony of the Lord of the Sabbath, the command to keep it may be broken without blame.

This, and the true meaning of the word "fulfil," used by our Lord in relation to the law, enable us to understand what the apostle says about Sabbaths—Colossians 2. 16-17: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Let me illustrate this simply. You are standing in the road with your back towards the rising sun; suddenly a shadow appears of a hat, and as it passes you the head next appears, and so on. By this you know someone is overtaking you, but owing to the position of the sun the shadow is long drawn out, and some minutes may elapse ere your friend in the body overtakes you. So Christ was coming, and unseen cast His shadow before in the form of Old Testament rites and ceremonies, holy days, new moons, and Sabbaths.

But when He who cast the shadow came, it would surely be foolish to be occupied with the shadow and not with Himself. And now He is gone awhile we need no shadow, for we have the substance in the Third Person in the Holy Trinity who dwells with us and in us as the Representative of our absent Lord Jesus. This, those who lived under the old dispensation, the economy of shadows, had not (John 7. 39). Therefore the futility of such arguments as the following:

Q. Were there any sabbath days in the old dispensation that were local and shadowy?

A. "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath."

"Also the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement, . . . It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls" (Lev. 23. 24-32).

Q. What were these days for?

A. "These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon His day" (Lev. 23. 37).

Q. Were these entirely distinct from the seventh-day Sabbaths?

A. "Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside your gifts, and beside all your free-will offerings, which ye give unto the Lord" (verse 38).

NOTES.—It is very evident from the study of this subject that the "Sabbath of the Lord" and the shadowy sabbaths were altogether different institutions, and they were for widely different purposes. The

Why the Sabbath was Given.

first was to commemorate God's great creative work, while the others were shadows, pointing to the substance—Christ. When He to whom they directed the mind was come, they were no longer needed; for since His death the memory of Him is preserved through the memorial of the Lord's Supper.

You will observe that this writer forgets that Paul includes in his category all these "shadowy sabbaths" as well as the Sabbaths. He mentions "holy day" and "new moons," which terms include all these feasts of the Lord, holy convocations, and extra days of rest—for "sabbath" is only the Hebrew for "rest"—as well as "sabbaths" by which term he refers to "the seventh-day sabbath."

Now, if it was so important for us to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, why is it not mentioned in the New Testament? There we have all the rest of the commandments written on the two tables referred to and re-inforced, but NEVER the Sabbath, except where we are told it is abolished.

Again, nowhere are we told that the children of Israel were given the Sabbath in commemoration of the creation rest, but for a distinctly different purpose, which these Seventh Day Adventists carelessly or carefully overlook.

In the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, where the ten commandments are repeated, we find this reason added to the Fourth: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: THEREFORE the Lord thy God COMMANDED THEE TO KEEP THE SABBATH DAY."

The law was given to Israel by God, and as a sign thereof He chose that they should rest on the seventh day, on which day He also had rested. That fact is given by God as an explanation why He should choose the seventh rather than any other day. Just as now we can give the reason why God has chosen the first day of the week for us to remember especially our deliverance from the land of sin and death, from the kingdom of darkness with its prince, the god of this world, on—it is the day on which our Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead. Any other day, or all the days, would do for the believer's remembering his Lord's death on, for his directions are only "do this till He come," but the apostles and the early Church had their hearts directed to the first day (which thus came to be called the Lord's Day) by the fact that it was the day of His Rising and the Spirit's Coming.

Now the law was a covenant between God and Israel (Heb. 9. 4: "The tables of the covenant"). He gives them this sign as a seal. He could not bid them remember His resting after creation, for they had no part in that; but He remembered it as His rest day, and so He gave it to them as the day on which they were to remember their deliverance from Egypt's hard labour and their entrance into rest. And as the sign is often put for the thing signified, so it is written: "Wherefore the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a PERPETUAL COVENANT"—of which the Sabbath was to them both sign and seal.

As we are not the children of Israel, but are distinctly said to be "by one Spirit . . . baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles . . . where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision" (1 Cor. 12. 13 and Col. 3. 11), we have no part or lot in this Old Covenant. Of the Jews Peter said, "Ye are the children of the covenant God made with our fathers" (Acts 3. 25). But it is written of this covenant, "If that first covenant had been faultless then should no place have been sought for the second" (Hebrews 8. 7); of which second or New Covenant Jesus, not Moses, is said to be the Mediator (Hebrews 8. 6). As the Sabbath was the sign of this first covenant, which "had also ordinances of divine service . . . a tabernacle . . . candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread, which is called the sanctuary" (Hebrews 9. 1, *et seq.*), when this first covenant was supplanted by the second, then the sign, that is, the Sabbath, was done away with.

It is written: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the Blood of Christ? . . . for this reason He is the Mediator of the New [*i.e.*, second] Covenant" (Heb. 9. 13-15); therefore the Sabbath was abolished at the Cross (Col. 2. 16; Rom. 14. 5, 6; Gal. 4. 9-11).

Study in this connection what the Holy Spirit, through Paul, saith: "God also hath made us able ministers of the New Covenant, not of the letter . . . for the letter killeth . . . if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones [literally, *engraven on stones by means of letters*, referring directly to word *letter* twice repeated in the preceding clauses], was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not sted-

fastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which was to be done away . . . For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious" (2 Cor. 3. 6-11).

Here we have a distinct statement that the covenant that was represented by the two tables of stone, upon which was written the Sabbath law is abolished. You are therefore placed on a horns of a dilemma, either you are under the Old Covenant with its ministration of death, or you are under the New with its ministration of the Spirit who giveth life.

If you keep the Seventh-Day Sabbath you are acknowledging that you are under the former, and therefore have no claim to the benefits of the latter. Not only so, but as to be under the former necessitates your becoming a Jew; so the Seventh-Day Adventist dictum is: "Gentile Christians must become Jews, Israelites, and so come under the obligation to keep the Sabbath, for the Sabbath was given for ever throughout their generations." Now to become an Israelite you must be circumcised; there is no other way (Acts 15. 1), "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, YE CANNOT BE SAVED," taught men from Judea. But what saith the Scriptures? Galatians 5. 1, *et seq.*: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, CHRIST SHALL PROFIT YOU NOTHING."

Do not forget it; the Seventh-Day Adventist Sabbatarian position brings you to this—CHRIST PROFITS YOU NOTHING.

CHAPTER XI.

"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" (Matt. 28. 1).

"And when the Sabbath was past Mary Magdalene and Mary . . . And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came" (Mark 16. 1, 2).

"Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came" (Luke 24. 1).

"The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark" (John 20. 1).

BY the help of God I purpose proving that with the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, there came into existence another day. The Sabbath ran on, as it does to-day amongst the Jews, but for believers it had no longer

any significance. They worshipped a Risen Lord; they lived a new life, the Resurrection Life; they dwelt spiritually in a new sphere, the new creation; therefore they worshipped on a new day, the first day of the week, called in the calendar in common use all over the known world they inhabited, *Dies Solis*—that is, Sunday. As it was a pagan world it had a pagan calendar, in which the days and months had pagan names, yet as in many other cases the Church of the Living God took those names and glorified them by using them in the service of the Most High. As one of our own poets hath said, “A rose by any other name would smell as sweet,” so these strong-hearted believers could convert a day named after “Sol” to the service of God by filling its golden hours with praise and worship, just as the great apostle converted the school of pagan philosophy, with all its unutterable evils, into the very gate of heaven, where many a soul was born again and entered the kingdom of God.

As time rolled on a new name for Sunday came into use amongst the believers, a name they received from the Apostle John—“Lord’s Day.” But speaking to a pagan you must use pagan terms, as speaking to a Frenchman you must use French terms; so addressing the heathen the day received its heathen name Sunday, but speaking amongst themselves it received its own name of Lord’s Day. There is no mystery here. Nay more when the doctrine grew that the day was the Christian Day of Rest or Sabbath (which is only Hebrew for *rest*), there was no confusion as to the day, it was still the day of the Resurrection.

It is forgetting this distinction that Seventh-Day Adventists try to make capital out of the writings of obscure theologians, whose names are not to be found in any encyclopædias I know of, backed up by the obscure utterances of others whose zeal for maintaining the restful character of the day (as I have already shown), led them to attempt to show that the day was changed so that a certain amount of what the Old Testament said about the Sabbath might be applied to the first day of the week. Nowhere in Scripture is it changed. It could no more be so changed than Friday could be changed into Saturday. Above all there yawns between the two days an impassable gulf—the grave of our Lord.

Therefore I shall show by suitable extracts that the two days ran on contemporaneously, and never were mistaken

the one for the other. Consequently the statement of the Seventh-Day Adventists, upon which they stake the most, that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week is not only utterly baseless, but is altogether outside the question.

Here are a few of their (what I must call foolish) statements:

“The name, origin, authority, and sacredness of the Sunday institution are altogether and only pagan.

“The Pope had changed it [the day in question] from the seventh to the first day of the week.

“The Pope has changed the day of rest from the seventh to the first day.

“Here we find the mark of the beast. The very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, on the part of the Catholic Church, without any authority from the Bible.

“Sunday keeping must be the ‘mark of the beast.’

“The change of the Sabbath is the sign or mark of the authority of the Romish Church.

“The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark. Sunday came in with Constantine; and it is the sign of the beast, for we owe its observance to the Roman Catholic Church.”

Thus, and in many more passages, they commit themselves to the statement, “Sunday came in with Constantine; and it is the sign of the beast, for we owe its observance to the Roman Catholic Church.”

Now, by proving that the two days run on contemporaneously from the days of the apostles until now, I prove this fundamental position of theirs to be untenable, and the statement, even though it be uttered by the “inspired” Mrs. White, to be FALSE.

As some of my readers may not be fully acquainted with the literature of the period under review, before entering on the subject I had better give a short sketch of the writers and works referred to.

From A.D. 30 to A.D. 67 we have the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. To the end of the first century we have the writings of John the Apostle and Evangelist. Then follows (I refer only for brevity’s sake to the writers whose works I shall use) the Epistle of Barnabas, which is dated by the latest authorities about the beginning of the second century; then come the seven genuine Epistles of Ignatius in the Vossian Recension, accepted by the best authorities and dated A.D. 107; the Epistle of Polycarp, about A.D. 108; the Epistle to Trajan of Pliny the Younger, A.D. 111 or 112; the writings of Justin Martyr, A.D. 145-150; the

"Apostolical Constitutions" (with the exception of Book VIII., regarding the date of which critics are at sea), critics follow Bunsen in saying that they give a faithful description of the life of the Church in the second century; Dionysius of Corinth, A.D. 170; Melito of Sardis, about the same date; Irenaeus, A.D. 155 to 202; Tertullian, A.D. 150-230; Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 150-220; Origen died in A.D. 253; and the well-known Cyprian of Carthage was beheaded there for the faith of Christ in A.D. 258.

Again, notice how these men are linked on to one another—Ignatius was a pupil of the apostles; Polycarp, the friend of Ignatius, was a hearer of the Apostle John; Irenaeus describes how he sat at the feet of Polycarp—thus there is a living chain, the links of which, fastened to the Apostle John at the end of the first century, stretch to the beginning of the third century, and being there united to a great group of Christian teachers spread all over the Roman earth, have been well tested by all the mordant methods of modern criticism and found genuine. Certain objections to these witnesses brought forward by the Seventh-Day Adventists I will deal with after we have placed them one by one in the witness box and listened to their testimony. Other objections will be dealt with *en passant*.

A.D. 30 to A.D. 67 is the First Period.

Matthew, Mark, and Luke in the Gospels make a clear distinction between the Sabbath in which our Lord lay in the grave, and the first day of the week on which He rose. Taking John's testimony here, although his Gospel was not written until the close of the century, you will observe this important fact when you compare these four testimonies (given at the head of this chapter)—you will, I say, notice that they differ somewhat in their statements of time. Matthew says: "In the end of the Sabbath," or literally, "Late on the Sabbath, as it began to dawn..."; Mark says: "When the Sabbath was past"; Luke, "Upon the first day"; and John, "The first day, ... when it was yet dark."

What does this mean? Are they uncertain as to the time? No, for they all agree that it was about the rising of the sun on the first day of the week. The important fact I wish you to observe being that for Matthew the Sabbath ends at sunrise on Sunday morning, whilst for the others it ends at midnight on Saturday.

Here we have the Seventh-Day Adventist *dictum* that the day in Scripture begins at sunset and ends at sunset

completely controverted. Ceremonially it did; but I understand that the Seventh-Day Adventists will have none of that! I emphasise this fact, and call it rightly "important," for this absolutely incorrect impression that the only "days" in the Bible extend from sunset on one day to sunset on the other is the basis of one serious charge against the evangelists of inconsistency and error made by would-be critics.

John 20. 18: "Then the same day [the first day] at evening, BEING THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, . . . came Jesus and stood in the midst."

John 20. 26: "And after eight days again . . . came Jesus, . . . and stood in the midst."

Luke 24. 36: "And as they thus spake [the disciples back from Emmaus], Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them."

These are some of the many meetings that took place between the Lord and His disciples after His rising from among the dead. They are all on the first day of the week—for to say that John's "after eight days" means Monday is too puerile almost to notice; it is the common expression for this day week—and what is more, *in the evening*, after sunset. According to the Seventh-Day Adventists it must be Monday, for according to them the first day closed at sunset. Unfortunately for their veracity the Scripture adds, "Being the first day of the week," or "the same day." And as the disciples said at Emmaus, "Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent" (an interesting word meaning "declined" or "bowed down," clearly referring to the sun and the natural not ceremonial day), so He tarries with them to reveal Himself to them in "the breaking of bread." How late, then, must it have been when after this they returned all the way to Jerusalem! Not only so, it is after they have told their long but delightfully entralling story of what happened to them in the way that Jesus appears in the midst. It must have been near midnight, yet it is still "the first day of the week."

Luke, in Acts 2. 1: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come" the Holy Spirit appeared. That was the first day of the week, for in Leviticus we read: "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath [that is, the first day of the week], . . . even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath [that is, the first day of the week] shall ye number fifty days" (23. 15, 16). Now Pentecost is the Greek for "fiftieth," therefore "the morrow after the seventh Sab-

64 What they Call "Conclusive Evidence"!

bath" was the fiftieth day, or Pentecost, or the first day of the week.

Luke, in Acts 20. 7: "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech to midnight." This is a terrible barrier in the way of the Seventh-Day Adventists' argument, and they employ every means legitimate and illegitimate to overcome it—of course without success. Let us see how they try:

(1) It is a remarkable fact that this, the only instance of a religious meeting on the first day recorded in the New Testament, was a night meeting, which is proved by the fact that many lights were burning in the assembly, and that Paul preached till midnight.

(2) From this follows the important consequence, that this first day meeting was upon Saturday night, because the days of the week being reckoned from evening to evening, and evening being at sunset, it is clear that the first day of the week begins Saturday night at sunset, and ends at sunset on Sunday; a night meeting, therefore, upon the first day of the week could be only on Saturday night. (!!)

(3) Thus are we furnished with conclusive evidence that Paul and his companions resumed their journey towards Jerusalem on the morning. Paul, therefore, preached until midnight on Saturday night, for the disciples held a night meeting at the close of the Sabbath, because he was to leave in the morning; then, being interrupted by the fall of the young man, he went down and healed him, then went up and attended to the breaking of bread, and at break of day, on Sunday morning, he departed.

(4) Thus are we furnished with conclusive evidence that Paul and his companions resumed their journey towards Jerusalem on the morning of the first day of the week; they taking ship to Assos, and he going on foot (this fact being an incidental proof of Paul's regard for the Sabbath, in that he waited till it was past before resuming his journey, and it is a positive proof that he knew nothing of what in modern times is called the Christian Sabbath).

(5) This narrative was written by Luke at least thirty years after the alleged change of the Sabbath. It is worthy of note that Luke omits all titles of sacredness, simply designating the day in question as the first day of the week, &c., &c.

These "proofs" are by a Seventh-Day Adventist known principally amongst them as the author of a large tome on "The Sabbath," which Mrs. White makes good use of in her writings. As I find the size of the book impresses some young believers, and as they cannot read it (it is the hardest of their works to read; the style is dry, and the numerous inaccuracies make it irritating), they are apt to be unduly impressed by its seeming learning, so I give this illustration of its logic, so that *ab uno discere omnes*: or, "bulk according to sample."

Sunday Morning or Monday Morning? 65

1. Notice the distinction between the Sabbath and the first day of the week is clearly admitted.

2. I know not what is meant by a "religious meeting" if the gatherings already recorded in the Gospels to meet with the Lord be not religious meetings; and they were, without exception, IN THE EVENING of the FIRST DAY of the week. That reminds me: the S.D.A.'s profess to keep the Fourth Commandment, but as their "religious meetings" are on the Sabbath, many of them have to travel miles there and back, thus breaking the command. As assumption is the rule of the road with this writer, may we not also assume that believers at Troas had to travel on the Sabbath if this were "a night meeting at the close of the Sabbath"? So much for the correctness of his bold statement that this is "the only instance . . .".

3. You will notice that even in Leviticus "the first day of the week" is called "the morrow after the Sabbath." Why should Luke then write the "first day of the week," when he meant the "morrow" AFTER the first day of the week? Had he been a S.D.A. writer it might have been possible, not otherwise.

Read the 7th verse again: The disciples came together "upon the first day of the week." Nothing is said about "lights" until after Paul's address is described as having lasted "until midnight."

Read the passage in the original language, and you will see at once the physician's touch, for here he is giving (as in Luke 22. 45) the causes of Eutychus' unfortunate drowsiness, the length of the address, the lateness of the hour, and the smell of the lamps, which had to be lit when dusk fell. Quite a different thing from what our Sabbatarian author argues about. Pity such do not first study their Bibles before they attempt to employ them in a false cause!

Upon the first day of the week Paul preaches to them "ready to depart ON THE MORROW." That is plainly the morrow after the first day, or in our language Monday morning. Oh, no, says our learned writer, the morrow is Sunday morning; so that according to him Paul preaches on Sunday and yet departs on Sunday morning. He is so glad to make Paul travel on Sunday that he makes words mean anything or nothing.

4. All these assumptions, mis-statements, suppositions, &c., are due to the fact that this writer has not studied what the Scriptures do say. We have seen that there were other

meetings on the evening of the first day; that the day does not end at sunset unless it is under what they call the "ceremonial law," and there above all places the morrow after the day mentioned is exactly what we mean by the same term: that is to say, it is the next day. But here I should like to quote our greatest authority on the geography and chronology of the Acts, Professor Ramsay:

"In A.D. 57 Passover fell on Thursday, April 7. The company left Philippi on the morning of Friday, April 15, and the journey to Troas lasted till the fifth day, Tuesday, April 19. In Troas they stayed seven days, the first of which was April 19, and the last, Monday, April 25. Luke's rule is to state first the whole period of residence, and then some details of the residence. On the Sunday evening just before the start, the whole congregation at Troas met for the Agape; religious services were conducted late into the night, and in the early morning of Monday the party went on board and set sail. In A.D. 56, 58, 59, the incidence of Passover is not reconcilable with Luke's statistics, as is apparent from the attempts that have been made to torture his words into agreement."—"St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen," pp. 289, 290.

Professor Ramsay is not referring to this discussion at all. He is only bent on showing the absolute trustworthiness of Luke as a historian and of Acts as a history. It is well known that he began as a Higher Critic of the most advanced type, but a lengthy sojourn in the regions described and a careful and minute study of the text of the book in the light of the most recent discoveries compelled him to accept the book and its writer to be what they profess to be.

But what I would that you should carry away from this discussion is that according to the Seventh-Day Adventist Paul waited until the Sabbath was over before he began to preach and to break bread with the disciples; but that according to those passages from the earliest inspired writer to the latest, from the resurrection to the close of the first century, the distinction between the two days is clear, the Sabbath is the Sabbath, and the First Day of the Week is the First Day of the Week. Which authority do you accept? The Bible, of course!

Now we come to the writers who follow the apostles.

I. THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS: about A.D. 100.

"Further, also, it is written concerning the Sabbath in the decalogue which the Lord spoke, face to face, to Moses on Mount Sinai, 'And sanctify ye the Sabbath of the Lord with clean bands and a pure heart' (Exodus 20. 8; Deut. 5. 12) . . . If therefore anyone can now sanctify the day which God hath sanctified, except he is pure in heart

in all things, we are deceived. . . . Ye perceive how He speaks: Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made—when, giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the EIGHTH DAY—that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the EIGHTH DAY with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead. And when He had manifested Himself, He ascended into the heavens."

II. THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS: A.D. 107.

(a) "And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's Day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all days.

"Looking forward to this, the prophet declared 'To the end, for the eighth day' (Psalms 6. and 12; inscription), on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ, whom the children of perdition, the enemies of the Saviour, deny, 'whose god is their belly, who mind earthly things,' who are 'lovers of pleasure and not lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.'—Ep. ad Mag. IX.

(b) "Be not deceived with strange doctrines, nor with old fables, which are unprofitable. For if we still live according to the Jewish law, we acknowledge that we have not received grace. . . . If, therefore, those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's Day, on which also our life has sprung up again by Him and by His death—whom some deny, by which mystery we have obtained faith, and therefore endure, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ our only Master."—Ep. ad Mag. VIII. and IX.

III. THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP: A.D. 108.

Polycarp knew the Apostle John, from whose Book of Revelation the name "Lord's Day" for the first day of the week is taken (Rev. 1. 10), and had much intercourse with him. John was banished under the Emperor Domitian to Patmos in A.D. 95 or 96. He returned to Ephesus, where he died somewhere between A.D. 101 and 105. Polycarp was martyred in A.D. 155 or 156, when he was a very old man, for to the Proconsul who said to him, "Swear, and I will set thee at liberty," "Reproach the Christ!" he answered bravely, "Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He never did me any wrong; how then can I blaspheme my King, my Saviour?" He was therefore in the prime of life when John and he lived much together.

Now, just about this time Ignatius passed through Smyrna, where Polycarp was then living, on the road to martyrdom in Rome, A.D. 107.

Ignatius writes to Florinus, "how he (Polycarp) would describe his intercourse with John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and he would relate their words. And

whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the Life of the Lord, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures." Unfortunately we have only one of Polycarp's letters. In this fragment he refers to Ignatius and his letters, saying, "by them ye may be greatly profited."

Thus we have the testimony of Ignatius corroborated by one who lived and conversed with the Apostle John, who used the term "Lord's Day." In the light of this fact read again the extracts from the genuine letters of Ignatius, and do not be misled by the capital made out of the fact that there have been letters written in later times fictitiously ascribed to him.

IV. THE EPISTLE TO TRAJAN BY PLINY THE YOUNGER: A.D. III OR 112.

"The Christians affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be, that they were accustomed to assemble together on a stated day, before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a God, and to bind themselves by a sacramentum, . . . after which it was their custom to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose."

V. THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR: A.D. 145-150.

(a) "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read . . . bread and wine . . . brought . . . and the people assent, saying Amen; . . . and they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected . . . orphans and widows, and those . . . sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning amongst us . . . all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, BECAUSE IT IS THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK on which God . . . made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, WHICH IS THE DAY OF THE SUN (Sunday), having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for consideration."—"First Apology," LXVII.

(b) "A Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew." In this he attempts to show the Jew the futility of observing the Sabbath in this new dispensation of grace. The passage is too long and involved to quote, but may be read in Chapter XXVII. of Justin's work. Trypho says to Justin: "Why do you select and quote whatever you wish from the prophetic writings (Justin had quoted Isaiah 1. 13, and similar passages), but do not refer to those which expressly command the Sabbath to be observed?" Trypho thus seems to have been one of the forerunners of the Seventh-Day Observance movement!

VI. APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS: Church Life in the Second Century.

"On the day of the resurrection of the Lord—that is, the Lord's Day—assemble yourselves together without fail, giving thanks to God and praising Him for those mercies God has bestowed upon you through Christ, and has delivered you from ignorance, error, and bondage, that your sacrifice may be unspotted and acceptable to God, who has said concerning His universal church: 'In every place shall incense and a pure sacrifice be offered unto Me; for I am a great King, saith the Lord Almighty, and My Name is wonderful among the heathen.'

VII. DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, A.D. 170, in an epistle to the church at Rome, writes:

"To-day we kept the Lord's Holy Day, in which we read your letter."

VIII. MELITO OF SARDIS: A.D. 175.

This Christian teacher composed a treatise on "The Lord's Day." The fact is recorded, but up to the present no copy of the manuscript has been found.

IX. IRENAEUS: A.D. 155-202. A controversial writer of great repute. The following extracts are made from his "Against Heretics":

(a) "This same does Ezekiel the prophet say with regard to the Sabbaths: 'Also I give them My Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord, to sanctify them.'

"And in Exodus God says to Moses: 'And ye shall observe My Sabbaths; for it shall be a sign between Me and you for your generations.'

"These things then were given for a sign; but the signs were not unsymbolical—that is, neither unmeaning nor to no purpose, inasmuch as they were given by a wise Artist; but the circumcision after the flesh typified that after the spirit. . . . But the Sabbaths taught that we should continue day by day in God's service."

(b) "Moreover the Sabbath of God—that is, the kingdom was as it were indicated by created things; in which kingdom the man who shall have persevered in serving God shall in a state of rest partake of God's Table."

Irenaeus is arguing that the Sabbath days are to be taken as a sign, as circumcision was: NOT TO BE KEPT—as a passage from a fragment of his on the burning question of his day, "Shall believers keep Easter according to the Jewish calendar, or restrict its observance to the Lord's Day?" makes clear:

"The mystery of the Lord's Resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the Paschal Feast."

Here is another indication of the way in which the Lord's

Day was kept separate from the Sabbath day or any other anniversary. Traditions might vary as to the proper day on which to keep the anniversary of our Lord's rising from among the dead, and controversies might arise; but the weekly one was never questioned in East or West.

X. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: A.D. 150-220.

Through Clement the Neo-Platonistic theology was brought into the Church, which has wrought such havoc with the doctrine of the soul and its destiny after death; to it we owe such speculative doctrines as annihilation and universalism, although so great is the ignorance of many as to what these early teachers really taught that they actually imagine that Plato is the patron saint of orthodoxy in this matter. So true is it that fact is stranger than fiction. For Clement is the first great teacher of these doctrines, for which he adduces Plato as his authority. Now, though the following extract from his writings reeks of Plato, yet it is good testimony as to what was believed in his times, viz:—that the seventh day is the Sabbath, which gives place to the eighth or Lord's Day.

"And the Lord's Day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the Republic, in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth day they are to set out and arrive in four days.' By the meadow is to be understood the fixed sphere, as being a mild and genial spot, and the locality of the pious; and by the seven days each motion of the seven planets, and the whole practical art which speeds to the end of rest (Sabbath—rest). But after the wandering orbs the journey leads to heaven—that is, to the eighth motion or day (*i.e.*, Lord's Day)."

XI. TERTULLIAN: born at Carthage, A.D. 150; converted 192; died 230.

His chief work (from which the first extract is made) is his "Apologeticus," a defence of Christianity called forth by the persecution under Septimius Severus in which Irenaeus was martyred:

(a) "In the same way if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing, FROM A FAR DIFFERENT REASON THAN SUN-WORSHIP, we have some resemblance to some of you [the Jews] who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury. Others . . . suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians . . . because we make Sunday a day of festivity. . . . For the Jewish feasts are the Sabbath. . . ."—"Ad Nationes," Chapter XIII.

(b) "He who argues for Sabbath-keeping and circumcision must show that Adam and Abel and the just of old time observed these things."—"Adv. Judaeos," Chapter II.

XII. ORIGEN: A.D. 185-253.

(a) "Thus was he [John the Baptist] born to make ready a people for the Lord, a people fit for Him at the end of the Covenant now grown old, which is THE END OF THE SABBATH PERIOD. Hence it is not possible that the rest after the Sabbath should have come into existence from the seventh of our God; on the contrary it is our Saviour who, after the pattern of His own rest, caused us to be made in the likeness of His death, and hence also of His resurrection."

(b) "It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to KEEP THE LORD'S DAY."

XIII. CYPRIAN: beheaded at Carthage for his loyalty to Christ, A.D. 258.

"For in respect of the observance of the eighth day in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh, a sacrament was given beforehand in shadow and in usage. But when Christ came it was fulfilled in truth. For because the eighth day, that is the first day after the Sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give us circumcision of the spirit, the eighth day, that is the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day, went before in figure."—Cyprian's "Letters," LVIII., par. 4.

With this I close these extracts, extracts all made by myself, so that ignorance of the context might not mislead me (the portions omitted I have omitted since they do not affect the sense, and merely cumber the pages). From the gospels, down through apostolic times, through the early teachers who were contemporaries of the apostles, through the second century, culling extracts from the writings of men living both in the East and the West, and closing with this man who laid down his life for Christ's sake when the third century was more than half over—converted in his old age he could have escaped from the persecutor had he been willing to forsake the little flock committed to his charge. But no; absent from Carthage when the fury of the persecution broke forth, he returned to strengthen them by his loved presence, and counting not his life dear to himself, he laid it down willingly for his dear Master's sake on September 14, A.D. 258—that is, from A.D. 33 to A.D. 258 we have gone without finding one hint of the seventh day being placed before the eighth day, the Sabbath before the Lord's Day, the day of the old covenant before the day of the new covenant. And having carefully gone through all the writings extant, I state that I have not suppressed one passage to the contrary.

Now it would be idle to pretend that these witnesses have not been assailed. They have, but in their assault their assailants have only exemplified the old saying—"No case;

abuse the other side!" Take for instance the following reasons why we should not accept the testimony of Justin Martyr:

1. "That this plea would only show tradition of the Sunday festival." This objection is based on the assumption that the Lord's Day is not found in the New Testament, and that consequently we are seeking to get out of Justin what was not first in the Bible. I accept no doctrine on the ground of tradition; but the Lord's Day being found in the New Testament it is interesting to see what a man who lived in the very times of the apostles, and who laid down his life for the Gospel, taught about the Lord's Day and its observance.

2. "That Justin Martyr is a very unsafe guide, his testimony relative to the Lord's Supper differing from the New Testament."

This is what is popularly called "drawing a red herring across the path." Because we find even at that early date traces of declension from primitive simplicity, and a record of these traces in Justin, surely that does not impair the value of his testimony to facts. Because in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings we find more than traces of declension from the law laid down in the Pentateuch, surely that does not warrant our saying that these Books are not worthy of credence. There were changes, as we know from earlier writers than Justin Martyr, and of these changes Justin gives a faithful record. Are we then to reject his testimony as to the co-existence of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day? Surely not! To do so would be tantamount to declaring that if a man chronicles errors correctly he is incapable of doing as much for the truth, although he in the end laid down his life for the truth.

Besides all this, notice I am NOT producing Justin Martyr as a teacher, but as a witness; not adducing his writings as an explanation, but as an attestation of the fact that the Jews kept the Sabbath and the Christians kept the Lord's Day, the former the seventh day and the latter the first day of the week. Hence it is beside the mark to pronounce him an unsafe guide. What is asserted is that he is a true witness, and if this is not proved, I know not what can be proved.

3. "That the American Tract Society, in a work published against Romanism, bears the following testimony relative to the point before us."

There is no need to quote the passage. The substance of the accusation is: Justin is an untrustworthy witness because he supposed that a pillar on the island in the Tiber was a monument erected by the Roman people to Simon Magus. Whereas, if he had known his Livy, he would have known that the pillar had been put up to Semo Sanchus, an old Sabine god.

That is, because you are ignorant of one thing, THEREFORE you must be ignorant of another! A very unsound piece of reasoning which would do away with all trustworthy witnesses.

Suppose I asked you what is the tree laden with toys put up in your best parlour and lit up with candles, and you replied that it is a Christmas tree; or that the log you put on the fire is the Yule log; or that the whisky (I trust not) you supply to all comers on the last day of the year is only part of Hogmanay festivities; and did not know that according to "your Ramsay," or similar competent authority, Christ was NOT born on the 25th of December, that the tree and log were common objects in pagan Egypt, Rome, and elsewhere, and had a pagan meaning; that your whisky is but the cheaper representative of the new wine offered to all at the Feast of the Numberer (Hog Manai), or Man in the Moon—you are NOT to be believed when you appear as a witness. In fact your ignorance of the past is to make your knowledge of the present of no account.

Because in your ignorance you celebrate as religious or family rites a thousand and one memorials of the obscene and horrid deities our forefathers stained with woad and, wandering wild in the wildernesses of our native land, worshipped with dreadful rites, THEREFORE your statements concerning matters of everyday occurrence are to be impugned and their veracity denied. Because of such ignorance we are to doubt the correctness of the date you place on your letter, and deny your knowledge of the day you go to market, or whether Good Friday is a holiday or Easter Sunday a festival in the Episcopal Church.

You cry "Bosh!" Then mete out the same justice to Justin, a native of the East, a stranger to Rome, who had other things to do—notably, to die for Christ—than studying Livy in a manuscript that cost its weight in gold at least, instead of accepting a local tradition (probably told him by some garrulous guide) to the effect that Semo Sanchus' Pillar was Simon Magus' Memorial. Such are fair speci-

mens of the objections Seventh-Day Adventists bring against these witnesses. Suppose for a moment they were really able to throw doubt upon every one of our witnesses, what then? Have they any witnesses? NOT ONE!

The Seventh-Day Adventists affirm "Sunday came in with Constantine in the fourth century; and it is the sign of the beast, for we owe its observance to the Pope of Rome"—after the eleventh century.

Where are their witnesses? Nowhere to be found: nay, could they be found they would be but false witnesses testifying to a lie, for Dies Soli, or Sunday, was the name in the popular calendars of the second century for the first day of the week, or Lord's Day, of the first century.

The Sabbath or the seventh day was the sign of the dispensation of law where rest follows work. The Lord's Day, or first day of the week, or Sunday, is the sign of the dispensation of the Spirit where work follows rest. Our Saviour on the Cross tolled the knell of the legal dispensation when He said, "It is finished."

The spirit of the present dispensation is in His words: "Come unto ME all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you REST. Take My yoke upon you and learn of ME; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find REST unto your souls" (Matt. 11. 28. 29).

CHAPTER XII.

"Then shall be revealed the Lawless One, . . . whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders of falsehood" (2 Thess. 2. 8, 9, R.V., margin).

BEFORE dealing with the Seventh-Day Adventists' Eschatology or Doctrine of the Last Things, I must deal with Mrs. E. G. White, whose prophecies are the principal foundation to-day of their eschatology.

The apostle in warning the Thessalonian believers, who thought that the day of the Lord was at hand, or had already come, warned them against One who had to come first. This Great Personage would come in the energy of the Great Spirit of the world of evil, and he would produce as his guarantee "powers and signs and wonders." Thus he would be an exact travesty of the true coming One, who came (and shall come again) in the energy or "inworking" of the Holy Spirit, producing "powers and

signs and wonders" as His proofs of being what He claimed to be (Acts 2. 22). So far the comparison holds good, but here it ceases, and is replaced by a contrast. The energy our Lord had for His mission was of the Holy Spirit; the energy of the false lord of lawlessness is of Satan. Our Lord came "a Man approved of God unto you by powers and wonders and signs"; the false lord comes a man with his falsehood proved by "powers and signs and wonders," for the apostle does not say that these are false, but that they prove what is a falsehood—they are the guarantees of a lie. So further on he writes "that they should believe a lie."

I make this preliminary statement, for so often Christians are led astray by supposing that many things they cannot explain are only tricks of parlour magic; that if one only had the apparatus and the skill one could do as much. This is a dangerous attitude to take up. It minimises the meaning of these wonderful performances; it pooh-poohs these exhibitions of superhuman power, and it makes little of the "signs and powers and wonders" until the impossibility of copying these performances by even professed conjurors is discovered, and in a moment the reaction comes, and the mind swings from its former position of incredulity to a new attitude of the most grovelling credulity—the dread moment has come wherein "to believe a lie."

What attitude are we, then, to take up? The apostle tells us in the same chapter: "So then, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught, whether by word, or by epistle of ours" (2 Thess. 2. 15). These "powers and signs and wonders" are produced to prove that NEW teaching in opposition to the TRADITIONAL teaching is the TRUE teaching. The apostle declares that new teaching that is not in accordance with the rest of Scripture, however it may be bolstered up by wonderful and powerful signs, is UNTRUE. For it is possible for "powers and signs and wonders" as real, so far as our powers of observation go, as those by which God approved His Son, to be produced to prove a lie. When, therefore, we relate some of the things Mrs. White did to prove the truth of her messages, we do not cast doubt upon their reality. Having already shown that the teaching is NOT in accordance with Scripture, and proposing to show the mistakes she made in her messages thus attested, we simply relate them (as given in their own writings) in order to fill in the picture.

1. Messages directly contradicting Scripture.
2. Messages directly contradicting facts.
3. Powers, signs, wonders, attesting these false messages.

If these strokes do not fill in the picture so that it exactly resembles the picture given by the Apostle Paul in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, I do not know what does. I am not seeking to prove that Mrs. E. G. White, the prophetess of the Seventh-Day Adventists, is the lawless one. I do not believe she is. But what I shall prove is that, possessing his characteristics, she belongs to his company. You may possess a common oleograph copy of some great picture. In these days they make them wondrous like; but people would laugh if you went about saying "I have that great picture by So-and-so." But for all practical purposes it is the same—to you.

Now, if Mrs. E. G. White is a copy of the Lord of Lawlessness, she is an unconscious copy. Just as the child is an unconscious copy of his father. But to produce a copy in the sphere of the spirit, the possession of the same spirit is required, just as the copy in the case of the child requires the same life. So our Lord, recognising certain traits in His followers, said, "Ye know not of what spirit ye are of." They wanted to resemble their Master, but suddenly an opportunity occurred, and the other spirit was manifested—unconsciously.

So Mrs. E. G. White had no desire to copy such a master; it would be the farthest from her desires to become such an one as he—the travesty of the Good Master. But the opportunity occurs, and his spirit manifests itself, and unconsciously she fills in the resemblance, so that to-day we can point to it and say, "Do not you see it?" Don't make a mistake and think that I am painting the picture. For your welfare I sorrowfully and solemnly draw aside the curtain and turn on the light just at the right angle—and there is the picture already drawn and filled in by herself.

Let me premise that the following description is not taken from the writings of enemies, but from a history of the movement written by the Seventh-Day Adventists themselves. The passages occur in a chapter headed "Tokens of Divine Guidance," and beginning with a historical view of the subject under such headings as "Moses' Call from the Burning Bush," "The Presence of the Lord Promised," "Gifts of the Spirit during the Reformation," "The Remnant Church to have the Spirit of Prophecy," "Paul's Testimony

on the Gifts"; and then comes Mrs. White's case under "A Fulfilment of the Promise."

The opening words are significant: "This gift [of prophecy] has been more fully developed since the close of the 2300 days. The Lord chose His own instrument for this purpose, selecting as His agent one who had not only surrendered all for Him, but whose life trembled in the balance, 'the weakest of the weak.' Within two months after the passing of the time, Miss Ellen G. Harmon [*i.e.*, Mrs. E. G. White], of Portland, Maine, then only about 17 years of age, began to receive revelations from the Lord."

Now, I trust you will not fail to notice and remember that last clause "began to receive revelations from the Lord." The statement is clear and definite—"BEGAN to receive REVELATIONS from the LORD."

Miss Harmon's First Vision.—At the time she had her first vision she was staying at the home of Mrs. Haines. It was in the morning, and they were engaged in family worship. There were five persons present, all sisters in the faith. Others had prayed, and Miss Harmon was praying in a whisper, when the power of God came down in a most wonderful manner, manifestly affecting all who were present, and in a moment she was lost to all that was transpiring around her—she was in a vision.

The following brief synopsis of her first vision, as related by her to the believers at Portland, will give some idea of the character of all of them:

"While praying, the power of God came upon me as I had never felt it before. I was surrounded with light, and was rising higher and higher from the earth. I turned to look for the Advent people in the world, but could not find them, when a voice said to me, 'Look again, and look a little higher.' At this I raised my eyes, and saw a straight and narrow path cast up high above the world. On this path the Advent people were travelling to the city, which was at the farther end of the path. They had a bright light set up behind them at the first end of the path, which an angel told me was the 'midnight cry.' This shone all along the path, and gave light for their feet, that they might not stumble. And if they kept their eyes fixed on Jesus, who was just before them, leading them to the city, they were safe. But soon some grew weary; they said the city was a great way off, and they expected to have entered it before. Then Jesus would encourage them by raising His glorious right arm, and from His arm came a bright light which waved over the Advent people, and they shouted Hallelujah! Others rashly denied the light behind them, and said it was not God that had led them out so far. The light behind these went out, leaving their feet in perfect darkness, and they stumbled and got their eyes off the mark, and lost sight of Jesus, and fell off the path into the dark and wicked world below. Soon we heard the voice of God like many waters, which gave us the day and hour of Jesus' coming. The living saints knew and understood the voice, while the wicked thought it was thunder and an earthquake. When God spake

the time, He poured on us the Holy Spirit, and our faces began to light up and shine with the glory of God as Moses' did when he came down from Mount Sinai."

Here, then, Mrs. White claims to have heard the voice of God giving "the day and hour of Jesus' coming." This, being a "revelation from the Lord," must be true. If it be not true, it cannot be a "revelation from the Lord," but only what it on the surface appears to be—a farrago of nonsense produced by the brain of a hysterical girl suffering from a form of religious mania in which the poor creatures so afflicted imagine they hear the voice of God, are the Virgin Mary, and suffer from other such brain-sick fancies. Let us test it then. Having had this knowledge of the day and hour of Jesus' coming—let no man quibble and say she meant His coming to the sanctuary, for as it was after the 2300 days, that stage was past—what has been her attitude? Fifty years ago she wrote: "Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord." Fifty-seven years ago she wrote: "Now time is almost finished, and what we have been [six] years learning they the [new converts] will have to learn in a FEW MONTHS."

That there may be no mistake as to this, I will quote what she foretold would happen in the United States when the Lord came.

In 1847 ("Early Writings," p. 28) she states: "I saw the pious slave rise in triumph and victory and shake off the chains that bound him, while his wicked master was in confusion." Mrs. White claimed to be the prophetess of the remnant Church, and to declare what no man knows, not even the angels, "the day and hour of Jesus' Coming," and she here declares that Jesus will come before the abolition of slavery in the U.S.A. As Lincoln issued the famous Emancipation Proclamation on the 22nd September, 1862, which resulted in the abolition of slavery throughout the United States at the close of the Civil War in 1865, it can easily be seen what a tremendous mistake she made.

Therefore her vision was not true, and consequently not a "revelation from the Lord."

Having taken her first vision and shown how it cannot be a "revelation from the Lord," I propose now following out my scheme:

1. Messages directly contradicting Scripture: take as an example of this the following given in her "Early Writings," pp. 46, 47:

After Jesus left the Holy Place in 1844 she says: "I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness . . . Satan appeared to be by the throne trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne and pray, Father give us Thy spirit, then Satan would breathe upon them an unholy influence."

Here we have three serious statements:

(a) Since 1844 no souls can be saved. All are left in hopeless darkness. This contradicts all gospel messages. It denies that Jesus is still saying "Come unto Me," and "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out." It declares that all who have believed and have entered into peace through believing in our Lord Jesus Christ since 1844 are under a delusion. This is so gross a lie that no means have been left untried to hide this gigantic error of hers. Testimonies have been fabricated, passages have been erased, to undo the harm this one message of the prophetess has done her cause. But it remains on record in the original copies of her "Early Writings."

(b) Satan by the Throne trying to carry on the work of God.

(c) In answer to penitent prayers God permits Satan to breathe unholy influences on poor sinners. What a contradiction of the whole tenor of Scripture.

"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" (Luke 11. 13).

Those who know how rightly to divide the Word of Truth and understand in some measure what is called "Dispensational Truth," will see how thoroughly and completely this passage contradicts Mrs. White's message.

I need hardly quote again the passage about Jesus lifting the lid of the ark and Mrs. White looking in to see the "fourth commandment in the very centre of the ten precepts, with a soft halo of light encircling it." I have already mentioned it (page 31) in connection with the conversion of Elder Bates. After what has already been said about the real place of the fourth commandment in Scripture, it is quite clear that such a vision contradicts Scripture.

2. Messages directly contradicting facts:

(a) Her vision about slavery is one example very much to the point.

(b) "Jan. 4, 1862 . . . The system of slavery which has ruined our country, is left to live and stir up another rebellion."

Has it? of course not. The Civil War put an end to it, and there has been no slavery requiring another rebellion since!

(c) "When England does declare war all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war."

Did England declare war? Thank God, no; although we were on the verge of it when these words were written. This shows that her messages professing to be prophecies are like the "tips" about the winning horse published in too many papers, alas! Unhappy guesses made in the vain hope that some, even one, might hit the mark.

(d) "March 24, 1849 . . . I was shown," writes Mrs. White, "that the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, relating to the shut door [of mercy], could not be separated . . . I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformation would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse [!], for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people, but if their hearts could be seen they would appear as black as ever. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their salvation is past."—"Present Truth," 21, 22.

Every true conversion—and there have been millions—that has taken place since that message has given it the lie direct. So conscious are the S.D.A.'s of the utter falsity of that statement that they spend much time in presenting the reader with mutilated copies of the passage, and even then the bowdlerized passage needs an elaborate explanation. One lies (in more senses than one) before me as I write, headed, "A Vision Misconstrued."

I might fill many more pages with "Mrs. White's Mistakes," but I refrain. If the above do not convince, would a hundred more examples do so? I trow not.

3. Powers, signs, wonders, attesting these messages:

(a) Powers—"In the room where the [third] vision was given, there was lying on the bureau a very large family Bible. It was one of an edition printed in Boston by Joseph Teale, in the year 1822. The book is eighteen by eleven inches, four inches in thickness, and

weighs a little over eighteen pounds. While in vision she arose and took this heavy Bible on her left arm, the book lying open, and held it out at right angles with her body; and then for over half-an-hour, with her right hand, turned from place to place, and pointed to different texts of Scripture, which she repeated while her eyes were looking upward, and in an opposite direction from the book. Her sister Sarah, or at times some other person present, looked at every text to which her finger pointed, and saw clearly that in every instance she was repeating the Scripture upon which her finger was resting. Mother Harmon said her daughter Ellen in her natural condition 'was unable for lack of strength to lift that heavy Bible from the bureau; but in the vision she held it as easily, apparently, as though it were only a pocket Testament'."

(b) Signs—"One Sabbath Mrs. White was given a vision in which she was shown, among other things, that at some place on our contemplated journey Satan was going to make a powerful attack on her . . . While journeying by train from Brookfield to Mansville, Mrs. White's face became inflamed just under the eyes. This was so painful that by the time we reached Mansville she was obliged to take to bed. The inflammation increased for two days, depriving her of sleep, as well as preventing her taking any part in the meetings. Her head was swollen so that both eyes were closed, and her face was so disfigured that it no longer looked like that of a human being. Amid all this racking pain and extreme nervousness, caused by loss of sleep, the enemy was striving hard to cause her to murmur against God . . . In about ten minutes after we began to pray, the power of the Lord came down and filled the room. Mrs. White was instantly relieved from all pain, and at once called for food. This was about five o'clock in the afternoon. By seven o'clock the swelling had all disappeared upon her face, and she attended the meeting that evening, to all appearance as well as ever."

(c) Wonders—"A physician was present . . . A lighted candle was held close to her eyes, which were wide open; not a muscle of the eye moved. He then examined her in regard to her pulse, and also in regard to her breathing, and there was no respiration. A looking-glass was brought, and one of them held it over her mouth while she talked; but very soon they gave this up, and said, 'She doesn't breathe.' Then they closely examined her sides, as she spoke, to find some evidence of deep breathing, but they did not find it. As they closed this part of the examination, she arose to her feet, still in vision, holding a Bible high up, etc., etc. The upper portion of her body was raised from the bed, so that there was a space of some eight or nine inches between her shoulders and the pillow . . . and in that position she remained during the continuance of the vision, which was thirty minutes. No one could naturally assume that position, unsupported by hands and arms, much less hold himself there for that length of time. Here again was proof that some power over which she had no control was connected with the vision. There was present a Dr. Brown, a hale strong man physically, a spirit medium . . . Those at the door who knew of his boasting said, 'Go back, and do as you said you would; bring that woman out of the vision.' In great agitation he grasped the knob of the door, but was not permitted to open it until inquiry was made by those near the door. 'Doctor, what is it?' He replied, 'God only knows; let me out of this house!'"

Such are examples of the "powers, signs, and wonders" by which Mrs. White sought to justify her assertion that her visions were of God. To many these are truly "powers, signs, wonders," and it suffices to grant that it is so, but what do they go to prove?—falsehoods and lies, as we have already seen. Why, the vision that led to the conversion of Elder Bates (pp. 48, 49) from scepticism to belief in Sister White's revelations was false. The Elder in his ecstasy at the astronomical marvels she spread before him, prayed, "Oh, that Lord John Rosse was here!" I wonder Sister White did not correct the poor man, for the Irish astronomer famous in those days, because of his wonderful telescope, was not Lord John Rosse, for there was no such person, but William Parsons, third Earl of Rosse.

These poor fanatics appeal to the Law of Moses. They say it is permanent. That this solid earth and yonder gorgeous firmament may pass away until not a shred be found, but this Law remaineth. What, then, saith the Law? "The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my Name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that PROPHET SHALL DIE!"

CHAPTER XIII.

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4. 1).

THE eschatology or the doctrine of the last things of the Seventh-Day Adventists need not occupy us long. After Satan has borne their sins away the good go to heaven, whilst the bad are burned up with Satan and all his angels: that is to say, annihilated. As I have dealt with annihilationism* elsewhere, I shall not dwell upon it here. It is as unscriptural a doctrine as it is unscientific, and therefore irrational. As their principal work on eschatology is that written by their prophetess, I extract a few passages from Mrs. White's great book to show what these poor people are called upon to believe as gospel truth.

First, I would remind you what I have stated in the first chapter, that Mrs. White is placed upon a superhuman platform by the elders of that people. They declare that she is able "to read the future with more than human fore-

* "After Death," pp. 53-55. Messrs. Pickering & Inglis, Glasgow.

sight"—a capability she must only have attained to within the lifetime of the youngest inhabitant on this globe, as up to the present we have seen that her readings of the future have been mostly mistaken. However, I have been lately astonished by the number of people who give themselves to reading the future, and, in spite of their failure hitherto, by the number of people who go on believing in their power to do so. Unless this were not a common trait of the human mind, where would be our "Zadkiels" and "Old Moores" *et hoc genus omne?* As a humble student of human nature for a considerable period of time now, I here register my firm belief that were the forecasts of these prophets less erroneous, belief in them would diminish in due proportion as their error diminished. The truth of the matter being that the fallen human heart so dreads the future that false prophecies are a comfort, seeing they prove it unknown, and "*omne ignotum pro magnifico*"—*everything unknown is (assumed to be) something magnificent!*

Second, under the heading "God's law [meaning thereby the Law of Moses] is immutable," Mrs. White tells us that the dragon of Revelation 13 is Satan; the first beast is the Papacy; the second beast, with "two horns like a lamb," is the United States of America; the "image of the beast" is made by the "second beast" when "the leading churches of the United States of America, uniting upon such points of doctrine as are held by them in common, shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions, THEN Protestant America will have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy"; and the observance of the Lord's Day, or Sunday, is "the mark of the beast."

Third, having these facts before them, readers are able to appreciate at their true value of the following statements of Mrs. White:

(a) "When the third angel's message closes, mercy no longer pleads for the guilty inhabitants of the earth. The people of God have accomplished their work. They have received 'the latter rain,' 'the refreshing from the presence of the Lord,' and they are prepared for the trying hour before them. Angels are hastening to and fro in heaven. An angel returning from the earth announces that his work is done; the final test has been brought upon the world, and all who have proved themselves loyal to the divine precepts have received the 'seal of the Living God.' [A note in the Appendix tells us that this is the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath.] Then Jesus ceases His intercession in the sanctuary above. He lifts His hands, and with a loud voice says, 'It is done. . . .'"

And so on to a wearisome extent, reminding us of the descriptions by Emanuel Swedenborg of his journey through heaven and what he saw there. It is simply what she wrote about sixty years ago which had to be suppressed, for what would be the use of a Seventh-Day Adventist propaganda if the door of mercy is closed? Still there is a dubious flavour of uncertainty about it. When does "Jesus lift His hands"? Nobody can tell but she who has the entrée of the sanctuary where once the very lid of the ark was lifted that she might look in and see the fourth commandment with a halo round it. That being so, the chances of our salvation depend on Mrs. White, for after her imaginary deity has said with "a loud voice . . . 'It is done,'" there is hope for none. Then it would be wrong for a Seventh-Day Adventist propagandist to sell me a book or invite me to join and contribute a tenth of my income to the cause. It would be wrong because it would be too late. Think not that I am irreverent. Nothing is farther from my mind. As there were many people named "Jesus"—Barabbas had that name, if ancient versions are to be believed—so Mrs. White has added another to the number, only it is one of her own imagination. It is not the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, God the Son, Blessed for evermore. That it is so is plain from what she says over and over again. Fifty thousand and seventy men were slain at Bethshemesh for looking into the ark on its way home from the land of the Philistines. It was not even amidst the secret glories of the sanctuary. But when found not in an earthly but in a heavenly sanctuary, this product of Mrs. White's diseased brain (and labelled by her with the Name so sacred to every true believer) lifts the lid that SHE, a Gentile, and not only a Gentile but a woman, may look in! After what would have been an utterly impious act under the Law (which she declares immutable), am I not justified in proclaiming her use of the sacred Name of Jesus unwarrantable, and the supposititious bearer thereof no more to be honoured than the boulder marked with ruddy smears one would not worship because a Santhal calls it "God!"?

Bear this in mind, reader, as we proceed together. It is not I who am irreverent, but Mrs. White, the false prophetess of a modern Baal.

(b) "Though God's people will be surrounded by enemies who are bent upon their destruction, yet the anguish which they will suffer is

not a dread of persecution for the truth's sake; they fear that every sin has not been repented of, and that through some fault in themselves they shall fail to realise the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise, 'I will keep thee from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world.' If they could have assurance of pardon, they would not shrink from torture or death; but should they prove unworthy, and lose their lives because of their own defects of character, then God's holy Name would be reproached."

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

And what is the Gospel that Paul preached, and which he here calls the Gospel of Christ? Hear him: "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ . . . There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus."

Men, women and children died the most awful deaths in the arenas of the Roman Empire with faces shining like angel faces, and singing praises to Christ as God; similarly others have died at the stake by fire and by water, by axe and by halter, by tortures too awful to hint at, and by bullet on some lonely moor; but they did it triumphantly, seeing heaven opened, and as the poet so beautifully says:

"He heeded not reviling tones,
Nor sold his heart to idle moans,
Though cursed and scorned, and bruised with stones;
He prayed, and from a happy place
God's glory smote him on the face."

But could they have done this had they been believers in the Seventh-Day Adventist Gospel? I trow not; for so Mrs. White (who knows such better than we do) tells us. Therefore we add: "The S-D.A. Gospel, which is not a gospel," for good news always makes us happy amidst the most dreadful circumstances. Mark what Paul says about "an angel from heaven"—Mrs. White was always seeing angels from heaven! The true Gospel points me to the Lord Jesus Christ, and I have the peace of assurance, for I trust wholly in Him for salvation. The S-D.A. Gospel, according to "Sister White," points me to self, and I have neither peace nor assurance, for I doubt myself entirely. The saints of old went to their deaths as to a bridal or coronation, for they died for Christ, their dear Lord and all-precious Redeemer. The S-D.A.'s might not shrink from death, but they would go dismally, for they would probably be losing their lives

through their own folly. "Lose their lives because of their own defects of character." And what comfort is there in that?

Reader, which gospel will you have? The Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of Peace and no condemnation, is the true answer to that question!

Listen to what they say about Christians who do not accept Seventh-Day Adventist teaching:

"They will, in their despair, confess their sins in words of burning anguish, while the wicked exult over their distress. These confessions are of the same character as that of Esau and Judas."

Words fail me in characterising such an abominable statement. Talk about keeping the Law! Here they pluck out and cast into the dark abyss of utter malignity one of the two nails upon which, says the Lord Jesus, hang all the Law and the prophets.

Women seem to have a sneaking fondness for the devil, just as often a wicked man will fascinate them more than a good one. So Marie Corelli writes of "The Sorrows of Satan," and Mrs. E. G. White strikes her prophetic soul and gives vent to the following:

"As the crowning act in the great drama of deception, Satan himself will personate Christ. The Church has long professed to look to the Saviour's advent as the consummation of her hopes. Now the great deceiver will make it appear that Christ has come. In different parts of the earth, Satan will manifest himself among men as a majestic being of dazzling brightness, resembling the description of the Son of God given by John in Revelation. The glory that surrounds him is unsurpassed by anything that mortal eyes have yet beheld. The shout of triumph rings out upon the air, 'Christ has come! Christ has come!' The people prostrate themselves in adoration before him, while he lifts up his hands and pronounces a blessing upon them, as Christ blessed His disciples when He was upon the earth. His voice is soft and subdued, yet full of melody. In gentle, compassionate tones he presents some of the same gracious, heavenly truths which the Saviour uttered; he heals the diseases of the people, and then, in his assumed character of Christ, he claims to have changed the Sabbath to Sunday."

As we are here dealing with fiction, I may be pardoned if I refer to a great writer of fiction. One of his many characters that have become classic is Dick. Now, Dick's great desire is to present a petition about something or other; and as he is not quite sound in his mind he is allowed to cover reams of foolscap with copies of this petition, as doing so employs his time and makes him happy. Unfortunately everyone of them is spoiled, because poor Dick cannot keep out a reference to King Charles's head.

Under this character so playfully drawn lies a profound psychological truth, an illustration of which we have in the world of facts (which are stranger than fiction) in Mrs. E. G. White. Her prophecies equal Dick's petitions in their fictitiousness, and she (like him) spoils them all by being unable to keep out any reference to her *idie fixe*—Sunday.

In the passage quoted we have a picture of Satan. Like the generality of wicked men in women's novels he is possessed of every trait that goes to make a man handsome—irresistible and fascinating. He is "majestic," he is the handsomest being that "mortal eyes have yet beheld," his voice is perfection and "full of melody," and he speaks in "gentle, compassionate tones," so that the listener believes that what he tells her is "gospel truth." A perfectly feminine account of the great enemy of mankind. The only blot in his character is that "he claims to have changed the Sabbath for Sunday," but even here there is hope found for him by the feminine mind, for mark he only claims—he cannot say that he has changed the Sabbath. If he did, "Sister White" knows better, for she has already told us that it was the Pope of Rome and not the devil that did that. Unless she has received a special revelation that he and the Pope of Rome were for the occasion only one and the same person, and I have overlooked her record of this marvellous piece of news, we must understand it so and leave it there!

No; I am not trying to be humorous. I am trying to take Mrs. White seriously, and yet not permit the horrible blasphemy of the whole thing to overwhelm me with despair. That anyone, even professing to honour the Lord Jesus Christ, should write page after page of such descriptions, applying what belongs to Him to His great enemy and ours, and call it revelations from the Lord, is appalling. That men and women who ought to know better, with an open Bible before them, should be drawn aside by a system built on such blasphemies is no less appalling.

That there may be no excuse for such, that they may not be able to say, "We did not know that such teachings were at the basis of the whole system!" I refer readers to Chapter I., and when they have studied again what is written there of the place given to Mrs. White, then let them read the following extracts from her writings:

(a) "Again a voice musical and triumphant is heard saying 'They come! they come! holy, harmless, and undefiled. They have kept the word of my patience; they shall walk among the angels;' and the pale, quivering lips of those who have held fast their faith utter a shout of victory."

(b) Then comes the most wonderful description of what follows, an epitome of which I present—earthquakes, darkness, streams ceasing to flow, "clouds come up and clash against each other" spots of indescribable glory in the heavens, the firmament opens and shuts, mountains shake like reeds, rugged rocks are scattered about, the surface of the earth heaves and swells like the surface of the sea, mountain chains disappear, inhabited islands are swallowed up, talent-weighting hailstones fall, graves open, &c., &c. "Soon there appears in the east a small black cloud about the size of half a man's hand. It is the cloud that surrounds the Saviour. . . . All come forth from their graves the same in stature as when they entered the tomb. Adam, who stands among the risen throng, is of lofty height and majestic form, in stature but little below the Son of God. . . . Transported with joy, he beholds the trees that were once his delight,—the very trees whose fruit he himself had gathered in the days of his innocence and joy" . . . and so on with the vines, the flowers, the pumpkins, and the melons.

(c) "In like manner when the work of atonement in the heavenly sanctuary has been completed, then in the presence of God and heavenly angels, and the host of the redeemed, the sins of God's people will be PLACED UPON SATAN; HE WILL BE DECLARED GUILTY OF ALL the evil which he has caused them to commit. And as the scape-goat was sent away into a land not inhabited, so Satan will be banished to the desolate earth, an uninhabited and dreary wilderness. The revelator [? Mrs. White] foretells the banishment of Satan and the condition of chaos and desolation in which the earth is to be reduced and he [? she] declares that this condition will exist for a thousand years."

(d) In the final chapter of Mrs. White's book we see how the Lord returns to the earth; how Satan and his followers [who have been on the desolate earth for a thousand years as told above] are then annihilated: and there is a full description of the glories of the new heavens and the new earth. Here we have a woodcut kindly thrown in to help or stimulate our poor, toiling imaginations faint through following Mrs. White's terrific flights of fancy. In its foreground is a young lady somewhat insufficiently attired sitting on a hillock sunk in meditation. A little lamb tries, but apparently in vain, to attract her attention. Beside the lamb crouches some horrid kind of spotted beast of prey, perhaps a leopard, it is not clear; whilst in front of the group is the figure of a recumbent lion with one eye on the lamb and another on the spectator or on the cow in the background with some other unmentionable animals; at any rate I cannot mention their names, for I do not recognise a likeness to any beasts I know, unless it be to some that came out of my children's "Noah's Ark." A stream runs through the picture and a 'forest primeval' runs down to the stream, whilst between the two a black bear seems to be promenading. That this is intended to be a picture of the new earth is apparent from the accompanying text where such passages are quoted as "the wolf

also shall dwell with the lamb," only it is not a wolf. Of course if I believed that Mrs. White has the entrée of the saucyuary and can look into the ark I might believe that her picture is correct although it contradicts the Scriptures both as to time and place, as to actors and spectators.

And this is the woman who is said "to read the future with more than human foresight!"

In conclusion, let me command you to the Word of God, which is able to keep you from falling into the foolish mistakes and gross errors of these false teachers who have been proved false by their own prophecies. It will be your own fault should you be enticed from the way of the Lord in the matter of this special heresy founded by William Miller and carried on under the name of the "Seventh-Day Adventists" with such a false prophetess as Mrs. White at their head.

The Lord has granted you a sign in His grace, a sign according to His own Word,—"And if thou say in thy heart, 'How shall we know the word which the Lord hath NOT spoken?' When a prophet speaketh in the Name of the Lord, IF THE THING FOLLOW NOT, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him" (Deut. 18, 21, 22).

The sect of Seventh-Day Adventists was founded on the prophecy that the Lord should come in 1843 or 1844. The Lord came not. Therefore the prophecy was false. Founded on falsehood, the sect is sustained by falsehood. And the Lord has judged it.

Be not thou then afraid of it, or of the curses it pronounces upon those who will have none of its prophets or prophetesses, its signs or marks, its sabbaths or ordinances, its frenzied appeals to the Word of the Lord even as did the false prophets of old, its salvation by works, and its blasphemous substitution of the devil for the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and Sacrifice for sinners.

