

# SUNDAY vs. SATURDAY

## GRACE VS. SINAI-LAW

(This booklet contains part of the author's book, "Sunday Observance or Sinai Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keeping." See last page.)—C. E. Putnam.

There appeared in a newspaper in Florida, last winter, the following challenge (also other like offers): "A good automobile and \$100.00 will be given at ..... for one text in all the Bible commanding the religious observance of Sunday."

At the request of several pastors, we held some union meetings in that city, noting the Scriptural authority for Sunday observing, and dealing with "Legalism and the Seventh-Day Question."

### SOME OLD TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest; and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: **on the morrow after the sabbath** the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer **that day** when ye wave the sheaf **an he lamb without blemish** of the first year for a **burnt-offering unto the Lord**" (Lev. 23: 9-12). Thus typifying the firstfruits of the resurrection (Christ's resurrection), which event occurred on **Sunday**. (See Matt. 28: 1-6 and 1 Cor. 15: 20, 23.)

Would not "the morrow after the [Sinai-law] sabbath" be **Sunday**, and was not this offering of "the sheaf" and other offerings including "an he lamb without blemish," a "religious observance"? And was not this **God's positive command**?

Again, "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering, seven sabbaths shall be complete: even unto **the morrow after the seventh sabbath** shall ye number fifty days; and

ye shall offer a new meat-offering unto the Lord. . . . . Then ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace-offering. . . . . And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be an holy convocation unto you: **YE SHALL DO NO SERVILE WORK THEREIN**; it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings throughout your generations" (Lev. 23: 15, 16, 19, 21).

Not merely one, but were not all these typical offerings which God commanded to be observed "on the morrow after the sabbath," "**RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK**"? And were not these Sundays by God's command made a sabbath of rest from "servile work"?

Does not this Levitical offering on "**Sunday**" the fiftieth day after the firstfruits resurrection-offering logically and Scripturally typify some event of Pentecost [Pentecost means fiftieth], which occurred also on "**Sunday**," the fiftieth day after Christ's resurrection? See Acts 2: 1-47.

#### **Are These Seven Intervening Sabbaths Feast-Sabbaths or Fourth-Commandment Sabbaths?**

The fallacy of Seventh-Day-Advent exegesis of Leviticus 23: 1-21 is very apparent to the thoughtful reader. See verse 15, then verse 16, which reads thus: "Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days." Now were all these seven intervening Sabbaths feast-sabbaths, or were they the fourth-commandment Sabbaths? To ask the question is to answer it. No Seventh-Dayist, who has the right use of his mind, would say they were feast-sabbaths. Nor can it be said, either logically or Scripturally, that **Sabbath**, as here used, means **week**. The language is so clear and definite that a mere child may know that these seven Sabbaths between these feasts were the fourth-com-

mandment Sabbaths and not weeks or feast-sabbaths. "The morrow after the **seventh sabbath**" could be only **SUNDAY**. And being the fiftieth day after the former feast proves conclusively that this first-fruits feast-sabbath (the fiftieth day before this morrow after the seventh fourth-commandment Sabbath) was also "**Sunday**," and it was the morrow after the first fourth-commandment Sabbath. And these two "first-day-of-the-week" feasts were to be observed each year (not every seven years) on these two feast-sabbath Sundays after the first and seventh fourth-commandment Sabbaths.

It is very evident, in the light of verses 5, 6 that the Passover Sabbath would be irregular unless the Jewish year contained an exact multiple of 7 in days. If it did not, the Passover Sabbath day would be changed, as to the seventh day counting, every year. Verses 5, 6, make this mathematically certain. But not so with the "sheaf-of-the-firstfruits" feast or "wave-offering," nor with the feast "fifty days" later, the "new meat-offering." For these feasts were to be kept (each year) on **SUNDAY**, "**on the morrow**" following the first fourth-commandment Sabbath after "ye shall reap the harvest thereof," and again "**on the morrow**" after the seventh fourth-commandment Sabbath "fifty days" later.

The Passover feast and these two later feasts were not connected as to time, for the firstfruits-feast date was not computed from the Passover, but from the **harvest week**, from the time of reaping the harvest—"When ye . . . . . shall reap the harvest thereof" (Lev. 23: 10).

Again, Exodus 23: 14-19; 34: 18, 22, 23 and Deuteronomy 16: 1, 9, 13, 16 reveal with certainty also (if carefully read and received), that the seasons or dating periods of these three yearly feasts were quite distinct and entirely separate. (See C. H. Mackintosh's notes on Lev. 23rd chapter.) The

Passover feast, with which the feast of unleavened bread only was linked, was to commence on the fourteenth day of "Abib," or "the first month." The second of these three yearly feasts, the feast of weeks covering the firstfruits and meat-offering, had its dating, not from the Passover, but from the **beginning harvest**, as is **specifically stated** in two of the above references. (See again Lev. 23: 10 and Deut. 16: 9.)

Mark that "the Lord spake unto Moses" (Lev. 23: 1-8), giving commands regarding the "Passover" and "the feast of unleavened bread"; then again, separately [A new subject is introduced by these words], "**the Lord spake unto Moses**" (vv. 9-22), this time commanding concerning this feast of weeks in the **beginning harvest**; then again, later (introducing once more another subject, the third great yearly feast), "**the Lord spake unto Moses**" (vv. 33-44), commanding the feast of tabernacles, which had its **dating** after the later harvests, in "the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land." Now is it not clear, indeed, that each of these three feasts had its **own, separate, basic date**, and that there is no connection whatever [But rather a clear separation is stated], as to datings, between the Passover Sabbath and the firstfruits feast Sabbath of Leviticus 23: 11? The "no resurrection" Sadducees, Pharisees or others, may have made changes later, but the law here given by Moses is very **definite** as to these **feast dates**.

These two entirely different feasts, with the feast of tabernacles, constituted the three, separate, distinct, yearly feasts, held at three separate, distinct times in the year, of which God says. "Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord GOD, the God of Israel" (Ex. 34: 23), "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose;

in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles" (Deut. 16: 16). (Read again carefully Deut 16: 1, 9, 13, 16 and Lev. 23: 4, 5, 9-21, 33-44.) Observe that "the feast of weeks," as the name indicates, covered both the firstfruits-sheaf-offering and "a new meat-offering," as shown by Leviticus 23: 9-22 and the antitype fulfillment.

If this "feast of weeks," this "firstfruits" and "new meat-offering," dated from and commenced with "the feast of unleavened bread" and Passover feast, as is claimed by some, how could there be three separated feast times in the year? How could God say, "Thrice in the year," "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear"? Is not such evidence conclusive?

Note, too, that these two feasts were not to be kept till, "**When ye be come into the land which I give unto you.**" Not until they got into Canaan, which is a type of the spiritual life and rest we have in Christ under the New Covenant of grace, were these feasts to be kept. For they Scripturally and logically typify the "firstfruits" of the resurrection, that is, Christ's resurrection and our hope of same (1 Cor. 15: 20, 23; Rom. 8: 22-25), and the beginning of the Christian Church.

And this resurrection, doctrinal truth, is the hope of the true spiritual Church, the body of Christ, which the Lord began to build at Pentecost just fifty days after His resurrection. (See Matt. 16: 18 and Acts 2: 47.) (Mark that it is Christ Himself, not Peter, who "will build my church," and again at Pentecost, it was Christ the Lord, not Peter, who "added to the church.")

Do not these facts show the true meaning and spiritual significance of these two typical feasts, as well as the EXACT WEEK-DAY DATE of their observance and complete fulfillment? Certainly these two events (Christ's resurrection and the beginning

of the Christian Church) are the antitypes of these two typical **Sunday-Sabbath** feasts.

### Why and How Christians Should Observe Sunday

So, then, according to Old Testament Levitical law and typical teaching, will not the real membership of the Christian Church, the truly "saved," "redeemed," living-in-"Canaan," "born-again" ones, "THE CHILDREN OF THE RESURRECTION," observe "Sunday," "the first day of the week," "the Lord's day," the day "He arose from the dead," THE DAY OF VICTORY OVER DEATH, our only hope (1 Cor. 15: 13-23)? Observing it in adoration, joy, service and in commemoration of both the resurrection and the Lord's supper, and in true spiritual worship. Not now according to the restricted typical law requirements (See John 4: 20-24), nor in secular labors, nor in worldly pleasures; but by worshipping God "in spirit and in truth," as Jesus here states, and also according to New Testament Apostolic custom, as the following clear evidences reveal:

#### SOME NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. **Upon the first day of the week** let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come" (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2).

Now was not this command of Paul's to **all the churches of Galatia and the church at Corinth concerning which day of the week** they were to thus make their religious offering "for the saints" truly and logically a command for the "religious observance of **Sunday, the first day of the week**"? See John 20: 19, 26, and Acts 20: 7 for the weekly custom of the Apostles and disciples as to their worship, rest from labor, and use of Sunday. Should we not in our seventh-day rest from "servile work" and in our special united worship follow the weekly order

of these early saints, and regard also the antitype of Levitical law? Notice the custom, that it was on "**Sunday**," not on "**Saturday**," "When the disciples came together to break bread," that is, to keep "the Lord's supper" (1 Cor. 11: 17-34). Are more references needed? Study sincerely also Revelation 1: 10-18.

These portions of the Word are made positive and clear, not by the author's exegesis, but by their own definite statements and other harmonious, corroborative and explanatory scriptures cited, and they are certainly convincing to all the conceivable. Only by doing violence to the English language can such evidence be perverted and set aside. May each and every person be honest at least with God, with His Book, and with himself, and thus regard his eternal destiny. **Do not be deceived, nor deceive yourself.** Who, except God Himself, can change, abolish, or set aside any of His harmonious Word?

Observe, too, that no text thus far has ever been found, for there is none, commanding the Christian Church "to keep" the Seventh-Day Sinai Sabbath. Such is only man's perversion of the Word and added requirement. (Note God's warnings to all such in Prov. 30: 6 and Rev. 22: 18.) Hence, of Advent Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keeping, it cannot be Scripturally said to be for the Lord's Gentile Church. See Acts 15: 24-29; 21: 25, which show that God's instructions for His Gentile Church **do not include** Sinai "Sabbath-Keeping." Are not these Scriptural facts convincing?

If God really desired the Christian Church to observe "**Sinai-law Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keeping**" is it not very, very strange indeed that He did not once so state it, nor even indicate it in any New Covenant scripture? Especially so does it seem when God said so often to Israel (under the Old Covenant

law) "Ye shall keep the Sabbath . . . . . it is holy unto you." But to Christians such things are not to be made a ground of judgment (Rom. 14: 4-6; Col. 2: 16-3: 3), and the Scriptures say many times, that, in accepting the New Covenant and Christ its Minister, "ye are not under the law." Is the Christian Church "Israel," and under Israel's law? Is the Bible thus contradictory? Certainly it is not.

### Which Day is the Christian's Weekly Worship and Rest Day, or Sabbath?

Will it please the Father, if His Gentile church, without command or clearly revealed Bible authority, tries to keep (in a present-day modified and man-changed way) the day of which God says, "It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel" (Ex. 31: 17)? (Note that this Sabbath day "sign" was for "Israel" and not the Christian Church.) Or should we, His Gentile Church, obey God's inspired instructions to saved Gentiles (Acts 15: 24-29; 21: 25) who knew not this law (Rom. 2: 12, 14)?

These instructions and commands were given by God through the church at Jerusalem, because of just such false teachers as these, who believed in Christ, but tried to mix "law and grace." Study carefully once more Acts 15: 5-29; 21: 17-25. Observe again that in all these instructions no Sinai-law "Sabbath-Keeping" was required.

Should we not today faithfully regard, as did the Apostles and disciples, "The first day of the week," "Christ's resurrection" and "firstfruits-feast-Sabbath"? "Not foraking the assembling of ourselves together." And, refraining from worldly amusements and labors, should we not observe and use this typical and fulfilled anti-typical day in true spiritual worship, and in caring for the saints and others (even "as God hath prospered him"), as the first disciples and Apostles both did and commanded (John 20: 19, 26; Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; Heb.

10: 25)? But we are not "to keep it," as was demanded of Israel in keeping Saturday under the law. See Exodus 35: 1-3 and Numbers 15: 32-36. Do Seventh-Dayists thus keep it today? Why do Seventh-Day Adventists falsely charge that "Rome changed the day," when they, without Biblical authority, have changed so radically even the way to keep it? How inconsistent.

Constantine did not change the Sabbath day. But with his acceptance of Christianity, about A. D. 316, he did make a Christian day proclamation. Not changing the Jew's Saturday Sabbath, but he decreed that in his empire, "The Roman Empire," the week day which the Christians observed, "the first day of the week," Sunday, should be the national worship and rest day, or Sabbath. (Sabbath means "to rest," "cessation.") Constantine did not change the Christian Sabbath, but he accepted it for himself and his nation.

After creation, after six days or periods of creative work, God rested and blessed the seventh day or period of time. It was His Sabbath, "cessation." For 2513 years of human life and history absolutely no mention is made of it in the Scriptures. At Sinai, "by the hand of Moses," God revealed or "madest known thy holy sabbath," "and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments" (Neh. 9: 13, 14). God then chose the exact rest day for "Israel," not computing it from the creation, but from the beginning of His giving the manna. And God made this Sabbath "a sign between me and the Children of Israel." These verses in Nehemiah corroborate other Scripture, and perfectly harmonize with the fact that no mention of such a "sign" or Sabbath with its restrictions had before been given. Paul makes it clear also as to the Sinai law and its date of origin, or when it was given (Gal. 3: 17).

May we further warn would-be Christian Sinai legalists, and say to those professing Christians who take Jewish grounds, "ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" It says, "The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates" (Ex. 20: 10; Deut. 5: 14). Note that this law says "thou shalt not do **ANY** work." Where does this leave room for introducing "works of necessity" so called? There certainly is none. We may think it necessary (outside of Palestine) to kindle a fire, but (when and for whom this law was given) God's penalty for doing so, or breaking this Sabbath law, was death (Ex. 35: 2, 3; Num. 15: 32-36).

Where is the Scripture showing that this Sinai-law-Seventh-Day Sabbath, this "sign-day-to-Israel," has been changed, or in which the strict observance of the day is in the smallest degree relaxed? There is none. There is not a shadow of divine authority for altering the mode of observing this day. But who or what professing Christian thus "keeps it"? And, if we (real Christians) are now under this Sinai Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keeping law, we are bound "to keep it" exactly according to this law or else be cursed—"Cursed be he that confirmeth not **all** the words of this law to do them" (Deut. 27: 26). Again, "For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in **all** things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. 3: 10). Note James 2: 10.

Jesus made it certain that these restrictions were not and could not be eliminated by man from the Sinai law. He said, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5: 18). But did not Jesus (for His own, the

Christian) completely fulfill this law, yea, all the law, giving real abiding rest (which the Sinai Sabbath typifies, Heb. 4: 1-11) to us who truly receive, and abide in Him? Matthew 5: 17; 27: 35 and Romans 10: 4 answer this question definitely and convincingly. Do hear the Word!

Now this Sinai Seventh-Day with its Sabbath-Keeping, this "sign"-day between God and "**Israel**," characterized the dispensation of the Jew, "the dispensation of law." But which day of the week characterizes the Christian dispensation, "the dispensation of grace"? Is it "Israel's" Sinai law seventh day, Saturday, or is it "the first day of the week," Sunday, "**the Lord's day**"? This resurrection day (our hope) is pre-eminently the Christian-Church's day (Matt. 28: 1-6; Mark 16: 1-6; Luke 24: 1-7; John 20: 1-9, 19, 26, 29; Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; Rev. 1 10).

So will not the truly born-again Christian, the "new creature" by grace ("Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new," 2 Cor. 5: 17), duly observe this "new" rest-in-Him day, the resurrection day, "the Lord's day," as the Apostles both did and commanded? And will he not observe it in all the sacred reverence and sanctity which his resurrected and **new nature** will naturally clamor for? Will not such a Christian by this very "new nature" and the constraining power of "**the love of Christ**" (2 Cor. 5: 14), refrain from all secular labor and worldly, fleshly amusements? Will not all Christ-honoring, Apostolic Christians thus observe and utilize this "**first day of the week**"?

But both Sinai-Sabbath **legalists** and over zealous Sunday **liberalists** may ask:

Is the Christian Church commanded to observe Sunday? Should we regard one day above another? Romans 14: 1-9, 14, 23 and Colossians 2: 4-16, 17

answer fully regarding the Sinai law commands, as to their authority over the Christian's food, "the sabbath," and the other "holydays." Notice (Col. 2: 16) that the word "days" after "sabbath" is in italics, hence it is not in the original. Observe also that "holydays" are separately enumerated, and these "holydays" included all the feast-sabbaths. So, are we not forced to recognize that **"the sabbath" here mentioned** is the fourth-commandment Sabbath? This is convincingly confirmed also by verse 17 and Hebrews 4: 1-11. As to the first question, we find no Scripture commanding the Christian "to keep" any week day. Christians do not live under a present-time-penalty-constraining code of laws, which are for the natural man only (See 1 Tim. 1: 5-11), but we are constrained and guided by "the law of Christ" ("love") and the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 5: 14, 15, 17; Gal. 6: 2; Rom. 13: 8-10; John 16: 13, 14).

However, we may know from both the written and unwritten laws of the Creator and from science also that a cessation (sabbath) or rest day on the basis of 1 out of 7 is for our good. We should worship, live for and with Him every day. But as to the day for a weekly public-worship-rest-day, a cessation from labors and all worldliness for more helpful worship, the holy inspired Apostles and writers have clearly and convincingly taught us both by example and command (John 20: 19, 26; Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16, 1, 2; Heb. 10: 23-25; Rev. 1: 8-11) just how we should use Sunday, "the first day of the week." True we have liberty, but we **must remember** the restriction—"ONLY USE NOT LIBERTY FOR AN OCCASION TO THE FLESH, but by love serve one another" (Gal. 5: 13).

### Purpose and Significance of the Sinai-Sabbath

Mark 2: 27, 28 states definitely that Jesus **"is Lord also of the Sabbath,"** and that **"the sabbath was made for man."** But Seventh-Day Adventists reverse

this, for as they construe it **"man was made for the Sabbath."** And then they hold this Sinai-Sabbath-day covenant-sign, which covenant-sign God made with **"the children of Israel"** (and Israel only as we shall soon discover), above Jesus' resurrection day. Thus they dishonor Jesus, and (like Esau) "despise" God's power over death (our hope, see 2 Cor. 4: 14; 1 Cor. 6: 14; 15: 17-23) by esteeming Israel's "sign"-day superior to Christ's glorious resurrection-power-day.

This Sinai-Seventh-Day Sabbath was a "sign" between **God and Israel solely**, and for a specific purpose, for God says so (Ex. 31: 12-17; Ezek. 20: 12, 20). Study this truth carefully. Do search the Word, for in all the Scriptures only of **"the house of Israel"** is its keeping commanded (v. 16), and only to **"Israel"** is it made a perpetual covenant" (v. 17).

But under the New Covenant of grace Pauline Christians are so married and united to Christ that Christ lives in them (Gal. 2: 19, 20). They then know without a Sinai Sabbath-Keeping "sign" that Jehovah is the "Lord your God." Paul says, "For I know in whom I have believed" (2 Tim. 1: 12). And in Christ "he is a new creature (2 Cor. 5: 17). Then this once necessary Sinai Sabbath-Keeping "sign" for Israel, including the whole law, which law is no longer for the man made righteous through Christ (1 Tim. 1: 8, 11), "is dead" and "ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ" (Rom. 7: 4, 6).

Again, in Galations 2: 19, Paul said of himself (yet for us also), "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." That is, "through the law" I am made to know my sin and natural death state (Rom. 7: 9, 11), for sin **"by the Commandment . . . . . slew me."** Following this knowledge "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," after which we will say with Paul,

"I through the law am dead to the law" with its Seventh-Day "kindle no fire" restrictions. And furthermore by another law in Christ (Rom. 8: 2) we are delivered or made free from its "ministration of condemnation" and its "ministration of death" (2 Cor. 3: 7, 9). **STAND FAST THEREFORE IN THE LIBERTY WHEREWITH CHRIST HATH MADE US FREE, AND BE NOT ENTANGLED AGAIN WITH THE YOKE OF BONDAGE**" (Gal. 5: 1).

Notice in Romans 8: 2 and Galatians 2: 20 that it is not the observance of the law given at Sinai, but another law, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus that makes us free from 'the law of sin and death.'" That is, make us free from the law that says, if you "sin" it is "death." Now sin is the transgression of the Sinai law (1 John 3: 4), hence it must be included in this "law of sin and death" of Romans 8: 2.

Again, as we are married to Christ we embrace the "New Covenant," the "Better Covenant," whose Minister is Jesus. And if then we still adhere to and perpetuate the Sinai law with its Seven-Day Sabbath-Keeping, that is, if we do not "become dead to the law" and "delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held," are we not guilty of spiritual adultery? Paul says that such religionists or professing Christian are like a woman that is married to, and lives with, a second man while her first husband (to which she "is bound by the law" "so long as he liveth") is yet living. Then, regardless of her guilt, she still continues to live with and is alive to both.

Romans 7: 1-7 is very clear, positive, and unmistakable language. Why not heed and obey it? Living simultaneously under both Sinai law with its Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keeping and under grace through union with Christ (if God would permit such) would Scripturally and logically be spiritual

unchastity, if language has any meaning. Can Sinai law, and New Covenant grace, and a real believer that is truly surrendered to Christ and the Word, dwell together in spiritual chastity? Paul answers, No! He again makes clear, certain and definite his teaching, and the course we are commanded to pursue, in Galatians 4: 21-31. Why will deceived Seventh-Day legalists not believe and receive what it says, and, as commanded, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son," which Paul says very definitely is the Sinai covenant (vv. 24, 25). Hebrews 8: 7-9, 13 and Deuteronomy 4: 13; 9: 9, 11, 15; 10: 4 make certain what the basis or foundation of that Sinai "old" or "first covenant" is, and Hebrews 9: 1-10 states its ordinances. That is, the ceremonial part of the law is the covenant's ordinances. Do listen to God rather than men, lest you be guilty of attempted spiritual adultery. Study carefully Galatians 4: 9-11 also, lest you should be lost.

Paul earnestly contended against "grace and law" mixtures. We are writing this, hoping thereby to help save dying men and women from Satan's snares which will affect their eternal destiny.

Again may we ask if Seventh-Day Adventists can reasonably and logically reconcile all the two covenant Scriptures, when teaching that the Old Covenant of Sinai law and the New Covenant of grace (of which Christ alone is the minister) can both harmoniously function over a Christian at the same time? If so, let them duly regard the English language, quit dodging, and honestly interpret and harmonize with their teaching Romans 7: 1-7, and Galatians 4: 21-31 also, in a sane, sensible, logical manner. If it cannot be done they are certainly deceived and in error. We challenge any one to produce such a reconciliation. God says, "Cast out the bond woman and her son," the Sinai Covenant.

The book of which this is about 16 pages is listed on last page.