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BOOK ONE

Sabbath Impossibilities

Introduction – The Scope Of The Problem

Chapter 1 – Dr. Bacchiocchi Opens Pandora’s Box

Chapter 2 - The Three Sabbatarian Crisis of the Christian Church

Chapter 3 - The Sabbath In The Early Church – Earlier Than Early

Chapter 4 – Where Sunday Observance Did And Didn’t Come From

Chapter 5 – Impossible Barriers To Sabbatarianism
Introduction To Lying For God

A chain of bomb-shell revelations regarding the deceptions of Adventism rocked the Seventh-day Adventist Church between 1974 and 1990, destroying any factual basis for the three pillar doctrines of Adventism. In 1974, while doing research in the General Conference vault, SDA researcher, Dr. Stephen F. Yost, stumbled across a stenographer's transcript of a series of top-secret meetings held at the 1919 Bible Conference. He made an unauthorized removal of the document, and it was published by the ultra-liberal independent SDA journal, *Spectrum*, in May of 1979. This astonishing, incriminating transcript revealed that the conference's high-level participants knew there were three things that were fatal to the Seventh-day Adventist belief model: (1) That Ellen White was a plagiarizing false prophet; (2) that the 1844 Investigative Judgment doctrine, which was supposedly based on Daniel's (supposed) 2,300 year prophecy of Daniel 8:14, had been literally fulfilled in 2,300 literal days over 100 years before the birth of Christ, and; (3) that Ellen White's theory that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath needed an unimaginable amount of twisting to make Early Church history appear to agree with what she said. This unprecedented revelation of Adventist perfidy in 1974 kicked off a new wave of inquiry which steadily developed a radically new and unflattering understanding of the realities of the history of the Advent Movement and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Thanks to this research, we now know that Adventist leaders knowingly lied, not only about the Three Pillars of Adventist doctrine, but about D.M. Canright, Harvey Kellogg, Desmond Ford, and other prominent persons whose lives had the misfortune of becoming entangled with Adventism.

The uncloaking of the Ellen White Lie as revealed by the discovery of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* may have influenced SDA theologian, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, to boldly challenge her prophetic claims in his iconoclastic 1977 book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*. He became the first Seventh-day Adventist theologian to challenge a claim she had credited directly to divine inspiration without losing Church employment. By 1990, an official release of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the *Veltman Report*, conceded that she had copied extensively without crediting her sources. Dr. Veltman named the books she copied and even questioned her honesty. Here is his response to the study's third formal question. Keep in mind that in her introduction to *The Great Controversy*, Ellen White credits direct, divine, inspiration from God as the source for her information. (For clarification, the main focus of his eight-year study was literary dependency in Ellen White’s classic book on the life of Christ, *The Desire of Ages*:)

3. How do you harmonize Ellen White’s use of sources with her statements to the contrary? Do you think the introductory statement to *The Great Controversy* constitutes an adequate admission of literary dependence?"

I must admit at the start that in my judgment this is the most serious problem to be faced in connection with Ellen White's literary dependency. It strikes at the heart of her honesty, her integrity, and therefore her trustworthiness.

As of now I do not have - nor, to my knowledge, does anyone else have - a satisfactory answer to this important question. The statement from *The Great Controversy* comes rather late in her writing career and is too limited in its reference to historians and reformers. Similar admissions do not appear as prefaces to all her writings in which sources are involved, and there is no indication that this particular statement applies to her writings in general.


In a loose comparison with the king in the Hans Christian Anderson story, “The King's New Clothes,” – the discovery of the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes* forced Seventh-day Adventist leaders to parade down Theology Street without a stitch of evidence for the three most important teachings of the Church. But not even the unmasking of their perfidy caused them to consider fundamental doctrinal reform. There was no apology to the faithful flock and no admission of guilt. They chose to act like nothing had happened. They counted on the primitive status of world communications of the day to keep the news of these embarrassing discoveries from penetrating the ranks of the faithful, and their gamble paid off— for a while. Their
fortunes would change, however, as the “advent” of the Internet gave those who possessed unflattering knowledge of the problems of Adventism the ability to communicate the truth about its many problems to the masses.

In the midst of the unprecedented turmoil that engulfed Adventism after 1974, SDA theologian and Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, chose to publish his iconoclastic defense of the Church’s Sabbath doctrine, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, in 1977. While his new book defended the Church’s Sabbath teachings, it also mocked the prophetic claims of Ellen White and taught the astonishing cognate doctrine that Christians must also observe a set of Jewish festivals and holy days.

Dr. Bacchiocchi received his doctorate in theology from the Gregorian Pontifical University at the Vatican— a very unlikely explanation of why he seemed oblivious to the fact that during the time when Adventists taught that Rome (the West) was in a gradual process of changing the Sabbath to Sunday, the center of Christian power and influence was unquestionably in the East (Think Greek Orthodox Church). Christian doctrine and practice emanated from there and spread throughout the rest of the world, including Rome. Apparently, Bacchiocchi’s Vatican professors did not explain to him that during the formative years of the Christian Faith, the Eastern Church not only had founded the Church at Rome, but had nourished it, controlled it, and had even deposed its bishops when they wandered too far from orthodox belief and practice. Since the Western Church gained the ascendency in later centuries and retained that supremacy to this day, it is easy, even for historians, to lose sight of the difficulties involved with the idea that such a sweeping change in universal church practice could possibly have originated in the West. Since the Greek Orthodox Church kept meticulous records from its earliest days, and since those records prove that the Eastern Church never kept the Sabbath, the fact of the overwhelming early supremacy of the Eastern Church spells the death knell for the idea that the Roman Catholic Church (the West) could possibly have changed the Sabbath.

Bacchiocchi’s timing could not have been worse. His extreme Judaization of the Sabbath doctrine got the attention of the rest of the Christian world, especially since Dr. Bacchiocchi mass-marketed *From Sabbath to Sunday* to the leaders and clergy of Sunday-observing denominations throughout the world. Thanks to the continuing work of biblical scholars during the first 60 years of the 20th Century, and the accompanying development of a new understanding of the tremendous diversity of the Early Church during the centuries when Christian doctrine and practice were being developed, Dr. Bacchiocchi opened himself up to a level of criticism that he would not have experienced had he written just 20 years earlier. Bacchiocchi’s militant challenge to Sunday observance spurred on an already existing Evangelical research project, spear-headed by Evangelical theologian, D.A. Carson, to definitively respond to the Sabbath-Sunday controversy.

The Carson Team settled this issue once and for all when it discovered that Moses used a set of Hebrew linguistic devices in his wording of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 to clarify that the Sabbath ordinance was not established at Creation but rather was first introduced to Israel with the giving of the manna during the Exodus. In regard to Exodus 20, this same research demonstrated that Moses used a variety of Hebrew literary meaning indicators to clarify that the 4th Commandment was a new ordinance that was merely *modeled* after Creation week. These meaning indicators involved usage patterns that are not translatable into any other language, but they are clearly understood by a native Hebrew reader. This discovery threw much light on why the Jews have always believed the Sabbath was given to Israel only. These Hebrew meaning indicators were by no means obscure to Hebrew linguists, and they should have been understood by advanced SDA Hebrew scholars. As you will soon see, some of the Seventh-day Adventist scholars who participated in the secret meetings at the 1919 Bible Conference had an excellent knowledge of biblical languages. Is it possible that no Seventh-day Adventist Hebrew scholar ever bothered to read Genesis and Exodus in Hebrew? Why have all the SDA Sabbath scholars since 1982 chosen not to mention this critically important problem in their books? These questions, and many others, cry out to be answered!

In view of the stark facts about the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, it is very difficult to make a case from Scripture that anyone but the Jews are required to keep the Sabbath— especially since Moses told Israel in Deuteronomy chapter 5 that the Sabbath had been given to them as a reminder that God had delivered them from slavery. Logic tells us that both criteria must be met for those who must keep the Sabbath. The people designated to keep the Sabbath must not only keep it to remember Creation week, but they also must be a people who were slaves in Egypt and
were brought out of Egypt by their God. The first criteria can be met by anyone group of people. The second criteria can only be met by Israel.

By the time of its publication in 1982, the Carson Team’s book, *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*, was so focused in approach that each chapter had been developed to cover a specific problem with Bacchiocchi’s methods and conclusions. Coming from the hands of a group of the world’s most respected Evangelical scholars, this work most certainly was well-known to the book’s primary target– Dr. Bacchiocchi himself– as well as to SDA leaders, and to the SDA Sabbath scholars who followed him. Therefore the top leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church have known since 1982 that the Church’s Sabbath doctrine stands in defiance of what the Bible teaches. It appears that the Church’s leaders have loved the institution and culture of Adventism more than the Truth of Scripture.

In *Lying For God*, you will get to examine for yourself how Moses used a variety of writing conventions in his own native language to prevent his Hebrew readers from concluding that the Sabbath was instituted before the giving of the manna during the Exodus. Additionally our readers now have the ability to study the Carson research for themselves by obtaining a copy of *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*.

Another Evangelical scholar discovered that the structure of the 10 Commandments was modeled after the treaties of Israel’s neighbors. In that age, treaties were written such that a ceremonial ordinance was placed in the middle of the actual laws, its purpose being to remind the people through their frequent performance of that ritual of the requirements that had been imposed on them. This discovery strongly suggests that God spoke to His people in the cultural context of something they could readily understand. Another such example of God’s sensitivity to the cultural environment in which His people lived is that God did not choose, at that time, to prohibit slavery– something that was an integral part of ancient society and culture– but instead regulated it in such a way that in Hebrew society slaves would be well treated by their masters by proffering them some rights within the law. Every week as Israel kept the Sabbath, they were reminded that it was Jehovah who rescued them from Egyptian slavery and that they should treat their own slaves with dignity and compassion.

Since no later than 1982, many Adventist pastors, university professors, Conference officials, and college theology majors have known many of these things, but they have been afraid to stand up for their convictions because they know they will either lose their jobs or will be unable to find employment within the Church. Imagine yourself as a senior theology major at an Adventist college, and you have discovered during your four years in school that Ellen White failed six of the seven biblical tests of a true prophet! Imagine that you are finishing up your advanced studies at the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan, and your independent study has led you to understand that the original Hebrew text of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, clearly teaches against a Creation origin for the Sabbath ordinance. What will you do? Perhaps you have a family to support. This untenable internal conflict set the stage for the hypocrisy that has bred corruption from the highest to the lowest levels of Church leadership since the 1970’s. You will “believe” in the Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Investigative Judgment if you want to keep or get a Church job.

We will explore the direct relationship between this hypocrisy and corruption in *Lying for God*.

Every Saturday, many SDA pastors preach sermons about things they know could not possibly be true. Every Monday through Friday SDA University professors of history and religion teach things they know are nothing more than fairy tales. They understand that they would be fired if they taught what they know. For example, no Adventist Hebrew scholar would dare to teach his students what Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 have to say about the origins and proper application of the Sabbath concept.

Sabbatarianism develops when a proof-texting approach to Bible study is utilized that ignores the major themes, concepts, and principles of the Bible. Its greatest single cause is an unfortunate ignorance of the nature of God’s Law and the way New Testament writers, and especially St. Paul, thought and wrote about the LAW. Your authors, therefore, have spent a great deal of time researching and presenting a biblical view of the LAW that demonstrates that there is no conflict between his view of the LAW and the way other New Testament writers saw it.
In the halls of the SDA seminary at Andrews University there have always been hushed discussions about whether or not St. Paul was a false apostle. Because Adventist theologians and their unfortunate students do not understand how St. Paul thought about the concept of the LAW, he appears to them to have taught a doctrine of "cheap grace." This misunderstanding has created some splinter groups within the Church which actually reject Paul as a false apostle. Furthermore, some former Adventists, who still cling to Sabbatarianism, reject both St. Paul and Ellen White as false teachers. I once sent a copy of an earlier edition of Lying for God to a Sabbatarian who rejected both St. Paul and Ellen White. I never heard from him again.

Once a Christian grasps the biblical concept of the LAW, there is no difficulty understanding what St. Paul meant when he taught that Christians should not use their freedom from the LAW as an excuse to sin. In Lying For God, Robert K. Sanders explains the differences between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant and clarifies what the 10 Commandments are NOT. Kerry Wynne explains the differences between Torah and Noachian LAW and how this distinction shaped Paul's thinking and writing about the LAW. William H. Hohmann completes the study by demonstrating that under the terms of the New Covenant the Christian believer is not under the LAW but is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The three of us would appreciate it very much if you would make a commitment to read the entire book. Our chosen subject may be the most difficult of all Christian controversies. For the writer who is brave enough, and possibly foolish enough, to try to write about this thorny topic, there is no good place to begin, and there is no best pathway to get from the beginning of the discussion to the end of it. Sabbatarianism is so complex that one cannot see the forest for the trees. If you read only parts of our book, you may imagine objections to our points that you will find out later do not actually exist.

You are about to embark on a theological adventure that is stranger than fiction. Like the J.R.R. Tolkien epic series, The Lord of the Rings explores the self-destructive nature of evil, Lying for God examines the nearly unfathomable mystery of how a long string of men and women who appeared to be honorable in nearly every other way could stultify their consciences and place the good of the institution of Adventism above truth itself—deceiving themselves and others into believing that the end (preserving the Church) justified the means (deception). Whether reading our book leads you to renounce Sabbatarianism or not, you will have to question why “truth” has to be shored up by a vast web of interwoven lies.

The facts we present are easily verifiable, and the interpretation of these facts is controlled by the principles of logic, common sense, proper methods of biblical scholarship, and the science of linguistics.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church can no longer deny these charges. What has been done in the dark has now come to light. Between the three of us, it has taken over 10,000 hours of research and writing to present the Sixth Edition of Lying For God. We have read vast portions of the sources we quote to assure ourselves that we have not taken the authors out of context. We are asking you to read extensive portions of our sources so that you can see the context in which the statements are made and can see the injustice of the interpretations Seventh-day Adventist writers have assigned to them.

We did not pull this evidence against Sabbatarianism out of thin air. We have put together all of the key parts of the Sabbatarian puzzle, component by component, to demonstrate that a non-Sabbatarian point-of-view links all the parts of the Bible together with a refreshing harmony that eventually will create a gestalt of sudden enlightenment in almost anyone's mind who is patient enough to think things through with us. If Sabbatarianism were true, how, then, could we possibly demonstrate from so many different angles that it is not true? One could grant a favorable-looking argument here and there, but we found dozens of approaches that, woven together, provide a rope of evidence so strong that it is impossible to break by the proof-texting method of Bible study that is needed to support the idea that Christians must keep the Sabbath.

Before hastily concluding that your authors are way out on a tangent, consider the enormous task you would face if you chose to embark on a mission to disprove the principles of Adventism that we present. Few individuals are willing to devote the enormous number of hours we have put into this project to test beliefs that claim to be truth. Our book packs these many thousands of hours of research into less than 250 pages. As for myself, I left Adventism after following Ellen White for
nearly 60 years. Why? Because no one in the Church could provide me with a single satisfactory answer to my probing questions! Nor did I need any books about the prophetic failures of Ellen White to figure out that she was a false prophet. I have lived over half a century, and that has been more than enough time to see that a host of her predictions failed. The final blow to my faith in Ellen White came when I picked up a copy of *People Magazine* and learned that the Fox Sisters, who started the Spiritualism Movement during the mid-1800's, confessed that the “rappings” they had earlier claimed were supernaturally caused were actually “the result of human trickery.” These were the exact words the article’s author used to describe the confession made by the Fox Sisters. Ellen White, in her very own words, had said that the phenomenon was “not the result of human trickery.” All I needed to do was read what Ellen White herself had said about everything and use my God given brain to compare what she had said with everything I had learned during my lifetime. I also noted that she had predicted that all the main-line churches would swallow Spiritualism hook, line, and sinker, and that it would come to be considered a sin to speak against it. I could not help but note that all the main-line churches I know of strongly oppose Spiritualism and teach against any attempt to communicate with the dead– even though they believe the dead are conscious.

Sabbatarianism is not simply an innocent doctrinal error. **It is a heresy that disables the Gospel.** It is a teaching that has caused untold hardship to the families of Sabbath-keepers whose breadwinner refused to work on the Sabbath and lost his or her job as a consequence of those misplaced convictions. It is a doctrine responsible for getting in the way of countless marriages between Christians, or caused many not to marry at all, when they could have found a suitable Christian believer from another denomination. If you stop and think, you will be able to think of dozens of other kinds of hardships imposed on Sabbath-keepers by their refusal to work on Saturdays and their refusal to associate, in general, with a whole world of Christians whose fellowship could be a great blessing to them. If you become convicted of its error, you dare not rationalize that you can stay in the Adventist Church and teach others that Sabbath-keeping is a salvation issue. I personally believe that God forgives and over-looks doctrinal errors that Christians acquire in sincere ignorance. However, just like as with sin, we still have to suffer, in this life, the consequences of these unfortunate errors and false beliefs.

The last place on the face of the Earth you would look for the TRUTH about the Sabbath is a large, financially successful denomination that depends on its members believing in the Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Investigative Judgment in order to keep the money flowing into its coffers. If you want the truth about the dangers of smoking, you don't go to a cigarette company. If you want to know the truth about the dangers of artificial tanning, you don’t go to the manufacturers of tanning beds or to the owners of tanning salons to obtain reliable information. Neither do you go to the Seventh-day Adventist Church to find out the truth about the Sabbath, Ellen White, 1844, and the Investigative Judgment.

For our readers who wish to read the 1919 *Bible Conference Minutes*, the entire transcript is posted at the General Conference Archives at:

http://www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=19&SortBy=1&ShowDateOrder=True

Kerry Wynne

October 19, 2011
CHAPTER ONE

ABSTRACT FOR CHAPTER ONE – This first chapter of book one explains how the discovery of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes may have paved the way for SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, to openly challenge Ellen White’s claim that she was directly inspired by God when she taught that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath. It links this probable connection between cause and effect to the chain of events that led to the third major Sabbath-Sunday Crisis of the Christian Faith, which spurred an Evangelical team of biblical researchers to discover that the Hebrew text of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 contraindicates the giving of the Sabbath ordinance at Creation, placing its origin during the time of the Exodus with the giving of the manna. We demonstrate how Bacchiocchi’s challenge to the claims of Ellen White, his inadvertent validation of so many things that D.M. Canright said, and his total Judaization of Christianity, launched the anti-Sabbatarian movement that is currently threatening the membership roles of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and caused its “sister” Sabbatarian church, The Worldwide Church of God, to renounce Sabbath-keeping in 1995. We present what Adventist leaders already knew about the impossibilities of the doctrines that form the Three Pillars of Adventism by the year 1919, and begin our study of the Church’s cover-up to keep this knowledge from its followers.

Bacchiocchi Opens Pandora’s Box

“She [the Eastern Church] is the mother, and Rome the daughter” (page 66).” All the first founders of theology were Easterners. Till the time of Augustine (355-430) no divine had arisen in the West; till the time of Gregory the Great (596-604) none had filled the papal chair. The doctrine of Athanasius [the Trinity] was received, not originated, by Rome” (pages 71, 72). This indicates how dependent Rome was for centuries on the East and how far behind the East Rome was in learning and influence.” – D.M. Canright (The Lord’s Day From Neither Catholics nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-Day Adventism On This Subject) quoting Dean Stanley [1815-1881], Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford, in his History of the Eastern Church.

The Sad Tale of Frank M. Wilcox And The 1919 Bible Conference Minutes

I was stunned when I realized the significance of what I had just found in my library of SDA books! Could the author of this unabashed defense of Ellen G. White’s prophetic gift really be F.M. Wilcox? Was not Frank M. Wilcox unequivocal in his assertion that her claim to be an inspired prophet was fraudulent as recorded in the “leaked” stenographer’s transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes? Soon my amazement turned to anger! How could such a thing be possible? How could anyone do such a thing? What could possibly justify such whopping perfidy on the part of a man whose appearance of piety earned him the honor of serving as the editor of the official church paper of Seventh-day Adventists, The Review and Herald, from 1911 to 1944?

The book in my hands was his The Testimony of Jesus, published in 1934, just 15 years after he stated that he did not believe her writings were any more inspired than those of any other author. Had it not been for the 1974 discovery, theft, and later unauthorized publication (Spectrum magazine, 1979) of this “bomb shell” stenographer’s transcript of a secret 1919 meeting– one convened to decide what should be done about Ellen White’s fraudulent prophetic claims– we could look back on Frank Wilcox as an Adventist leader of the highest integrity. General Conference President, A.G. Daniells, who conducted the meeting, understood the danger to Adventism that this transcript represented, so he ordered it to be sealed for a minimum of 50 years. He put it in a plain paper bag and confined it to the furthest depths of the huge vault at the General Conference Headquarters in Washington, DC, where Dr. Stephen F. Yost found it in 1974.

This amazing document shows the meeting’s participants agonizing over the Ellen White problem. Should they repudiate her and deal with the havoc that would ensue, or should they continue trying to cover-up her prophetic blunders? If they decided to continue the present cover-up, how would they keep the truth about her from the Church’s seminary students? They discuss her prophetic blunders, biblical and historical errors, and blatant plagiarism in cautious terms. Each participant is aware that saying too much could finish his or her denominational career. Yet, despite this fear, the hard facts spill out into the open and are addressed frankly, but with painful caution. The fact that even one of the participants was willing to risk his or her career to speak out on this explosive issue is, in itself, evidence that the Ellen White problem had become impossible to ignore.

Indeed, the transcript reveals that Wilcox was one of the most vocal participants in denouncing Ellen White’s prophetic claims. He declares his opinion that her writings are not any more inspired than those of anyone else:
I would like to ask, Brother Daniells, if it could be accepted as a sort of rule that Sister White might be mistaken in details, but in the general policy and instruction she was an authority. . . It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing. Either the Lord has spoken through her or he has not spoken through her; and if it is a matter of deciding in my own judgment whether he has or has not, then I regard her books the same as every other book published. I think it is one thing for a man to stultify his conscience, and it is another thing to stultify his judgment. It is one thing for me to lay aside my conscience, and it is another thing for me to change my judgment over some view that I hold.

Could he have changed his mind during those 15 years that followed?

We now turn to a consideration of how the problems with Ellen White as revealed by the 1974 discovery of the transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes might have influenced Dr. Bacchiocchi to challenge her prophetic claims with the publication of his 1977 book, From Sabbath to Sunday.

What Adventist Leaders Knew By 1919 About The Single Most Important Prophecy In Adventism: The 2,300 Days And 1844

Since early Christian times some biblical scholars have understood that the little horn of Daniel 7 referred to the Roman Emperor, Nero. Nero persecuted Christians for exactly 1,260 days. Students of the Bible have also applied this prophecy to the persecuting activities of the papacy but without any need to link its persecuting behavior to the so-called “change” of the Sabbath as Adventists have done. Similarly, for a very long time biblical scholars have known that the 2,300 evenings and mornings of the little horn of Daniel 8 work out to the exact number of days that Antiochus Epiphanes polluted the Jewish Temple before 161 BC. These prophecies have been so remarkable in their actual “a-day-stands-for-a-day” historical fulfillment that higher critics of the Bible claimed they had to have been written after these events took place. When the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries were made between 1947 and 1956, the early authorship of Daniel was firmly established, refuting the skeptics. It is likely that at least a number of honest-at-heart unbelievers had their faith in the Bible established by this spectacular fulfillment of prophecy.

The entire concept of Adventism rests on the “foundation” of the 2,300 day prophecy of Daniel 8:14. This foundation can be shown to be purely imaginary; that no Investigative Judgment began in Heaven in 1844, and the Sabbath is not a “seal” even if Sabbatarianism were to be true. Nor did God call Adventists after 1844 to take the Sabbath and Investigative Judgment doctrines to the world to rescue them from receiving the Mark of the Beast on their foreheads, and 1844 becomes nothing more than a huge theological joke played on the Christian world by none other than Ellen G. White herself, whose quick thinking rescued the debacle of 1844 from the jaws of defeat. The Investigative Judgment doctrine is pivotal for Adventism and affects, to one degree or another, almost every aspect of Church's teachings. It is obvious that Ellen White is a false prophet if the doctrine is not true, but it is less obvious, for example, that Adventists are also forced by it to teach that the dead are unconscious and cease to exist until they are re-created in the resurrection (The doctrine of soul sleep, as it is also called.)

The transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes suggests that Wilcox and the other delegates mistakenly applied the 1,260 days of the little horn of Daniel 7 to Antiochus and were struggling to find solid ground upon which to base the 1844 date on the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices of the little horn of Daniel 8 and 11. It is not surprising there was considerable confusion among SDA scholars regarding the 2,300 days of the little horn of Daniel 8, since they were trying incorrectly to apply the year-for-a-day concept where there was no scriptural warrant to do so in order to arrive at the desperately needed date of 1844. We will discuss this prophecy in detail later. The key point for now is that the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference believed that the fact that the little horn of Daniel 7 related to a much earlier historical event that happened way before what the event they desired to apply it to; and that they knew that this knowledge was dangerous to the foundation of Adventism, and that they wanted to withhold this damaging information from the Church because of that danger. “Watch” the delegates in this revealing passage from the Minutes:

PROF. LACEY: In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn—extremely alike, and I do not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekiel expresses it—a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of Daniel 7 can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the 11th down the line, three were plucked up in his place [names were mentioned], he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the law of the Most High; things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years. And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, supposed you and I had been living in...
that day we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfillment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great anti-Christ, of which Antiochus was here the personal representative. (Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted.)

ELDER DANIELLS: You would not want to say that you have just said now to a class of students, would you?

From the July 8, 1919 transcript as posted at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist archives.

The 1919 Bible Conference And The Concept That The Pope Changed The Sabbath

Dr. Bacchiocchi’s book, From Sabbath to Sunday, flatly challenged Ellen G. White’s vision that the pope had changed the Sabbath by demonstrating that the “change” of the Sabbath was essentially universal by no later than 140 AD. What influences could have emboldened a member of the faculty at the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary to directly challenge a key teaching of the Church’s prophetess that she had attributed to divine inspiration?

We speculate that perhaps, as a privileged Seventh-day Adventist theologian, Dr. Bacchiocchi may have had early access to the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes, or that he had heard about its content. If this were the case, he would have seen that the delegates were well aware of the extreme difficulties posed by Ellen G. White’s teaching that the papacy changed the Sabbath. The following portion of the transcript from the July 3rd 1919 Bible Conference Minutes is one of the most important keys to understanding what and when Adventists knew about this thorny problem. Older Seventh-day Adventist readers will immediately recognize that the Church made no attempt to correct these errant teachings in the Bible text books at any educational level. It is also important to understanding the problems with the “Resting Theory” of SDA Sabbath apologist, Bob Pickle, who seeks to rescue Ellen White’s blunder with a highly creative theory. He rationalizes that the Sabbath was not actually “changed” until the concept of resting became associated with Sunday, even though it took several additional centuries of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking to arrive at that point. According to Pickle, it matters not that Christians kept Sunday and broke the Sabbath from the first century onward. Instead, the Sabbath was not really “changed” until a series of edicts was successful in requiring a civil cessation of labor on Sundays. Nor does it seem to matter that this legislated “resting” was optional under many circumstances and was purely civil in its concept—not linked to the concept of day sacredness, as in the case of the Jewish Sabbath. You will see that the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference did not attempt to excuse Ellen White’s misstatement on this basis. (We will look at Bob Pickle’s “Resting Theory” later.)

Notice how the participants finally conclude that the only way her claim can be reconciled with the facts of history is to consider her statement to be a vague type of symbolism called a prolepsis (the representation or assumption of a future act or development as if presently existing or accomplished—Merriam-Webster’s On-Line Dictionary). This desperate attempt to prop-up their prophetess takes the art of rationalization to the ultimate level. The concept of prolepsis is not even applicable in this situation, since this term refers to something preceding a later development that is symbolic of the later event. Reverse logic is necessary, here, when the participants theorize that the “little horn” symbolically represented an entity which existed in the past. In the excerpt, you will see the delegates struggle to shore up the “truth” of their prophetess's statement with rationalizations that are accommodating to the point of the absurd:

FROM THE 1919 BIBLE CONFERENCE MINUTES – JULY 3, 1919

Begins on manuscript page 48 and ends on page 57.
Archives stamped page 149 for beginning page.

C.P. BOLLMAN: I was asked about these things we attribute to the papacy before that date [533 AD as discussed in the previous paragraph]. I would answer that in this way. I have used the expression in the paper, that the papacy at this time, emerging from its nonage or minority, proceeded to do certain things. Before that date the papacy was a boy, and at that time it became a man. And it is true that many things a boy does follow him all through his life, but he does a number of things afterward, and there comes a time when he really enters upon life. The graduating exercises are called commencement exercises, too, because that is the time when the student goes forth to engage in the activities of life.

W.W. PRESCOTT: I think this does not meet the point because the prophecy says it is the horn that changes the law. Now if you do not get the horn up in 533 you can’t say the horn changed the Sabbath before that date. It was another kingdom.
H.A. WASHBURN: Was there a monarchical power in the church until Justinian declared the pope to be head? This eleventh horn is a kingdom just as truly as the tenth. It is a kingdom a monarchical power, and it began in 533.

W.W. PRESCOTT: If that is the power that changed the law, we can’t say the law was changed in the middle of the fourth century.

H.A. WASHBURN: Brother Lacey told us of a woman who said she had spanked Emperor William. It was the same person, but he did not have a title. The apostasy changed God’s law, and it was responsible for all the acts against the Sabbath. There came a time when it was organized under one man.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Here is what I would like to say. Hold to the text. The horn power was a kingdom. That kingdom did not rise till 533. The prophecy says it is the horn that changes the Sabbath, the law, and I did not think we can put that back before the horn appears and say the horn did it, because the horn was not there. I would like to have that specifically met. What shall we do with that proposition that the horn power rose in 533 and changed the law? How can we say that the horn power did it in the middle of the fourth century?

L.L. CAVINESS: We meet that same dilemma in the Spirit of Prophecy when it says the pope changed the Sabbath. Please tell me the name of the pope that made the change.

A.G. DANIELS: That use of the word pope was intended for the papacy. It was not a specific term. It was the power that did it, but before it came to that special stage marked by Justinian.

E.R. PALMER: It appears to me that if we were to tie down all of the fulfillments of the prophecies to the span of the 1260 days of continuance spoken of in the prophecy, we are involved in serious difficulty at both ends, at the beginning, before 533, and since 1793 and 1798. It seems to me that in view of the fact that this evil principle began back in Paul’s day, that it embodied all these things that were powers that were exercised later as a horn, but that they all began back there. I think we have gone astray many times in our explanation by trying to put the change arbitrarily at a date in connection with the papacy at a certain time, but really that time began its work of changing the Sabbath way back in the first century. I think this is true. I think there came a time also when that period closes, and yet much of the most mighty work of that power has been exercised and is being exercised, after the termination of the period. It seems to me that to bring that too definitely within the 1260 year period, it involves us in serious difficulty at both ends, and I think we have a good deal of phrase adjusting and work adjusting in our literature relative to the Sabbath and the papacy to make the thing consistent with what actually took place before the 1260 years and afterwards.

A.G. DANIELS: Now then the horn power represents the papacy from its earlier embryonic condition to its destruction, does it not? Now then, it is necessary to place the rise of the establishment of that horn in 533 at the time we say it became a monarchical power? That is the question to me. Is that our position? Is that a right position? Is it a necessary position? Wasn’t it a horn power long before then?

E.R. PALMER: That is a serious question. If the thing was not developing, if it was not growing for much more than 1260 years, then there were certain developments that marked off the 1260 years in a definite way.

A.G. DANIELS: As a living, acting power, the beast, through various steps and at various times did various things. Now one of the things that the little horn did was to attack Jesus through His law and His Sabbath. It certainly did it before ever that decree of Justinian came. It is safe to not recognize it as a horn power before that decree was made? If that is not necessary, then where is the wrong in recognizing that fulfillment of the prophecy when it was broken up into the ten parts?

W.W. PRESCOTT: Here is another difficulty, and that is, we set the Council of Laodicea at the latest date, earlier than we set the breaking up of the empire, so that you have got that action. If we make much of the Council of Laodicea, it was before the breaking up of the empire began.

M.C. WILCOX: Shall we take up the beginning of that horn power, the assumption of the power itself, or the recognition of that assumption by the state?

W.W. PRESCOTT: You take it clear back when Constantine reached Rome, when Attila appeared against Rome. Was the pope the leading power then? Didn’t he turn back Attila? Yes! Then can’t we go back even to that time?
What was a great step in the assumption of that power? When Constantine reached Rome and the pope appeared? That was in the early part of the fourth century. Now as Brother Palmer suggested, the 1260 years mark a special phase of that Rome power, and there it sort of comes into that prophecy under that theme, but I don’t see how we can shut him off back of that, because there are things that appear back there that are very vital.

**H.C. Lacey:** I have been face to face with this for some little time, too, and I try to adhere to our traditional view. Our book says 538. We have changed that to 533, and it continues 126 years. I believe there is a great measure of truth in that. It appears that the Sabbath was changed before that. The church turned to the observance of Sunday before 533 or 538.

**A.G. Daniells:** You said our traditional view that the papacy arose in 538. You mean that that is when it received supreme power?

**H.C. Lacey:** Could we say that the papacy did something in days anterior to that special time when perhaps the papacy arose in that way to which we generally refer? I have used this little incident that was referred to, about the woman spanking the emperor. An old woman went around boasting that she had spanked the emperor, because she took him upon her knee and walloped him. (C.P. Bollman: She ought to have kept it up [Laughter]) It was not the emperor she spanked. It was the same person who by and by became the emperor. I find the Bible treats in this way the birth of Jesus Christ. He did not become the Christ until A.D. 27, but it speaks of Him as being born in A.D. 5. That is an exactly analogous figure. The papacy can come up in 538, and yet the apostate church was developed before, and by and by it changed the Sabbath.

Can we not have a figure of prolepsis? Some take the sign for the thing signified, as when Sister White says the pope changed the Sabbath. She took the pope to represent that system. She didn’t mean to identify a particular pope, but just as a general term. We say this is the home of the King, of the council. “The king” simply stands for the government, and the pope stands for the papacy. The apostate church changed the Sabbath. Step by step the change developed, and then the pope laid hands upon the Sunday institute and boosted it.

And so, as it stands today, the great sponsor of Sunday observance is the papacy.

**W.W. Prescott:** Is it not true, as a fact of history, that the papacy exercised greater political power in the fourth and fifth centuries than it did under Justinian?

**Lacey:** Certainly.

**C.M. Sorenson:** We all recognize that a correct explanation includes all the facts in the case. Of course that is the only explanation that takes recognition of all the facts in the case, and that is the ideal explanation toward which we strive.

We have been speaking about reading things into the Bible, and of course that is wrong. But there is another practice that is bad, and that is reading things into history. That is one of the evil legacies left us by A. T. Jones’ leadership. His books are full of that practice, and we have consigned them to the scrap heap. They contain some facts, but the facts are biased by a preconceived notion.

Now here is another point: There is no connection between the plucking up of the three horns and the giving of the saints into his hands for a time, times, and the dividing of time. If we will keep those two lines absolutely separate, it will be better.

There was no tremendous change that took place in 533, so far as the status of the papacy is concerned. There is that question of supremacy. Do we use that understandingly? There was a time when the papacy was the supreme power in Europe— from 1100 to 1300. The papacy was not supreme in any ordinary sense of the term during the 1260 years, but he did exercise domination over God’s people.

**M.C. Wilcox:** I have been trying to get a term that is suitable. What do you suggest?

**C.M. Sorenson:** The word “domination.”

**M.C. Wilcox:** That is the word I have been using— papal domination.
C.M. SORENSON: During those two hundred years the papacy did exercise actual political supremacy over all the rest of Europe and civilization. King John, right in the climax of that period, signed over his kingdom to the pope.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Can you say, Brother Sorenson, that the papal domination began in 533?

C.M. SORENSON: There was a legal enactment by Justinian at that time. But the actual domination over God’s people was tapered off at the beginning and at the end for the elect’s sake. It seems to have been lessened somewhat at the beginning, but more especially at the close of that period.

W.W. PRESCOTT: I know, Brother Chairman, it was a great surprise to me after I had read our books when I actually read history and found that the papal supremacy was only from 1100 to 1300, and gradually rose to that climax, and then gradually faded out. I think we have used that term “supremacy” very carelessly. We have heard and we have read how that in 538 the pope became supreme, but it was in that very year that he was absolutely humbled.

C.M. SORENSON: That was one of the worst years he ever had.

W.W. PRESCOTT: And yet you read in our books and hear in our sermons that in 538 the pope became supreme. If there is any way of correcting these statements, I wish it might be done.

W.L. BIRD: The Dark Ages should be considered in the same way.

C.P. BOLLMAN: I would just like to ready the prophecy. “After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beast that were before it; and it had ten horns.”

That is a picture of 478.

“I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of [a] man, and a mouth speaking great things.”

When did this little horn come up?—then, or two or three hundred years before? It says, “I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them.” And the term “another” conveys to my mind that the ten horns were there when it came up. It came up “among them.” They must have been there or it could not have come up among them, and they must have been there or it could not have been “another” one. It seems to me that we shall have to solve it along the lines suggested by Professor Lacey. I think we attribute to this power some things that were actually done before.

A.G. DANIELLS: This is very interesting and very profitable, and what has been said here shows a need of careful study, and comparison of views and teaching.

With the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes’ three-fold revelation of the perfidy of Seventh-day Adventist leaders down through time— that Ellen White was a fraud, that the prophetic basis for the 1844 Investigative Judgment had impossible problems, and that there were fatal problems with Ellen White’s concept that the pope changed the Sabbath— let us consider how some or all of this information influenced Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi to begin his first steps down the path that lead him to unwittingly become the greatest “hostile witness” against the claims of Ellen White and the Sabbath doctrine. If Ellen White had not claimed that God showed her these things in vision, we could just excuse her as a poor historian.

**BACCHIOCCHI ATTEMPTS TO REFUTE D.M. CANRIGHT**

The beginning of the end for the credibility of the Sabbatarian belief model started in the year 1977 with the publication of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi’s controversial book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*. This book, researched by this Seventh-day Adventist theologian and Sabbath scholar, attempted to refute the anti-Sabbatarian arguments of arch apostate SDA leader, D.M. Canright. Canright; the most significant high-level leader ever to renounce Adventism, who left the Church in 1887 and began to confront his former associates with the biblical and historical impossibilities of the Sabbath and that Ellen White was a false prophet. His opinion of Ellen White was credible because he had worked shoulder to shoulder
with Ellen and her husband, James White, for years before his stunning apostasy.

In 1888, Adventist leaders published the Church’s first anti-Canright book, *Replies to Elder Canright*, anticipating that he would release a full-length anti-Adventist book shortly. Canright did publish such a book, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, a year later in 1889. Thanks to the Church jumping the gun, Canright was able to reference his refutations of their rebuttals to the page numbers of *Replies to Elder Canright*. Because early Adventist leaders liked to put everything in writing, we have a record of exactly what Church leaders knew and when they knew it regarding the serious problems with their Sabbath doctrine. Subsequently the Church published a full-length version of its anti-Canright book, *Replies to Elder Canright’s Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists* (Review and Herald), in 1895. Canright revised his book several times between 1889 and 1914 (See the 1914 edition of *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*). We have a wealth of evidence, therefore, of the exchange of arguments for and against the Sabbath between Canright and the Church leaders of his day, including his rebuke to those leaders for knowing that for forty years they had been unable to explain away the fatal-to-Sabbatarianism implications of Colossians 2:14-17. He knew a lot about the Church’s Sabbath doctrine problems because he had been a powerful church leader during most of those years.

Bacchiocchi’s purpose in writing *From Sabbath to Sunday* was, apparently, to prove that although Canright was right in regard to one detail— that the Sabbath mentioned in this passage was a reference to the weekly Sabbath— he was wrong about his over-all conclusion that this fact means that the Sabbath is an obsolete Jewish ordinance that is not required of Christians. In order to impose this pro-Sabbatarian reading on Colossians 2:14-17, Dr. Bacchiocchi had no other choice but to Judaize Christianity to the point where neither perceptive Adventists nor Evangelicals could stomach it.

In two ways Dr. Bacchiocchi’s interpretation of Colossians 2:14-17 directly challenged the prophetic claims of Church prophetess, Ellen G. White. We will explain these two reasons subsequently.

Dr. Bacchiocchi also sought to demonstrate that, although D.M. Canright was correct in teaching that universal Sunday observance came much too early to be credited to the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, the Early Church’s “abandonment” of Sabbath-keeping was still the result of apostasy. This second concession to the correctness of Canright’s facts— but not to his conclusions about those facts— flatly contradicted Ellen White’s claim that God showed her in vision that the Catholic Church was responsible for changing the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

In our introduction we explained that the East was the center of power in the Christian world during the first 500 or more years of the Faith. We talked about how Christian doctrine and practice were developed in the East. We introduced the fact that the Eastern Orthodox Church not only founded the Church at Rome in apostolic times, but nourished it, and controlled it, and even deposed bishops of Rome who wandered too far away from Orthodox ideas. We introduced the concept that the supremacy of the Eastern Church (Think Greek Orthodox Church) was so great that its political and ecclesiastical power and influence controlled the Church at Rome, just like it did the other bishoprics in and around the Roman Empire. We pointed out that Dr. Bacchiocchi’s doctoral studies were done in Rome in the early 1970’s and suggested that his Vatican professors may not have emphasized the supremacy of the Eastern Church enough to help him grasp the unlikelihood that Rome could have developed the concept of Sunday observance, much less impose it on the other bishoprics of the Christian world.

While the first pope of the Roman Catholic Church was seated in 596, Gregory the Great, who reigned between 596-604 AD, the Great Councils of the Church were still being held in the East, including one in 787 AD (Second Council of Nicaea), and the last one in 869 AD (Fourth Council of Constantinople). The pope of the Western Church (Rome) would most likely not have had the power to develop and dictate Christian doctrine, therefore, until after 869 AD, and certainly not before 787 AD. Since J.N. Andrews, the earliest real Sabbath scholar of the Advent Movement, conceded that Sabbath “abandonment” was wide-spread by 100 AD and universal no later than 200 AD, the absurdity of Ellen White’s Roman Catholic Church theory is self-evident. We now know that Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD. And as we mentioned in our introduction, the Greek Orthodox Church kept good records from its beginning, and these records show that the Eastern churches never kept the Jewish Sabbath.

Even though Dr. Bacchiocchi was either ignorant of the overwhelming supremacy of the Eastern Church during these early centuries of the Faith, or chose to ignore this fact, he tacitly proved that Ellen White lied about her Sabbath visions by being forced to develop a set of alternative theories to maintain his personal agenda— to demonstrate, somehow, that the Western Church was still responsible for the so-called “change of day.” The “replacement” theory he developed to explain the phenomenon of Sabbath “abandonment” in the West— the Jewish Persecution Theory— was not accepted by biblical scholars because, aside from the fact that Christian doctrine developed in the East and moved to the West during this time period in question, it was not supportable by the facts of either the history of the Roman Empire or that of the Early Church. It didn’t help, either, that Bacchiocchi was forced to concede that he could not prove any link between sun worship and the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians. We will discuss this key concession of his in a subsequent chapter.
By admitting what Adventism had denied for well over 100 years— that the Sabbath listed in Colossians 2:14-17 is actually a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue— Dr. Bacchiocchi limited himself to only one possible route of escape, and that was to convince his readers that these obsolete "shadows" Paul refers to in this passage were not the ordinances themselves, but rather the man-made rules developed by the Judaizers to burden their observance, with additional potential for greater personal merit. Unfortunately for Bacchiocchi, the study of the Greek linguistics of this passage provides no basis for any other interpretation but that the ordinances themselves are the shadows.

THE EVANGELICAL RESPONSE TO BACCHIOCCHI

Both perceptive Adventists and thoughtful Evangelicals quickly saw that Dr. Bacchiocchi's attempt to turn the "gun" of Colossians 2:14-17 around and point it back in the faces of his anti-Sabbatarian opponents was a cheap trick. Within a few short years Dr. Bacchiocchi became, inadvertently, the greatest of all "hostile" witnesses against Sabbatarianism. The fact that he had access to extensive resources on the subject as a scholar at the Vatican, yet could not intelligently defend it, suggests that there is no possible way for anyone to do so.

Three factors combined to galvanize the Evangelical community to escalate an already existing Sabbath-Sunday Question research program into a Manhattan-like project determined to settle the debate once and for all:

1. The authority of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s scholarly credentials as a graduate from the Vatican’s Gregorian Pontifical University.
2. The Judaization of Christianity that resulted from his approach.
3. The aggressiveness of his effort to convert the Evangelical clergy by power-marketing his book to Evangelical leaders and clergy.

Evangelical scholar, D.A. Carson, and a team of well-respected biblical scholars were already working on a Sabbath research project when Dr. Bacchiocchi published From Sabbath to Sunday in 1977. This event kicked their program into high gear, and a remarkable set of discoveries were made between 1977 and 1982. The most important finding was that in the original Hebrew, Moses, writing in Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, used a number of literary indicators to clarify that the Sabbath ordinance did not begin at Creation; that it was introduced for the first time with the giving of the manna at the time of the Exodus, and that it was a new ordinance that was only modeled after Creation Week. Carson and his team of published their findings in their 1982 book, From Sabbath to Lord's Day. Each chapter was authored by an expert in his field, and each chapter targeted a specific weakness in Dr. Bacchiocchi’s research methods and conclusions. The clarity of what Moses said in Hebrew is what settles the Sabbath Question. There is no foundation for Sabbatarianism without a Creation Week origin for the Sabbath ordinance. Perhaps for the first time ever it could be definitively demonstrated that the Bible plainly teaches against the concept that Christians must keep the Sabbath, since Adam and Eve, Abraham, and Enoch never kept it.

The Hebrew Linguistics Discovery

The reason the anti-Sabbatarian teaching of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 was not recognized earlier is that the key meaning indicators Moses utilized to achieve this clarification make use of established patterns of usage and convention that cannot be translated from the Hebrew directly into any other language. For example, only a Hebrew reading in Hebrew (or a scholar with a nearly native understanding of the language) would understand what Moses “said” when he did not add the suffix phrase, “And the evening and the morning were the seventh day,” as he had done so, respectively, for his description of what took place on the other days of Creation Week. As we will explain later, this was an established convention that limits the application of the events of that day to that day itself. Those who study foreign languages soon encounter the fact that there are words, phrases, and concepts which simply cannot be fully translated from one language into another.

Until Dr. Bacchiocchi’s iconoclastic approach came along, Evangelical and orthodox scholars had no particular motivation to take a deep look at what Moses said about the Sabbath, or, for that matter, to spend any significant time dealing with an issue that appeared to have been settled during the volatile Sabbatarian crisis of the King James Era Sabbatarian theologians appear to avoid this subject. Human nature suggests that were a Sabbatarian scholar to discover what Moses really “said,” he would be inclined to push it out of his mind and pretend that what he saw really wasn’t there. He certainly would not what he discovered to the Sabbatarian church that pays his salary.

Our relatively new understanding of Hebrew linguistics explains why the Jews have always believed that the Sabbath was
given for the first time at the time of the Exodus and why they believe that the Sabbath was given to Israel only. The Hebrew people understand their own language. Later we will look at the problems with Dr. Bacchiocchi's claim that the Jews came to teach that the Sabbath was given only to them because of a political expediency that developed several hundred years before the birth of Christ.

Since it has been known with certainty since 1982 that the Sabbath did not originate at Creation, it is surprising to anyone without a Sabbatarian bias that any biblical scholar since the publication of Carson's From Sabbath to Lord's Day would presume to write a book defending the Sabbath doctrine by claiming it is a Creation ordinance. Dr. Bacchiocchi, in his subsequent books on the Sabbath, and his successors, continued to use the Sabbath-at-Creation argument as the foundation of the Sabbath belief model. In fact, the more other kinds of anti-Sabbatarian arguments are discovered and articulated, the more these SDA theologians pound the table and assert that since the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance, there are no possible valid arguments against Sabbatarianism, no matter how good those arguments might seem. Again, we have a serious ethics problem. Integrity in scholarship requires absolute honesty at all times, or one’s writings simply represent propaganda.

**Other Carson Findings**

The Carson team re-discovered the principle that observance of the Ordinance of Circumcision is a prerequisite for Sabbath-keeping, whether that person is a Jew or a proselyte to the Jewish Faith. This fact has been known to Christians from the very beginning. The founders of Christianity were Jews themselves, and Jews have understood the principle of the subjugation of the Sabbath ordinance to the ordinance of circumcision for several thousand years. What the Carson team accomplished, then, was to prove (provide evidence beyond any sensible doubt) that the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath defies what the Bible clearly teaches when it is studied with the purpose of understanding its major themes, principles, and dispensations.

The Carson Team also discovered the significance of the Easter Controversy. As support for the principle that Christian doctrine and practice was determined by the Eastern church, they observed that the bishop of Rome could not even persuade the other bishoprics to adopt the day of the year he wanted to designate as Easter. The Easter controversy was settled at the First Council of Nicaea, held in the east in 325 AD, and it did not choose the day urged by the bishop of Rome. The Roman emperor wrote letters to the other bishops throughout the Empire urging that they cooperate by unanimously adopting the Council’s choice. We will provide the Carson reference later in context of a fuller discussion of this subject. See also the on-line Catholic Encyclopedia article, “Easter Controversy.”

**THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST RESPONSE TO BACCHIOCCHI**

**The Response of Perceptive Adventist Thinkers**

Within four years of the publication of From Sabbath to Sunday, the world had a response to Dr. Bacchiocchi’s radical teachings from the perceptive and brilliant [now former] Seventh-day Adventist theologian, Dr. Robert D. Brinsmead, who published his authoritative essay, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined,” in 1981. This work integrated recent scholarly research on the Sabbath Question with long-standing anti-Sabbatarian knowledge. His main contributions to the Sabbath-Sunday debate included the significance of the new developments in Hebrew linguistics, the newly emerged picture of the tremendous diversity of the Early Church, the relationship of circumcision to Sabbath-keeping in Jewish thought, and the Jewish differentiation between Torah and Noachian Law. Dr. Brinsmead is a wealthy Australian who seemed to have had the luxury of almost unlimited time to research the Sabbath question during the four years that ensued after the release of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s book in 1977. In 1982 he released a supplement to “Sabbatarianism Re-examined,” entitled, "A Digest of the Sabbath Question," which provided additional scholarly support for his main points along with some additional new information. The quality of his second anti-Sabbatarian paper suggested that he had spent countless hours of further study—a luxury he might have as a result of being independently wealthy, and therefore not motivated by a paycheck from the organization.

As we mentioned earlier, the perceptive Seventh-day Adventists quickly realized that Dr. Bacchiocchi insulted the prophetic claims of the Church’s prophetess, Ellen G. White. This unprecedented attack on her prophetic gift by a seminary professor caused a few Adventist thinkers to see problems with Sabbatarianism that they would not likely have noticed had Dr. Bacchiocchi not proved that Sabbatarianism unavoidably led to his “absurd” conclusions. The result was that they studied their way out of Adventism. Here is what they saw:

**First,** Dr. Bacchiocchi’s doctrine that Christians— in order to believe that the Sabbath was not classified as an obsolete “shadow” by St. Paul— must also believe that Christians are obligated to keep the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbath feast days, and monthly sabbath feast days, directly contradicting a doctrine taught by Ellen G. White, who claimed that
God showed her in vision that all the "ceremonial laws" were nailed to the Cross.

**Second**, Dr. Bacchiocchi taught that the Roman Catholic Church was not responsible for changing the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, but that the so-called "change of the day" was accomplished hundreds of years earlier by the Church at Rome. In fact, Dr. Bacchiocchi joined the rest of the Christian world by conceding that Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD, which makes Ellen White’s teaching impossible.

It was the research of Robert D. Brinsmead combined with that of D.A. Carson’s team that moved perceptive Adventists to study their way out of Adventism and to launch the new anti-Sabbatarian movement that is presently threatening Sabbath-keeping churches, and especially the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

**What The Church Did About Bacchiocchi’s Theology**

Seventh-day Adventist leaders pretended the Bacchiocchi problem did not exist. He became the first Adventist theologian to avoid losing his job as a result of challenging Ellen White on things that she credited to visions from God. Conservative Adventists were appalled. Adventism dared not acknowledge the existence of some of the newer anti-Sabbatarian arguments, must less try to refute them, because even the mention of the very possibility that such things could be true could sow seeds of doubt that might cause a perceptive member to start questioning things that, as a Adventist, would be “better left alone”. Instead, the Church continued to pay Dr. Bacchiocchi’s seminary salary, and he continued to write books to defend his work from the growing storm of criticism that From Sabbath to Sunday unleashed from both fronts. In 1998 he published Sabbath Under Crossfire which was designed to answer the charges leveled at him by his anti-Sabbatarian opponents during the previous two decades. It also modified his position on what exactly was nailed to the cross in Colossians 2:14-17. (We will discuss his newer position at length later.) Then he went on to publish a set of three books that instruct Christians in how to keep the Jewish sacred days that he believed still have relevance that extends into the Christian dispensation.

Thirty years after Dr. Bacchiocchi published his disastrous defense of the Sabbath doctrine, the Church commissioned Dr. Skip MacCarty (who serves on the pastoral staff of Andrews University Pioneer Memorial Church, where the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary is located) to write another full-length apology for the Church’s Sabbath doctrine. One would think that Adventist leaders would want to bury the memory of the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco forever, but such was not the case. Unfortunately, MacCarty’s steering committee appears to have guided him in the preparation of a book that would merely re-mix Dr. Bacchicioci’s failed ideas into a more attractive package. We will review the theology of MacCarty’s book, In Granite or Ingrained? in detail later.

The Church paid the salaries of other Adventist theologians to create other theories to help make better sense out of the Sabbath Question than did Dr. Bacchiocchi. Later we will look at the Out of Easter Theory as articulated by Kenneth A. Strand and the Animal Sacrifices Theory, developed by Dr. Ronald du Preez, entitled Judging the Sabbath: Discovering What Can’t Be Found In Colossians 2:16, which attempts to explain away the anti-Sabbatarian implications of Colossians 2:14-17 in a way that contradicts Dr. Bacchiocchi and would, if it were successful, provide a return to the traditional SDA argument that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-17 really is just a “ceremonial” Sabbath, which would, in turn, mean that St. Paul did not target the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue as an obsolete “shadow.” Additionally we will look at the “Dual Day Theory” developed by the General Conference as an alternative to Dr. Bacchiocchi’s failed Jewish Persecution Theory.

In short, there was never any internal confusion about the Sabbath doctrine in Adventism before Dr. Bacchiocchi, but there has been no end of the chaos since the release of his first book in 1977.

**What The Church Did About the Ellen White-Canright-Bacchiocchi Problem**

It was business and usual for Seventh-day Adventists. Ignore it and hope it will go away! Cover it up! Step up the campaign of disinformation! Dr. Bacchiocchi proved Ellen White’s claim that God had shown her that the Roman Catholic Church had changed the Sabbath could not possibly be correct. If Christianity is supposed to be rational, the rules of proper biblical scholarship demonstrate she is a false prophet. However, this modus operandi was nothing new for Adventist leaders. Just three years after the Seventh-day Adventist Church officially organized in 1863, Iowa Conference leaders, Snook and Brinkerhoff, documented her lying cover-ups and failed prophecies in their 1863 book, The Visions of E.G. White Not of God. Church officials were not impressed. Ellen White herself was one of the primary founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Snook and Brinkerhoff proved she was a fraud even though they knew nothing of her plagiarisms. By the time D.M. Canright apostatized in 1877 and began writings books that confronted Adventist leaders with still more proof that she was
a fraud, the Church had become so financially successful that the Church had no interest in repudiating her. However, by 1919 it was getting very difficult to continue the practice of making excuses for her continual failures to meet the biblical test of a prophet. In 1899 White wrote a letter to Dr. Harvey Kellogg saying that God had shown her a vision that he was using funds diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium to erect a number of buildings in Chicago. The fact was that no such buildings had been built. Ellen White’s son, Willie White, conceded his mother was “shown” that the buildings were built but that, indeed, the buildings were not built. This prophetic blunder was only one of many, and Ellen White seems to have kept the Church busy finding ways to explain them away. These prophetic failures and a host of other problems led to the convening of the 1919 Bible Conference we discussed earlier, and the hiding away of the stenographer’s transcript of the proceedings, its bomb-shell discovery in 1974, and its devastating publication in Spectrum magazine in 1979.

Also in the year 1974, Andrews University history professor, Donald R. McAdams, found extensive evidence that Ellen White got her concepts, most of her material, and her theology for her book, The Great Controversy, from a book written much earlier by an early First Day Advent writer by the name of H.L. Hastings, entitled The Great Controversy Between God and Man— Its Origin Progress and End. He notes that even her chapter titles have similar names and an almost identical order. (Cited in Douglas Hackleman's, “Ellen White’s Habit,” referencing McAdams, Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians, 1974.) Problems with The Great Controversy were not new. In 1911 the Church was forced to spend $3,000 to revise this book due to anger over the fact that she had plagiarized extensively. $3,000 was a lot of money back in 1911. The revisions were demanded by Church leaders because she had copied from so many sources without giving credit to the original authors while she claimed that her work was directly inspired by God. The trouble in 1911 began when Battle Creek Sanitarium physician, Dr. Charles E. Stewart, stumbled across evidence that she was plagiarizing and took the time to do some research to find out how extensive her copying was. In a booklet, A Response to An Urgent Testimony he published in 1907, he placed her plagiarisms alongside of the original sources she had not credited.

In 1976 Dr. Ronald Numbers, then a professor at the Church’s medical school, Loma Linda University, published his book, Prophetess of Health, in which he outlined conclusive evidence that Ellen White got her ideas about health reform from other authors who had preceded her by as much as 20 years in particular a certain Dr. Jackson. As usual, the problem of her copying was minor compared to her lying about where that information came from. Her actions embarrassed God because much of the information she claimed that came from Him turned out to be clinically wrong. For example, benefits of drinking coffee and tea have been thoroughly established by science just within the last 10 years. Ellen White said that God showed her that it was a sin to drink these beverages.

In 1982 SDA pastor, Dr. Walter Rea, published his devastating book, The White Lie, which became a New York Times best seller. Dr. Rea was granted special access to the personal library of Ellen White for a project he was doing, and while he was looking through her books he discovered that she had copied freely, nearly word for word, from these other authors, while claiming that God had shown her these things in vision. In his book, Dr. Rea demonstrated her plagiarism to the point of over-kill. Still there was no willingness of the Church to repudiate its false prophet! Then in 1990, an eight-year, exhaustive study of Ellen White’s use of the work of other authors into her classic book, Desire Of Ages, conducted by Dr. Fred Veltman, concluded that over 80% of the material that she claimed came directly from God was “borrowed” from other writers. Most important, however, was Dr. Veltman’s concession that there was no explanation for her lying about her sources. Still the Church showed no interest in repudiating its false prophet after one of its very own theologians tacitly conceded she had lied!

As the decades have passed since Dr. Bacchiocchi proved that Ellen White lied about the source of her information for her claim that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath, one SDA theologian after another has attempted to develop a satisfactory theory to replace her impossible claim. Not one of them has succeeded. If Ellen White had met the biblical tests of a true prophet, no replacement theories would be necessary.

The response of the Church to Dr. Bacchiocchi’s proof that Ellen White lied about her Sabbath visions should teach us, if nothing else, that going to a Sabbatarian church for information about the Sabbath is like going to the manufacturers of artificial tanning equipment to get the truth about the health risks associated with artificial tanning. Or, it is like going to cigarette manufacturers back in the 1980’s and 1990’s to get the truth about the risks of smoking.

Speaking of cigarette companies, it was the discovery of several "smoking gun" internal memos that convinced the courts that the top level management in these cigarette companies knew that their products were addictive and dangerous. This shocking revelation of deception on the part of top management as revealed in these incriminating documents was instrumental in bringing about a successful class action suit against Big Tobacco. These companies failed to provide full disclosure of the truth about the dangers of their products. (In November of 1998, in a massive class-action lawsuit, these tobacco companies were forced to pay back mega-millions of dollars to individuals and government agencies in a landmark decision, the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement. See Wikipedia article of this title.)

In the case of Adventism, we have an uncomfortably comparable situation. There is a similar failure to disclose the terms
of belief that affects the exchange of the Church’s doctrinal “product” for money in the form of tithes and offerings that are demanded by the nature of that belief system. The deceptions of the tobacco companies resulted in destroyed lives. The deceptions of the SDA theology destroy eternal lives.

In 1861 the denomination knew that paying tithe was not biblical for its membership. *The Review and Herald* published James White’s rejection of the old covenant tithe command. "We do not urge the Israelitish tithing system as embracing the whole duty of the believers in the third [angel’s] message…. That system was necessary in God’s plan of the Levitical priesthood; but in the closing message [This message was an obscure reference to an article that appeared in an early Advent Movement publication about giving.] [it] presents a far greater call for something of the kind." *(R&H, April 9, 1861, p. 164).*

It didn’t take long for the Church to abandon its “Systematic Benevolence” model of giving for a tithing model that James White, himself, had earlier determined was not suitable for use outside of the Levitical priesthood, but when the money started rolling in as a result of its later adoption, as a result of a push in favor of it by D.M. Canright, it did not take long for Ellen White to give it God’s stamp of approval through vision. We will have more to say later about how this fiasco made it look like God didn't know which giving system was best for His church, and changed His mind about it when His first idea, revealed to Ellen White in vision, didn't work.

Our research uncovered a collection of SDA "smoking gun memos," both written publicly and in secret– that prove that the Church founders knew there were impossible problems with the Church’s Sabbath doctrine more than 10 years before the denomination formally organized in 1863. We have discussed the 1866 findings of Snook and Brinkerhoff, the broader and deeper damaging evidence brought forward by D.M. Canright beginning in 1887, the *1919 Bible Conference Minutes*, the 1982 Walter Rea book, *The White Lie*, and the *Veltman Report* of 1990. However, the business-as-usual way Adventism has used deception and propaganda to cover up the truth about the factual basis for Adventism goes far deeper yet.

In 1853 (circa) J.N. Andrews attempted to refute the idea, expressed in an anti-Sabbatarian paper by O.R.L. Crosier, that the Sabbath was not instituted at Creation. This proves that Andrews was familiar with the logic and facts behind the concept that the Sabbath was not given to Israel until the Exodus from the very beginning of his early Sabbath research. In the same paper, "Review of Objections to the Seventh-day Sabbath," he concedes that Sunday observance began during apostolic times:

1. We have never said that the keeping of Sunday as a festival, began with Constantine, or originated from the law which he enacted in its behalf. On the contrary, we believe that the Papal apostasy as stated by Paul, began even in the days of the apostles. 2 Thess. 2. Hence we are not surprised that some time after the days of the apostles, men began to pay some regard to Sunday, as also to Good Friday and to Holy Thursday. (p. 8, Para. 8, “Review of Objections to the Seventh-day Sabbath.”)

This document is not dated, but it seems to have been written no later than 1853. You can access this document at this web address for the Early Advent Pioneer Resource Library # 1: [http://temcat.com/L-1-adv-pioneer-lib/Advent-Pioneer.htm](http://temcat.com/L-1-adv-pioneer-lib/Advent-Pioneer.htm)

While Ellen White and J.N. Andrews were embellishing their impossible Roman Catholic Church theory, a contemporary of theirs, Scottish biblical scholar, Robert Cox, had been exhaustively researching the Sabbath Question. We know that Andrews was familiar with Cox’s work because he quotes him, but only to the advantage of his own Sabbatarian agenda– something made possible because Cox’s work represented a cataloging of everything of significance that had been written about the Sabbath Question, whether the source was for Sabbatarianism or against it. In 1865, just two years after the 1863 official organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and only one year prior to the unmasking of Ellen White as a false prophet in 1866 by Snook and Brinkerhoff’s book, *The Visions of E.G. White Not of God*, Cox published his comprehensive two-volume set, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*.

As a catalog of ideas, Cox’s work was about as objective as a book on this controversial study could be. However, as neutral as his presentation was, just the facts as listed in his work proved one thing for certain, and that is that Sabbatarianism has always been opposed by the Christian Church on well-articulated biblical grounds, and many times has been opposed on both biblical and historical grounds. Cox demonstrated that this principle is true whether looking at the writings of the Early Fathers, the Reformers, or the theologians and biblical scholars from the Reformation until the present time. Andrews cites Cox in his later versions of his (Andrews) *History of the Sabbath*, according to Canright, but he seems oblivious to the many fatal-to-Sabbatarian concepts cataloged within its pages. At the conclusion of his section on the writings of the Early Fathers in *Volume One*, Cox made these generalizations:

1. Did they consider the Sabbath as abolished by Christ?
It is universally admitted that they often speak of it as abolished with the other Jewish institutions, and that, if they ever recognize a primeval Sabbath at all, they nowhere allude to it as an institution surviving in Christian times. In the fact of this silence, Holden sees no adequate reason for concluding that they did not however believe in the continued existence of a Sabbath instituted at the Creation; while Domville maintains that the whole tenor of their teaching about the Sabbath is incompatible with the notion that they so believed. (See Heylin, Part I, ch. ii. lii. iv.; Holden, 42, 330; Domville, ii. 130-148; Cook, ii. 291-8; James, 142.) It was a prevailing opinion among them, as after-wards among the Reformers, that the Creator's rest on the seventh day, and likewise the Sabbath of the Jews, were typical of the Christian's rest in the present world from evil works, and in the next from sublunary toils and troubles. This “spiritual Sabbath” on earth they frequently contrast with the “carnal Sabbath” or bodily rest of the Jews (Neale, 88; Domville, I. 295-9; but see Holden, 323-330, and James, 123-6), which no writer before the promulgation of Constantine's Edict recommends to be observed by Christians on Sunday.

2. **Did the Fathers regard the Lord's Day as either the Sabbath shifted to the beginning of the week, or a substitute for the Sabbath?**

All who claim any knowledge of the works of the Fathers say these ancient writers usually, if not invariably, speak of the Lord's Day as an independent institution, of which neither the Fourth Commandment nor a primeval Sabbath is once referred to as the foundation (Heylin, Part II. ch. ii.; Taylor, Life of Jesus, Part II. Sect. Xii Disc. x. ss 24, and Duct. Dubit., B. II. ch. ii. Rule vi. Ss ss 49-53—Works, Heber's ed., iii. 29; xii. 415-421; Baxter, Pract. Works, xiii. 385; Cook, ii. 291-303; Holden, 334; Bannerman, 130; Neale, 90, 237; Domville, I. 291-9; Bunsen, Hippolytus and his Age, iii. 76). Certainly both institutions were long kept, each on its appropriate day, by the oriental Christians; but whether even the converts from Judaism observed the Saturday Sabbath so early as the first century is disputed by some, in spite of Acts xxv. 8 and xxvii. 17, Rom. Xiv. 5, Gal. iv. 10, Philip. lii. 6, and Col. ii. 16, 17. (Bingham, Antiq. Of the Christ. Church, B. xiii. ch. ix. Ss 3; Neader, Hist. Of the Christ. Church, I. 410; iii. 421-2; Holden, 335; James, 157, 164, 169, 170, 179-1818, 193-4, 255; Coleman, 533; Cox, 279-281, 527-9.) How the two institutions were respectively kept, is told by Bingham, B. xvi. ch. viii., and B. xx. ch. ii and iii.

3. **Did the Fathers ascribe the observance of Sunday to the injunctions or example of Jesus or his Apostles?**

In regard to the Fathers who wrote before the reign of Constantine and whose opinions are alone of importance, Domville, after elaborate inquiry, answers this question in the negative; nor can he discover that any of them has appealed to the Christian Scriptures in proof of a Christian Sabbath (vol. i. p. 302, and Supp.; see also Cox, 531, note). Equally unable is Mr. Baden Powell to find that "these writers in any instance pretend to allege any Divine command, or even apostolic practice, in support of its observance." (Kitto's Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit., ii. 270, 1st ed.) Two of them however, Barnabas and Justin Martyr, assign other reasons, of which those given by the one writer differ from those given by the other; each, as Domville shews, assigning as one of his reasons what is either too absurd or too improbable for belief. The credible reason alleged by Justin is, that on Sunday Jesus Christ our Savior arose from the dead. (Domville, i. 307-9.)

In addition to the work of Cox, we know from our study of J.N. Andrews’ work that he was also familiar with the 1613 book, History of the Sabbath, by Peter Heylyn. Access to the 1636 edition of this book has always been widely available to researchers. We could not find a copy of the 1613 edition, so exactly what was in the 1613 edition versus the 1636 edition is not know to us. This monumentally important book saved the Church of England from becoming a nation of Sabbath-keepers by demonstrating the biblical and historical impossibilities of the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath. We will tell you more about the research of Heylyn and Cox later. No wonder neither J.N. Andrews nor Ellen White cared to talk much about its content.

Despite his knowledge of the works of Heylyn and Cox, in 1873 J.N. Andrews published a revised and expanded edition of his 1859 classic, History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week, plus a new book, Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day. With the subsequent release of these books, we have proof that Andrews had immersed himself even more deeply in a wealth of information that would have convinced any prudent scholar that the Roman Catholic Church could not possibly have been responsible for the shift from Saturday to Sunday observance whether Sabbatarianism were true or not. Andrews’ writings are inconsistent in that he conceded on one hand that Sabbath “abandonment” was virtually immediate— evidence, he said, that the "apostasy" began very early— but still pushed the idea that the Roman Catholic Church, which did not come into existence until some 600 years later, apparently deferring to the direct revelation of “fact” of the Roman Catholic Church Theory which Ellen White claimed to have received in vision.

In fairness to Andrews it must be noted that a wide number of eyewitnesses of various persuasions testify to the supernatural activity that frequently accompanied Ellen White's visions. These testimonies cannot easily be dismissed as
merely stories concocted to substantiate a legend, and some of the witness accounts come from outside of the control of Adventist circles. After studying a variety of statements by these witnesses, it is our opinion that it is not reasonable to conclude that her visions were not of supernatural origin. Even table-tipping was observed during one of her visions.

**THE RESPONSE OF THE WORLDWIDE CHURCH OF GOD**

The Worldwide Church of God and the Seventh-day Adventist Church developed from the same group of post-Millerite Sabbath-keeping believers. This group split shortly after the Great Disappointment of 1844 over the Doctrine of the Shut Door as adopted and taught by Ellen G. White. The Church of God Seventh Day split into two factions in 1933, and eventually Herbert W. Armstrong branched off of one of those factions, and his followers metamorphosed into what was officially named *The Worldwide Church of God* in 1968. In a very real way, then, these denominations had shared the same Sabbath heritage from the beginning. (See *Wikipedia* article, “Grace Communion International.” Note: This is the new name adopted by The Worldwide Church of God a number of years after it repudiated the Sabbath and became a fully Gospel-oriented denomination.)

In 1995, The Worldwide Church of God renounced Sabbatarianism, and opened its doors for “business” on Sundays, and apparently became a full-fledged Gospel-oriented denomination. No greater rebuke to the perfidy of Adventist leaders could be offered. The turning from a religious cult to an orthodox, grace-oriented, Evangelical Christian faith had never happened before. The story of the circumstances that led to this unprecedented event represents a stern rebuke to the refusal of Adventist leaders to acknowledge the formidable evidence against its Sabbath doctrine that had accumulated by 1995. Here is what happened.

**Dale Ratzlaff**, a Seventh-day Adventist pastor and Bible teacher, left Adventism in 1981 because he could not find biblical support for Ellen White’s Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. Eventually he also studied his way out of the Sabbath doctrine by reading the research of Robert D. Brinsmead, Carson, and others. In 1990 Ratzlaff published his own refutation of the Sabbath doctrine, *Sabbath in Crisis*, which since has been renamed *Sabbath in Christ* and is widely recognized as the most extensive and authoritative book on the problems of Sabbatarianism. Meanwhile the leaders of The Worldwide Church of God were searching for answers due to most of Armstrong’s prophecies revolving around 1972 and 1975 failing to come to pass. Even in his last book before he died, Armstrong was claiming the end time events leading up to the return of Christ would come about before the end of the 20th century (*The Mystery of the Ages*; p. 298).

Somehow one of the leaders of the Church came across the writings of Brinsmead and Ratzlaff. These findings were presented to the Pastor General, Joseph W. Tkach, Sr., by his son, Joseph W. Tkach, Jr., and a few trusted associates. After studying the evidence, Joseph W. Tkach Sr., initiated the doctrinal change that did away with the Sabbath Doctrine, and in 1995 this former cultic denomination became a Grace-oriented, Sunday-observing Church. Joseph Tkach Sr. died in 1995, and his son, Joseph Tkach Jr., fully implemented the doctrinal changes that led to the denomination’s relatively recent acceptance into the National Association of Evangelicals (WWCG Video, “Called to Be Free, 2004).

There is no doubt that this astonishing development struck terror into the hearts of Seventh-day Adventist leaders everywhere, but there was no effort on their part to follow in the footsteps of their sister church. Apparently they observed the financial disaster that ensued as a result of The Worldwide Church of God’s profound doctrinal changes, and they decided the risk of major doctrinal reform was too great. Truth at any cost is not part of the SDA position or theology.

Money has been a huge problem for both denominations. Here are several remarkable similarities that beg comparison:

1. Both churches had a prophet figure who required their followers to tithe and give generously to the organization on the basis that the “church” is the one and only true church in the entire world.
2. Both denominations taught a version of the Jewish tithing system that is so twisted in its concept that it could not have been applied to Israel back in the days of the theocracy. (Chapter 16 will discuss this subject in detail.)
3. Both organizations developed financial and moral corruption that was way out of proportion to membership size.
4. Both the Seventh-day Adventist Church and The Worldwide Church of God developed this unprecedented financial and moral corruption at almost the same time.
5. Both denominations appear to have developed this large scale corruption because its leaders became increasingly aware that they were following false prophets and that they were teaching their followers to believe what they, themselves, did not believe.

Here is a summary of these parallel developments:
SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH – The Davenport Ponzi Scandal came to a head in 1980-1981 after a decade of multiple revelations of the perfidy of SDA leaders in regard to the cover-up of the problems with the fraudulent claims of Ellen G. White and the Investigative Judgment (Sanctuary Doctrine). A quick look at our historical timeline (See chapter 10) for the 1970’s lists a set of astonishing developments, including the discovery and subsequent publication of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes which proved that SDA leaders had known for certain that she was a fraud since no later than 1919. Samuele Bacchiocchi’s blundering defense of the Sabbath Doctrine in 1977 (From Sabbath to Sunday) betrayed a whole set of problems with the Sabbath that had never been fully encountered before, prompting perceptive Adventists to study their way out of Adventism on the account of two or three areas of difficulty. With Adventism, the financial corruption never dissipated from the early 1980’s until the present day, which we will discuss in Chapter 17.

WORLDWIDE CHURCH OF GOD - A huge financial scandal came to light in 1979 after a series of revelations that the cult’s founder and prophet, Herbert W. Armstrong, had prophesied things that did not happen, the surfacing of the moral problems of Herbert W. Armstrong and his son, Garner Ted Armstrong, and their lavish life-styles. For later comparison with the details of the Adventist record of corruption, here is a condensed version of what happened with The Worldwide Church of God:

Garner Ted Armstrong blamed Stanley Rader for his two-time ousting from his father's church. Garner Ted and other former and discontented members of the Worldwide Church of God prompted the State of California to investigate charges of malfeasance by Rader and others involved with the AICF. By 1979, California Attorney General George Deukmejian had brought civil charges against the church, and the church was placed into an investigative financial receivership for one year.

The group of dissidents also gained the attention of Mike Wallace who investigated the church in a report for the TV program 60 Minutes. Using documentary evidence obtained, Wallace brought to light lavish secret expenditures, conflict of interest insider deals, posh homes and lifestyles in the higher ranks, and the heavy involvement of Stanley Rader in financial manipulation.

Wallace invited Rader to appear on 60 Minutes April 15, 1979. Wallace showed Rader a secret tape recording in which Herbert Armstrong had alleged Rader was attempting to take over the church after Armstrong's death, reasoning that the donated tithe money might be quite a "magnet" to some evangelists. Rader abruptly ended the interview.

Rader, with the approval of Herbert Armstrong, was spending millions to fend off any financial audit or examination of the Church's income and expenditures by litigating the issue all the way to the United States Supreme Court, several times, unsuccessfully. Having lost in the courts, Rader lobbied the California legislature to force the California Attorney General to drop the charges against the church and him. Under Rader's lobbying, the California State Legislature passed legislation known as the Petris Bill, signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, which changed the applicable law of California so that the Attorney General had no authority over churches in such circumstances.

FROM A QUICK OVER-VIEW TO OUR FORMAL STUDY

Next we will transition into an expanded study of the Church’s cover-up of the three pillars of Adventism: (1) The Sabbath (2) The Prophetic Gift of Ellen G. White, and (3) The Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. Ellen White never originated doctrines. It was her habit to take a doctrinal interpretation introduced by someone else and then have a vision from God which validated it as the “truth.” It was Ellen White who, in this manner, chose the doctrines she wanted for her new Church and “gave” them God’s seal of approval. Her greatest triumph was her adoption and promotion of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. This remarkable feat of theological trickery successfully turned the humiliating defeat of the Great Disappointment of 1844 and made it into the Advent Movement, which became the Seventh-day Adventist Church, which began the biggest little Church in the world when measured by several benchmarks.

The Great Disappointment of 1844 was based on William Miller’s poorly conceived use of what he thought were prophetic time periods that all came together to “prove” that Jesus would return in that year. Later we will study the convoluted thinking that led to his prophetic blunder. It is worth noting, also, that Ellen White claimed, –God had shown her that He didn’t want anything changed about his charts, which were largely correct– but which contained the fatal error that led to the hugely embarrassing mistake Miller made. This doctrine was based on a text in Daniel 8:14, in which a word by the King James translators, “cleansed,” mentioned in reference to the Sanctuary, was tied to a supposed prophetic time period that had a certain beginning and would end in 1844. Miller concluded that the sanctuary referred to in the text must refer to the Earth and that the cleansing of the sanctuary meant the cleansing, or destruction, of the Planet Earth at the Second Coming of Christ. When Christ did not return in 1844, a certain farmer- an Advent believer by the name of Hiram Edison– had a sudden epiphany in a cornfield in which God showed him that the sanctuary that was cleansed in 1844 was the sanctuary in Heaven. The Advent believers then studied the sanctuary services associated with the earthly
sanctuary and determined that in 1844 Jesus passed from the Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary into the Most Holy Place. Drawing a parallel with the operations of the earthly sanctuary, the Advent believers concluded that a judgment process began in Heaven in 1844.

This judgment, according to Ellen White, started with the dead in 1844, and at some point unknown to anyone but God, the judgment of the living begins after the last dead person has been judged. When the judgment gets to the name of a living person, that person doesn’t know it, and his or her eternal fate is sealed at that very moment. For logistical reasons, the concept of the Investigative Judgment requires that the dead be truly unconscious, which necessitates the Adventist doctrine of soul sleep.

Down through the history of the Church, many an Adventist leader has questioned this doctrine and lost his Church employment as a result. The Doctrine makes no sense in light of the Gospel, and as the Gospel of salvation by Grace began to make small inroads into Adventism, more and more perceptive Adventists began to see that there was no possible way to reconcile the Gospel with the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment.

In the year 2002, the most respected Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell, published a complete exposé of the Church’s cover-up of its problems with the Sanctuary Doctrine after he retired from Church employment. This essay, "The Sanctuary Doctrine:– Asset or Liability" (2002), the written version of a speech he presented before the Adventist Forum in San Diego, completely dismantled the single most important doctrine of Adventism— the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment— which is also known as the Sanctuary Doctrine. If this doctrine is not true, the Seventh-day Adventist Church cannot possibly be God's specially chosen church for the Time of the End. Dr. Cottrell demonstrated to the point of over-kill that there is no biblical support for it. Additionally he exposed the existence of the Church’s cover-up of its inability to find any evidence from the Bible to support the single doctrine upon which the concept of the unique “truth” of Adventism stands or falls. Ironically the top secret Sanctuary Doctrine General Conference committee could not find any biblical support for the doctrine, and it was disbanded only a few years before the Church defrocked Dr. Desmond Ford at Glacier View Ranch in 1980 for revealing that he could not find any biblical support for it. The General Conference president, Neal C. Wilson, knew that the committee had not been able to find any biblical support for the Sanctuary Doctrine before he flew to the proceedings at Glacier View. Dr. Cottrell had chaired the committee. We will have more to say about Wilson's behavior surrounding this situation shortly.

Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell is widely recognized both inside and outside of Adventist circles as the greatest theologian the Seventh-day Adventist Church has ever had. That the Sanctuary Doctrine has been declared untrue by the greatest of all Seventh-day Adventist theologians is bad news for Adventists. It means that the Great Disappointment of 1844 was a huge theological joke rather than the inaugural event ordained by God to bring the Seventh-day Adventist Church into existence for the express purpose of warning the world about the beginning of the so-called Investigative Judgment in 1844 and the consequences of Sabbath breaking. Worst yet, the total lack of biblical support for this doctrine makes Ellen White’s claim that God used deception to test the faith of the Millerites appear blasphemous. She alleged that God held His hand over certain parts of William Miller’s prophetic charts so His people would not see their own errors:

“I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as He wanted them; that His hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until His hand was removed.” (Early Writings, p. 74.)

Then she alleges that God played another joke on His people later by “un-fooling” them:

“The hand of the Lord was removed from the figures, and the mistake was explained. They saw that the same prophetic periods reached to 1844, and that same evidence which they had presented to show that the prophetic periods closed in 1843, proved they would terminate in 1844.” (Early Writings, p.236.)

Ellen White’s brilliant shifting of the blunders of the prophetic calculations of William Miller to God and the shifting of the cleansing of the sanctuary on Earth to the sanctuary in Heaven was a huge success, but the price she paid for this feat was being tacitly guilty of a “White collar” form of blasphemy, since she accuses God of using a dishonest trick in His dealings with His people.

We will trace the history of the Church’s cover-up of the problems with the Investigative Judgment doctrine in subsequent sections, along with the problems of the Sabbath and Ellen White. Many thousands of hours of research over five years have brought us to the following conclusions, for which we will offer abundant support in the pages of our formal study. Please withhold your judgment until you have read the entire book. The Adventist version of Sabbatarianism is much more complex than that of other Sabbath-keeping churches. Rome was not built in a day. Neither will the Adventist concept that Rome had no Sabbath to “change” be dismantled in a day. Each piece of the Sabbath puzzle must be analyzed to see whether it really fits or not.
From our study we draw the following general conclusions about Adventism and will support these points with the study that follows:

1. The more evident it became to leaders of the Movement that the Sabbath doctrine is biblically and historically impossible, the louder the propaganda that emanated from the Church—in particular the fantastic, fairy-tale story of how the Roman Catholic Church supposedly "changed the Sabbath" from Saturday to Sunday as the result of a diabolical conspiracy.

2. As the factual basis for Adventism was destroyed by a series of block-buster revelations about the Church’s cover-up of the Ellen White affair and the weaknesses of the Sabbath doctrine in the 1970's and 1980's, Seventh-day Adventist leadership became more corrupt than any other small Christian denomination in the history of Modern Christianity, and has remained so ever since.

There are two relatively recent large-scale scandals at the General Conference level that subsequent leadership has refused to investigate and prosecute. One example will suffice. There is no sign that the new General Conference president (as of June 2010), Ted Wilson, plans to clean up the mess created by The David Dennis Affair which surfaced previous to the administration of the General Conference president who preceded him. (Note that David Dennis is the innocent party here, and that he was the whistle blower who called attention to a host of illegal activities at the General Conference, including the buying of General Conference positions of leadership and the ADRA financial scandal.) It is also interesting to note that Ted Wilson is the son of former General Conference President, Neal C. Wilson, who shamelessly lied to the entire Church about the proceedings at the 1980 Investigative Judgment “trial” of Dr. Desmond Ford at Glacier View Ranch. Neal C. Wilson flew back to GC Headquarters in Washington after the trial and announced that the committee unanimously rejected Dr. Ford's ideas when in fact the committee unanimously agreed with Dr. Ford on six of his eight major points and partially agreed with him on the other two points. The following year Wilson received a public written rebuke for his lying which was signed by around 40 SDA scholars who witnessed what really happened at the trial. This document is known as the Atlanta Affirmation.

3. The single most important reason why Seventh-day Adventist Sabbatarians are unwilling to give up their belief in the Sabbath is their non-biblical view of the nature of the 10 Commandments. The Scriptures explain that the set of 10 Commandments represented a covenant between God and Israel. The Bible does not teach that they represent a complete moral code in and of themselves, and God proved this fact Himself by giving Moses additional laws, not written in stone, which have equal moral value, such as laws against the non-adultery sin of fornication (sex between a man and a woman, neither of whom are married), and homosexual relationships. The sins of adultery and fornication are strongly differentiated in Jewish law and culture.

4. The reason for the development of this non-biblical view of the 10 Commandments seems to be the failure of Sabbatarian leaders— and in the case of Adventism, specifically the pioneers of the Advent Movement— to use good Bible study methods. Sabbatarianism is a pleasing theory because it gives the believer a wider role in the working out of his or her own salvation. Adventism was not strongly confronted with the Gospel of Grace until 1888 when Wagner and Jones presented the concept of salvation by faith alone at the Minneapolis General Conference session. The True Gospel message was rejected by the Church at that time, and it is widely acknowledged that Seventh-day Adventists maintained a strong legalistic approach to Christianity for almost the next 100 years largely as a rejection of their message. It seems to us that when someone is confronted with Scripture they do not wish believe, they alter it in order to get Scripture to conform to their beliefs. William Hohmann has spent a significant amount of time analyzing the errors of logic that have created the Sabbatarian belief model, including inference, assumption, drawn out conclusions, proof-texting, altering or redefining words and terms, and the violation of the rules of Critical Thinking. See Bill Hohmann's presentation of logic and Bible study methods in Chapter 16.

We believe the evidence we have provided regarding the specific Sabbatarian theology of the Seventh-day Adventists, as well as Sabbatarian theology in general, demonstrates very serious flaws, not only in regard to the theology and methodology of Sabbatarianism, but also the resultant abuses of power and position that the flawed theology has produced. We also understand that, regardless of how much evidence is presented, advocates of the Sabbatarian position will bitterly resist even the most careful and methodically sound scholarship in favor of a belief system in which they have invested a great deal of time and money.
CHAPTER TWO

The Three Sabbath Crises Of The Christian Faith

ABSTRACT - Chapter Two of Book I unmasks the failure of Ellen White and SDA leaders to disclose key facts about the history of the Sabbath-Sunday debate that are extremely damaging to the credibility of Ellen White's book, *The Great Controversy*. She failed to disclose the fact that major debates over Sabbatarianism arose both at the beginning of the Reformation and during the King James Era, and that in both cases Sabbath-keeping was rejected on biblical grounds, and sometimes on both biblical and historical grounds. The D.M. Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1888 was significant for Adventism, and, although Canright successfully refuted Sabbatarianism at the time, his research appears to have had no significant impact on the Christian World and had very little impact on Adventism itself. The third major Sabbath-Sunday crisis did not occur until the time of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, who, interestingly, conceded so much to Canright while seeking to refute him that it launched the third Sabbath-Sunday crisis of the Christian Faith that led to the D.A. Carson's research team's discovery that Sabbatarianism is flatly contraindicated by the original Hebrew text of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20.

THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION

Ellen White's classic book, *The Great Controversy* purports to give her readers the "history" of why Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping for Sunday observance. A study of what Advent Movement Sabbath historian, J.N. Andrews, knew and wrote about the history of the Early Church proves that he would have to have known that what Ellen White claimed God showed her about the Roman Catholic Church "changing the day" was historically impossible—regardless of whether he thought the Sabbath doctrine was right or wrong. A study of several major research studies published between the King James Era and the contemporary times of Andrews and White suggests that both Andrews and White had to know that her account of the status of the Sabbath during the Reformation in *The Great Controversy* was patently dishonest and plagued with unforgivable errors. For example, this book devotes several chapters to Martin Luther, but she does not disclose the fact that an important Sabbath-Sunday debate arose at the beginning of the Reformation and that Luther was staunchly against Sabbatarianism on the basis of well-reasoned biblical principles. If White had given a fair treatment of her subject, she would have had to discuss the merits of the biblical reasons he gave for opposing the idea that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath.

Sanders observes, "Luther heard Carlstadt's teachings on Sabbath observance and he rejected it. Mrs. White states that "angels of light from God's throne" revealed treasures of truth to Luther. If indeed God had shown Luther "treasures of truth" as stated by EGW, then Luther would have accepted the Sabbath. EGW just could not get it right. He furnishes these two EGW quotes from the Great Controversy:

Ellen White says of him [Luther]: ‘Zealous, ardent, and devoted, knowing no fear but the fear of God, and acknowledging no foundation for religious faith but the holy Scriptures. (p. 120)

Angels of heaven were by his side, and rays of light from the throne of God revealed the treasures of truth to his understanding. (p. 122)

Sanders then contrasts what Luther himself said to what Ellen White claimed God had showed her about him:

**Now hear Luther.** Carlstadt, a zealous and learned Sabbatarian, laid his arguments for the seventh day before Luther, who examined them. Here is Luther's decision in his own words: ‘Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath— that is to say, Saturday— must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised; for that is true and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as the law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all.’ —*History of the Sabbath* p. 457.

Ellen White claims direct divine inspiration for the content of her account of the beginnings of the Reformation and the life of Martin Luther. She holds him up as a righteous man whose example Christians should follow. Apparently the attending “angel” who gave her “divine” guidance in writing *The Great Controversy* had "forgotten" that Luther believed and taught that correct
belief is all that matters— that Grace frees Christians to do anything they want to do without fear of losing their salvation, and he lived his own life accordingly. The facts of Luther's highly immoral life-style should have been readily accessible to Ellen White's attending "angel" in the form of history books written by human authors. Luther sexually plundered the nuns that he freed from Roman Catholic bondage, had a sexual relationship with three women at one time, and only married one of them. He was an abominably heavy drinker. The truth is that his own moral example made Christianity "stink" in the sight of his contemporaries.

Furthermore, Ellen White extolled Luther for his commitment to religious liberty. The truth is that Luther was not committed to religious liberty by any sense of the imagination. We credit Dirk Anderson of www.nonegw.com for these insights into the real life and religious liberty views of Martin Luther. Here is an excerpt from Anderson's research:

"When I am angry, I am not expressing my own wrath, but the wrath of God". Luther knew that he was superior to any man or saint. "St. Augustine or St. Ambrosius cannot be compared with me." "They shall respect our teaching which is the word of God, spoken by the Holy Ghost, through our lips." "Not for a thousand years has God bestowed such great gifts on any bishop as He has on me" (E61, 422). "God has appointed me for the whole German land, and I boldly vouch and declare that when you obey me you are without a doubt obeying not me but Christ" (W15, 27), "Whoever obeys me not, despises not me but Christ." "I believe that we are the last trump that sounds before Christ is coming". "What I teach and write remains true even though the whole world should fall to pieces over it." (W18, 401). "Whoever rejects my doctrine cannot be saved." "Nobody should rise up against me".

Sabbatarian proponents have gone to the trouble to write papers with titles like, “Why The Reformation Failed,” based on the idea that Luther rejected the Sabbath light when it was presented to him. This kind of writing only makes sense if you assume Sabbatarianism is true. These writers also point to the fact that the Council of Trent (1545-1563), which was convened to deal with the Lutheran "heresy," decided to go with the authority of both the Scriptures and church tradition in the formation of its (The Catholic Church's) doctrine and practice on the basis that the Protestants had capitulated to the Mother Church in regard to the change of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. This claim was a Catholic lie, because in the Augsburg Confession (first presented at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530), the Protestants rebuked the Mother Church for its blasphemous claim that it had the authority to change the Sabbath. Then this Lutheran document spelled out the scriptural basis for Sabbath abandonment with many of the same arguments used by anti-Sabbatarians today, demonstrating that it was biblical authority, not church authority, that caused the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by Christians. Pro-Sabbatarian writers quote the following passage from the Confession to prove that the Roman Catholic Church claimed to have changed the Sabbath, while they ignore the significance of the fact that Lutherans understood and utilized biblical reasons for their rejection of Sabbatarianism and called "bluff" on the Catholic Church's claim that it had "changed the day"— something Ellen White either never knew about or chose not to disclose in The Great Controversy:

Moreover, it is disputed whether bishops or pastors have the right to introduce ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, holy-days and grades, that is, orders of ministers, etc. They that give this right to the bishops refer to this testimony John 16, 12, 13: I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth. They also refer to the example of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood and from things strangled, Acts 15, 29. They refer to the Sabbath-day as having been changed into the Lord's Day, contrary to the Decalog, as it seems. Neither there is there any example whereof they [the Mother Church] make more than concerning the changing of the Sabbath-day. Great, say they, is the power of the Church, since it has dispensed with one of the Ten Commandments!

But concerning this question it is taught on our part (as has been shown above) that bishops have no power to decree anything against the Gospel.

Then, after castigating the Mother Church for its presumptions, the Confession outlines the biblical reasons that the Jewish Sabbath was abrogated in apostolic times:

But there are clear testimonies which prohibit the making of such traditions, as though they merited grace or were necessary to salvation. Paul says, Col. 2, 16-23: “Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days. If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not; taste not; handle not, which all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men! which things have indeed a show of wisdom." Also in Titus 1, 14 he openly forbids traditions: “Not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men that turn from the truth.”

The Lutherans exhibit an excellent understanding of the total lack of any intrinsic holiness of any day of the year, and especially that of the Jewish Sabbath, and utilitarian nature of the Church’s decision to designate Sunday as the day of worship and Christian fellowship. A modern anti-Sabbatarian could not have said it better. Please read this passage carefully, as it is packed with significance for the Sabbath-Sunday Question:

It is proper that the churches should keep such ordinances for the sake of love and tranquility, so far that one do not offend another, that all things be done in the churches in order, and without confusion, 1 Cor. 14, 40; comp. Phil. 2, 14; but so that
The observance of the Lord's Day, Easter, Pentecost, and like holy-days and rites. For those who judge that by the authority of the Church the observance of the Lord's Day instead of the Sabbath-day was ordained as a thing necessary, do greatly err. Scripture has abrogated the Sabbath-day; for it teaches that, since the Gospel has been revealed, all the ceremonies of Moses can be omitted. And yet, because it was necessary to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the Church designated the Lord's Day for this purpose; and this day seems to have been chosen all the more for this additional reason, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the keeping neither of the Sabbath nor of any other day is necessary. There are monstrous disputations concerning the changing of the law, the ceremonies of the new law, the changing of the Sabbath-day, which all have sprung from the false belief that there must needs be in the Church a service like to the Levitical, and that Christ had given commission to the Apostles and bishops to devise new ceremonies as necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church when the righteousness of faith was not taught clearly enough. Some dispute that the keeping of the Lord's Day is not indeed of divine right, but in a manner so. They prescribe concerning holy-days, how far it is lawful to work. What else are such disputations than snares of consciences? For although they endeavor to modify the traditions, yet the mitigation can never be perceived as long as the opinion remains that they are necessary, which must needs remain where the righteousness of faith and Christian liberty are not known. (From: The Augsburg Confession)

Therefore, Ellen White's book, The Great Controversy, is not history. It is unabashed propaganda in the worst sense of the word. Her claim that her information came to her from God in vision does not paint a true picture of God's all-knowing Power and suggests that His memory of the events of the Reformation was growing fuzzy by the time He gave Ellen White this information in vision.

From Luther to the King James Era

Your authors do not dispute the fact that there have always been small pockets of Sabbath-keeping Christians, nor that some of them may have been hunted and put to death for their beliefs. The Sabbath heresy has been rediscovered periodically throughout history, and it re-surfaces from time to time as the result of poor Bible study methods, including the attempt to apply the Mosaic Law to a dispensation for which it was never intended. Andrews, White, and the Adventist Sabbatarian apologists who have followed them failed to tell their unsuspecting readers that Sabbath-keeping was opposed on biblical grounds by the Christian Church at virtually all times, including the Early Fathers, the great Reformers, and subsequent Catholic and Protestant scholars—again, on biblical grounds that are consistent and clear.

The more you look into what Andrews and White knew, what they probably knew, and what they should have known, the more reason one has to question their motives and their integrity. Our research indicates that Andrews and White had access to the two most exhaustive histories of the controversy over the Sabbath ever written—Peter Heylyn's 1613 book, History of the Sabbath, published during the reign of King James of England, and the massive two-volume study on the subject by Ellen White's contemporary, Robert Cox, published in 1865. Andrews quotes both Heylyn and Cox. (If they didn't have access to the 1613 edition of Heylyn's book, they would have had access to the later printing, as we did.)

Heylyn compiled an exhaustive biblical and historical study of evidence up through the King James Era that demonstrated to the point of over-kill that Sabbatarianism was impossible. Robert Cox, after discovering Heylyn's work centuries later, compiled an exhaustive list of all the arguments for and against Sabbatarianism from apostolic times through 1865. We quote from Luther's Larger Catechism as quoted in Robert Cox's 1865 book, The Literature of the Sabbath Question, Volume One, p. 127:

God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore, this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are not left free by Christ. But in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe that we keep a festival, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for these have no need of it...But that it is not bound to any particular time, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other...And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelities.

Please note that Luther discussed the church's view of the Sabbath as a festival. Later in our study the understanding that the concept that the Christian church observed Saturday as a FESTIVAL while observing Sunday as the day of WORSHIP is key to correctly interpreting many of the Sabbath-related passages in the writings of the church fathers during the first 500-600 years of the Faith. In many cases the writings of the Early Fathers cannot be properly interpreted without a study of the entire context of
their statements—a fact which requires, in some cases, the reading of the nearly entire work from which the excerpt is taken as well as a study of the context in which the entire work was produced. An analysis of the early, middle, and later work of SDA Sabbath historian, J.N. Andrews, proves that he was aware that the Early Church abandoned the Jewish concept of the Sabbath and created its own, non-sacred-in-itself way of commemorating the Creation of the World by instituting the Sabbath Festival, which was observed on select Saturdays during the liturgical year. Andrews says: "Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's Day." (Testimony of the Fathers, p. 11, quoted in D.M. Canright, The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans.)

According to Cox, the other reformers were of the same opinion as Luther and Melancthon. Cox says in regard to this fact:

The Reformers found more meaning than the Puritans and their followers have done, in Rom. xiv. 5,6, Gal. iv. 10,11 and Col. ii.16,17; while they failed to see in the New Testament any of those indications which the Puritans were the first to discover, of a transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week by Jesus or His apostles. (The Literature Of the Sabbath Question, Vol I, pp. 127,128.)

Melancthon, a close associate of Luther, and who, according to Cox (p. 131), was one of the most learned of the Great Reformers, said this about Sabbath-keeping for Christians:

Of this nature is the observation of the Lord's Day, of Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like holidays and ceremonies. For those who think that the observance of the Lord's Day has been appointed by the authority of the church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches, that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the church appointed for this purpose the Lord's Day, which for this reason also seemed to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that observance, neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary.

Cox's research on John Calvin, who died in 1564, established him as firmly anti-Sabbatarian, even though his comments on Genesis 2 and Exodus 20 suggest that it is possible he might have still believed that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation. Cox quotes from Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion as translated by Henry Beveridge and printed in 1845:

As the truth was delivered typically to the Jews, so it is imparted to us without figure; first, that during our whole lives we may aim at a constant rest from our own works, in order that the Lord may work in us by his Spirit; secondly, that every individual, as he has opportunity, may diligently exercise himself in private, in pious meditation on the works of God, and, at the same time, that all may observe the legitimate order appointed by the Church, for the hearing of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and public prayer; and, thirdly, that we may avoid oppressing those who are subject to us. In this way, we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets, who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment (this they term, in their language, the taxation of the seventh day), while the moral part remains, viz., the observance of one day in seven. But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews. And of a truth, we see what profit they have made by such a doctrine. Those who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews in the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism; so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah (Isa. I.13; viii.13) apply as much to those of the present day, as to those to whom the prophet addressed them. We must be careful, however, to observe the general doctrine, viz., in order that religion may neither be lost nor languish among us, we must diligently attend on our religious assemblies, and duly avail ourselves of those external aids which tend to promote the worship of God. — (Beverly's translation, volume I, p. 466.)

According to the Wikipedia article, "Puritans," the movement got its beginning among the Marian exiles (See Wikipedia article, "Marian Exiles") who earlier had fled England for the Continent to escape persecution, and then returned to England during the reign of Elizabeth I, who came to the English throne in 1559. This article explains that the Puritans adopted Sabbatarian views during this time. It was the combined forces of the Puritan “Sunday” Sabbatarians and traditional “Saturday” Sabbatarians that created the second major Sabbath crisis of the Christian World. In essence, then, the King James Era Sabbath Crisis in England was really a transplanted controversy that had been brewing in Holland for decades or longer prior to its eruption on English soil.

THE KING JAMES ERA CRISIS

Ellen White, in her book, Great Controversy, failed to discuss the significance of the King James Era in regard to the Sabbath-Sunday Question. Therefore, few Adventists know that the Church of England came precariously close to establishing the Sabbath at the same time the King James Bible was being developed and published. We were astonished by the discovery of this event because it seems like such an important part of the history of the Christian Church, now that we know about it. We also see that we probably were never told about it because these events are embarrassing to Sabbatarians. Here is what happened.

Before and after the reign of King James (1603-1625), two tremendously powerful Sabbatarian movements had developed and were putting pressure on the Church of England to keep the Sabbath. One faction was pushing for the adoption of the Jewish Sabbath and the other faction was pushing for the adoption of Sunday observance with Jewish-type Sabbath restrictions.
The King James Bible was published in 1611 under his auspices. Shortly after this, the brewing Sabbath controversy moved King James to turn in desperation to his court chaplain, Peter Heylyn, for help. He ordered him to begin a “Manhattan Project”-like research marathon to provide him an account of all the arguments for and against the idea that Christians must keep the Sabbath. Thanks to Heylyn's comprehensive and definitive research and his “no brainer” approach to the problem, the Church of England did not adopt Sabbatarianism in either form.

Heylyn's monumental work, The History of the Sabbath, was first published in 1611, just two years after the King James Bible was first printed in 1611. The final 1636 edition of Heylyn's book, which we utilize in our research, appears to encompass almost all the arguments used by modern anti-Sabbartarians, with the exception of advanced Hebrew linguistics studies of Genesis and Exodus. His major points were these: (1) Moses goes out of his way to show his readers that the Sabbath commandment was not instituted until the manna was given in Exodus 16, (2) that the Sabbath was given to Israel and to Israel alone, (3) that the Sabbath commandment is predicated by the requirement of circumcision, was ceremonial in nature, and was abrogated at the Cross—officially and publicly being “retired” at the Council of Jerusalem, (4) that Colossians 2:14-17 clearly abrogates the Sabbath, and (5) that the “abandonment” of Sabbath-keeping by the Gentiles was virtually immediate; the adoption of Sunday observance by them being virtually immediate, and that the Early Church observed the seventh day of the week only as a festival. No wonder Ellen White did not discuss these events in the Great Controversy!

Seventh-day Adventists may be especially interested to know that the biblical and historical evidence Heylyn discovered demonstrated that Ellen White's concept that the Roman Catholic Church “changed” the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday was impossible. As we noted earlier, Heylyn's work was familiar to pioneer Sabbath scholar of the Advent Movement, J.N. Andrews. This book has been available to Seventh-day Adventist scholars and historians throughout the history of Adventism. It is difficult to imagine how Ellen White, herself, could have written, as she did, about the King James Era and the 1611 publication of the King James Bible without learning about the biggest Sabbath crisis in the history of Christianity and its summary rebuttal on biblical and historical grounds. It is difficult, also, to imagine that the most prominent Sabbath scholar of the previous century, Seventh-day Adventist theologian Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, wrote as if he were largely unfamiliar with the evidence Heylyn uncovered against the credibility of Sabbatarianism. If any assumptions can be made about this failure to acknowledge the King James Sabbath Crisis, one would have to assume that it received no mention because the pro-Sabbatarians were summarily defeated by Heylyn's clearly defined biblical and historical arguments.

Heylyn also demonstrated an understanding of why Sabbatarianism destroys the Gospel principle that salvation comes by faith alone. In fact Heylyn labeled Sabbatarianism a heresy because its tenets suggest that Sabbath-keeping is ultimately a requirement for salvation.

THE THIRD MAJOR SABBATH-SUNDAY DEBATE:

THE BACCHIOCCHI SABBATH FIASCO OF 1977 ROCKS THE CHRISTIAN WORLD

A fourth surprise was to discover that I was wrong in assuming that the annual Feasts came to an end with the sacrifice of Christ, simply because they were connected with the sacrificial system of the Temple. I came to realize that the continuity or discontinuity of the Feasts is determined not by their connection with the sacrificial system, but by the scope of their typology. If the Feasts had typified only the redemptive accomplishments of Christ's first Advent, then obviously their function would have terminated at the Cross. But, if the Feasts foreshadow also the consummation of redemption to be accomplished by Christ at His second Advent, then their function continues in the Christian church, though with a new meaning and manner of observance. (From the book, God's Festivals in Scripture and History, Volume I: The Spring Festivals, from the chapter, “Preview of the Book,” by Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi)

We cannot classify the Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1887/1888 as a major event in the Christian world. Communication was primitive by today's standards, and Canright made little impact on Adventism despite the depth and breadth of his research. However, Canright laid the groundwork for Dr. Bacchiocchi's Sabbath fiasco by tempting Dr. Bacchiocchi to refute him decades later. Dr. Bacchiocchi's misguided efforts Judaized Christianity to the point of absurdity. This overwhelming evidence that his theory was unbiblical and errant was the primary reason for the strong Evangelical response. Evangelical scholars also took issue with his errant historical conclusions about how Sunday observance replaced Sabbath-keeping. Perceptive Adventists had additional reasons to become disillusioned with Sabbatarianism since Dr. Bacchiocchi proved Ellen White had apparently received misinformation about the subject in her Sabbath visions. The knowledge that the Catholic Church could not possibly have changed the Sabbath eventually led to a close examination of the prophetic time periods Adventists used to prove Adventism, and the result of that scrutiny was a complete rebuttal of how those prophecies applied to the change of the Sabbath. (It is interesting to note that Sunday-observing Christians have often looked at these same prophetic periods and sought to apply them to the papacy, but that they were able to do so without any necessity to involve the Sabbath-Sunday Question with those prophecies.) Our book, Lying For God, provides an account of the cause of the third Sabbatarian Crisis of the Christian Church and the effect it is still having on Sabbath-keeping churches, and in particular, the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
CHAPTER THREE

The Sabbath In The Early Church

ABSTRACT – Chapter Three of Book I documents the fact that the pioneers of the Advent Movement knew even before the Church officially organized in 1863 that Sunday observance had replaced Sabbath-keeping by no later than 200 AD. It did not take the research of D.M. Canright in the 1880's to educate SDA leaders about these historical facts that should have told them that Ellen White’s claim that God showed her that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath was fraudulent. By the time Samuele Bacchiocchi came along in the late 1970's with his research that proved Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD, Adventist leaders had successfully indoctrinated the faithful into thinking that the process of the transition from Sabbath-keeping to Sunday observance was gradual enough to provide enough time to make the Ellen White's teaching that the Roman Catholic Church and the influence of sun worship could have and did contribute to this transition. In this chapter we document how Adventists twist references to the early Christians practice of observing the Sabbath festival as evidence that they continued to keep the Sabbath in significant numbers into the second and third centuries. To conclude Chapter Three, we examine the deficiencies of SDA apologist, Bob Pickle, and his highly creative explanation that Ellen White's theory that the Catholic Church changed the day is actually correct because the requirement to rest on the Sabbath did not become a part of Sunday observance until after the time of Constantine's edict (321 AD).

If the Roman Catholic Church was not responsible for changing the day of worship for Christians from the Jewish Sabbath to “pagan” Sunday— and SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, concedes it was not– the Seventh-day Adventist Church’s prophetess, Ellen White, was a false prophet. She claimed God told her the Catholic Church did so in a vision. If the first Christians had largely abandoned Sabbath-keeping by 100 AD.— as admitted in 1859 by J.N. Andrews, the first Advent Movement Sabbath scholar and historian— it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the first Christians did so because they believed they were following the will of God. Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping so quickly that there was no time for the influence of pagan sun worship or the Catholic Church to play any part in what happened. St. Paul died between 64 AD and 67 AD, and he would have written his last epistle shortly before that— perhaps 63 AD, within only 40 short years of his death, most Christians were worshiping on Sunday. Even Dr. Bacchiocchi concedes that Sunday observance was wide-spread by 100 AD and universal by 140 AD. Note that Andrews conceded 100 AD for the wide-spread practice of Sunday observance four years before the Advent Movement officially organized as the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1863.

Dr. Bacchiocchi’s 140 AD. date seems especially reasonable in view of the extensive writings of two of the earliest Christian writers, Justin Martyr, writing in 155 AD., who was strongly anti-Sabbatarian, and Tertullian, who was born in 160 AD. Tertullian discusses at length the Early Church’s understanding that the Sabbath was first given to Israel in Exodus 16; that the Sabbath was a temporary ordinance to regulate Israel between the Exodus and the cross, and that the ordinance of circumcision was required for Sabbath-keeping. He also documented the fact that while Christians worshiped on Sunday, they celebrated the Creation event with festivities on some of the Jewish Sabbaths at various times of the year, including Passover Week, and discussed at what times of year Christians should fast on these occasions. His writings sound very much like those of the new anti-Sabbatarians who have written about the subject after the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco. You can study his anti-Sabbatarian writings in Appendix III.

At the same time we have every right to question Dr. Bacchiocchi’s scholarly integrity for not mentioning the substantial body of evidence that strongly suggests that Sabbath abandonment/Sunday observance took place almost immediately. By the time Dr. Bacchiocchi wrote From Sabbath to Sunday, historians had dated the Didache, which documents Christians worshiping on the first day of the week, to as early as 50 AD. and no later than 125 AD. More accurately, the Didache is a collection of the first Christian writings, and the section of the document that mentions the practice of Christians worshiping on the first day of the week is believed by some researchers to have been authored around 70 AD.
American scholars seem convinced that this section was probably written between 50 and 70 AD., whereas European scholars tend to think 70 AD. to 125 AD. In Appendix II, you will find our critique of SDA historian, J.N. Andrews’ 1912 study on the Didache. If you look at our historical time line in a subsequent chapter, you will see that D.M. Canright was bombarding Adventist leaders with the fact that Sunday observance happened almost immediately. Adventists should have raised the White flag of surrender at this time, as Canright, once more, had proved that Sunday observance happened much too early to have been caused by the Roman Catholic Church or the influence of pagan sun worship.

As Robert D. Brinsmead so clearly illustrated in his paper, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined” (1981), by the 1960’s a much clearer picture of the Early Church had emerged from continuing scholarly research, and this clearer portrait spelled disaster for Sabbatarians. Church historians found strong evidence that the Gentile churches probably never kept the Sabbath and that the Jewish churches that did cling to Sabbath-keeping slid very quickly into fatal heresies. Constantine’s Sunday law of 321 A.D. didn’t change the day of worship for Christians. It simply made it possible for Christian slaves (and others) to attend church without interference on the same day they had been worshiping on for nearly 300 years—Sunday. In fact this same clearer understanding of the Early Church demonstrates that while the Jewish Sabbath-keeping Christians fell into serious heresies and were lost to Christianity within the first 200 hundred years, the Sunday-observing, Gentile churches supplied the Christian Faith with believers who maintained orthodox Christian doctrines and carried the Gospel to the world. In stark contrast to what Seventh-day Adventists teach their followers, Sabbath-keepers were not the heroes of the Early Church. The Jewish, Sabbath-keeping Christians drifted into the fatal heresies of Ebionism and Gnosticism.

The Sabbath between 200 and 500 A.D.

There are numerous references to the Sabbath by early Christian historians between 200 and 500 A.D. in addition to those of Tertullian. Except for the writings of the heretical sects, including those who rejected the apostleship of St. Paul, none of the early fathers of the Church write in support of the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath so far as we can tell.

The Eastern Orthodox churches never kept the Sabbath. For the first 3-4 centuries after the death of St. Paul the Eastern Church greatly eclipsed the Western Church. In fact, the Church at Rome was a missionary outreach established by the Eastern Church. D.M. Canright in his extensively documented book, The Lord’s Day Neither From Catholics Nor Pagans, gives this appropriate reference provided to him by Raphael Hawaweeny, Bishop of Brooklyn, The Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church, around 1914:

The Longer Catechism of the Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church says:

“Is the Sabbath kept in the Eastern Church?”
“It is not kept strictly speaking.”
“How does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment?”
“She still every six days keeps the seventh, only not the last day of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the day of the Resurrection, or Lord’s Day.”
“Since when do we keep the day of the Resurrection?”
“From the very time of Christ's Resurrection.”

An understanding of the overshadowing supremacy of the Eastern Orthodox Churches during the first few centuries after the death of St. Paul is essential to understanding the immensity of the problem these facts pose to Sabbatarians. It is no wonder that Sabbatarian literature never mentions this subject. A study of Canright’s extensive scholarly research on this subject is well worth the effort for anyone who truly wishes to understand the Sabbath-Sunday question.

Early historians from the East and the West also wrote about the Christian practice of celebrating the Sabbath festival. In these two passages the historians commented on which groups of Christians celebrated it with fasting or by eating the Lord's Supper. Socrates Scholasticus lived approximately between 379 and 450 A.D., and Sozomen between 363 and 420 A.D.:
sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their offerings they partake of the mysteries. At Alexandria again, on the Wednesday in Passion week and on Good Friday, the scriptures are read, and the doctors expound them; and all the usual services are performed in their assemblies, except the celebration of the mysteries. This practice in Alexandria is of great antiquity, for it appears that Origen most commonly taught in the church on those days. He being a very learned teacher in the Sacred Books, and perceiving that the importance of the Law of Moses (Romans 8:3) was weakened by literal explanation, gave it a spiritual interpretation; declaring that there has never been but one true Passover, which the Saviour celebrated when he hung upon the cross: for that he then vanquished the adverse powers, and erected this as a trophy against the devil.— Socrates Scholasticus, circa 379-450 A.D., Ecclesiastical History, Book 5, quoted from www.newadvent.org.

That Socrates Scholasticus is not discussing Sabbath-keeping in this passage is clearly proved by his introductory words to Book 5, Chapter 22. He sounds very much like an anti-Sabbatarian writing after the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco, quoting principles from St. Paul and linking Sabbath-keeping to the ordinance of circumcision:

As we have touched the subject I deem it not unreasonable to say a few words concerning Easter. It appears to me that neither the ancients nor moderns who have affected to follow the Jews, have had any rational foundation for contending so obstinately about it. For they have not taken into consideration the fact that when Judaism was changed into Christianity, the obligation to observe the Mosaic law and the ceremonial types ceased. And the proof of the matter is plain; for no law of Christ permits Christians to imitate the Jews. On the contrary the apostle expressly forbids it; not only rejecting circumcision, but also deprecating contention about festival days. In his epistle to the Galatians, verse, 4:21 he writes, 'Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law.' And continuing his train of argument, he demonstrates that the Jews were in bondage as servants, but that those who have come to Christ are 'called into the liberty of sons.' (Galatians 5:13) Moreover he exhorts them in no way to regard 'days, and months, and years.' (Galatians 4:10) Again in his epistle to the Colossians (2:16-17) he distinctly declares, that such observances are merely shadows: wherefore he says, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of any holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come.' The same truths are also confirmed by him in the epistle to the Hebrews (7:12) in these words: 'For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.' Neither the apostles, therefore, nor the Gospels, have anywhere imposed the 'yoke of servitude' (Galatians 5:1) on those who have embraced the truth; but have left Easter and every other feast to be honored by the gratitude of the recipients of grace. Wherefore, inasmuch as men love festivals, because they afford them cessation from labor: each individual in every place, according to his own pleasure, has by a prevalent custom celebrated the memory of the saving passion. The Saviour and his apostles have enjoined us by no law to keep this feast: nor do the Gospels and apostles threaten us with any penalty, punishment, or curse for the neglect of it, as the Mosaic law does the Jews. (Book 5, Chapter 22, within the first couple of paragraphs) Quoted from www.newadvent.org

Seventh-day Adventist theologians and church leaders, since no later than 1992, have known that this particular passage from Socrates cannot be used to support the idea that Christians were keeping the Sabbath into the 300's and 400's, as evidenced by this assessment by SDA theologians Mervyn Maxwell and Gerald Damsteegt:

In actual fact, Socrates did not say that the churches of Rome and Alexandria had ceased to observe the Lord's Supper (the "sacred mysteries") on the Sabbath, implying that once upon a time they had so observed it. Instead, he said that the churches do not observe the Supper on the Sabbath, leaving the reader to conclude, if he wishes, that the church in these places never did so observe it. (Part 3, Note 27, (C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992, as cited in the internet article, "Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories;" by Michael Morrison, posted on the Grace Community International Web-site.)

Morrison, himself says, “Socrates actually said, "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, do not do this." He was commenting on fourth-century practices, with no implications about what had been done in earlier centuries. His comment cannot be used as evidence about the second century, especially if it contradicts all the other evidence we have from second-century documents.

Another early historian, Sozomen, mentions the term Sabbath in only one passage in his entire history of the church. He lived between circa 375 and 447 A.D. It is mentioned only in the concept, once more, of which groups fasted on the Sabbath “festival” or celebrated the Lord's Supper on it. He states, as you will notice, that he has digressed from his main topic to address the concept of fasting:

In some churches the people fast three alternate weeks, during the space of six or seven weeks, whereas in others they fast continuously during the three weeks immediately preceding the festival. Some people, as the Montanists,
only fast two weeks. Assemblies are not held in all churches on the same time or manner. The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usage established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings, and, although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited nor the same selections read on the same occasions in all churches. Thus the book entitled The Apocalypse of Peter, which was considered altogether spurious by the ancients, is still read in some of the churches of Palestine, on the day of preparation, when the people observe a fast in memory of the passion of the Saviour. So the work entitled The Apocalypse of the Apostle Paul, though unrecognized by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. Some persons affirm that the book was found during this reign, by Divine revelation, in a marble box, buried beneath the soil in the house of Paul at Tarsus in Cilicia. I have been informed that this report is false by Cilix, a presbyter of the church in Tarsus, a man of very advanced age, as is indicated by his gray hairs, who says that no such occurrence is known among them, and wonders if the heretics did not invent the story. What I have said upon this subject must now suffice. Many other customs are still to be observed in cities and villages; and those who have been brought up in their observance would, from respect to the great men who instituted and perpetuated these customs, consider it wrong to abolish them. Similar motives must be attributed to those who observe different practices in the celebration of the feast which has led us into this long digression.—*The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, bk. 7, ch. 19. (Quoted from: www.newadvent.org)

Additionally, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which can be dated from 375 to 380 AD. (*Wikipedia* article, “Apostolic Constitutions”), mentions the Sabbath. Leading to much confusion is the fact that Chapter 7 is a “remake” of the still more ancient document, the *Didache*. One section of the *Didache* talks about the first Christians meeting together on the Lord’s Day (Sunday) for worship, and early church historians have dated this section of the *Didache* to between 50 AD. and 125 AD. Since the Christian church observed the Sabbath as a festival, rather than keeping the Sabbath and often debated about whether or not one should fast on the Sabbath festival, it is easy to assume, incorrectly, that these references provide support for Sabbatarianism. A passage like this one, taken out of context, does not do justice to the problem because it ignores its relevance to fasting and that fasting in regard to the Sabbath “festival”:

“...But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord’s day festival;....”

As D.M. Canright documented from a variety of historical sources in his classic *The Lord’s Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans*, the Eastern Orthodox churches never kept the Sabbath, worshiped on Sunday from the very beginning of its history, and recognized the memorialization of Creation with festive activities on selected Sabbaths. As evidenced by the writings of Western church writers, the practice of observing the Sabbath festival was wide-spread enough to merit their comment. Let us examine the entire context of the reference to the Sabbath in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Book 7:

**WHICH DAYS OF THE WEEK WE ARE TO FAST, AND WHICH NOT, AND FOR WHAT REASONS.**

But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; (15) for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week. But do you either fast the entire five days, or on the fourth day of the week, and on the day of the Preparation, because on the fourth day the condemnation went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray Him for money; and you must fast on the day of the Preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the cross under Pontius Pilate. **But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord’s day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord’s burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival.** For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures.

The author of the above statement specifically states that there is only one Sabbath of the year that is to be observed with fasting. Additional study of the *Constitutions* reveals that the early Christians honored the Passover Week with fasting on set days of that week and no fasting on the other days of that one particular week of the year.

We recommend that our readers do a search for the *Apostolic Constitutions* and search the entire document for all references to the word “sabbath.” Here is what you will find:

These references to the Sabbath refer to the Sabbath festival.

Virtually all references to the Sabbath are in regard to whether or not fasting should be done on the day of the Sabbath festival.

The case for using the *Apostolic Constitutions* to teach that Christians were keeping the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word through the 300’s into the 400’s is extremely weak to non-existent.
Can Bob Pickle's Sunday “Rest” Theory Save Ellen White?

Bob Pickle is a highly articulate apologist for Adventism, its Sabbath doctrine, and its Church prophetess, Ellen G. White. He contends that Ellen White was right in teaching that the pope changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, despite the very early universal adoption of Sunday worship, because Christians did not rest on Sundays until after Constantine ordered cessation from labor on that day in the early 300's. He reasons that the sanctity of the Sabbath was not actually transferred to Sunday until the Sabbath rest was changed from the Jewish Sabbath to "pagan" Sunday. This is an interesting approach to solving the Ellen White problem because the idea of resting from labor on Sunday did happen as a result of Constantine's new Sunday law. It is most interesting to observe that Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi has no such illusions about whether or not Ellen White's theory of how Sabbath-keeping began could be reconciled in this way. He publicly stated that he disagreed with Ellen's position on the matter:

In an E-mail message to the "Free Catholic Mailing List" catholic@american.edu on 8 Feb 1997 [Bacchiocchi] said:

I differ from Ellen White, for example, on the origin of Sunday. She teaches that in the first centuries all Christians observed the Sabbath and it was largely through the efforts of Constantine that Sunday-keeping was adopted by many Christians in the fourth century. My research shows otherwise. If you read my essay HOW DID SUNDAYKEEPING BEGIN? which summarizes my dissertation, you will notice that I place the origin of Sunday-keeping by the time of the Emperor Hadrian, in A. D. 135.” (Posted at Bible.ca and available via search on Dr. Bacchiocchi's web-site, Biblical Perspectives.)

Here is an analysis of this interesting attempt to salvage Ellen White's historical blunders:

First, there is no sanctity to transfer. The Sabbath literally expired at the death of Christ. St. Paul clarified that under the New Covenant. No day has any sacred importance in itself. The early Christians did not rest on Sunday because they did not think of it as a "Sabbath."

Second, since the Gentile churches probably never kept the Sabbath and certainly did not after the Council of Jerusalem, and since all Christians, including the Jewish Christians, did not keep the Sabbath on a universal basis after 140 AD, they were working on Saturdays or having a festival on some of those Saturdays. There was no “resting” left for Constantine to transfer from Saturday to Sunday by the 300's. Christians, and especially the Gentile Christians, began "desecrating" the Sabbath immediately by doing anything on that day that they wished to do, forsaking all Jewish associations with that day from almost the beginning of the Faith.

Third, it was the little horn of Daniel 7 that was to change “times and laws.” Even if this little horn somehow symbolized the papacy (The prophecy was literally fulfilled by the Roman Emperor, Nero.), which did change times and laws that made its brand of Christianity almost unrecognizable in comparison to the early years of the Faith, the little horn did not come into existence until after 500 AD, and Sunday observance was universal by no later than 140 AD. There is no way to rationalize that the little horn existed before 500 AD according to the wheel-within-a-wheel “prolepsis” concept Adventists use to force Antiochus Epiphanes to symbolize something that would come at some time in the future [the papacy], because the prolepsis concept, but its very definition, does not work in retrospect. A new entity is not used to represent an earlier one. Adventists cannot have their cake and eat it too. As you will see in a revealing transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes, the Adventist leaders of 1919 understood this problem and struggled with their effort to prop-up their prophetess' claim that the papacy (the little horns of Daniel 7,8,11) changed the Sabbath.

Fourth, Pickle ignores the problem that Rome had no more influence than any other bishopric in the Christian world of that era of early church history, and the Greek Orthodox Church was the very center of Christian influence, doctrine, and practice, greatly over-shadowing Rome, even controlling it and deposing bishops of Rome who strayed from orthodox teachings. We will discuss the eclipsing power of the Eastern Church later, and a complete study is available in Appendix IV.

How, then, can anyone say that the Sabbath was not “changed” until the time of Constantine when from almost the very beginning of the Christian Faith, the Gentile Christians constantly violated the Jewish Sabbath by not ceasing from labor and by celebrating it as a festival? By the Old Covenant Sabbath laws, Christians observing the Sabbath after their own ideas, would create activity which would demand they be stoned. These Christians were likely picking up firewood for their celebrations and making food. One early Christian writer instructed his readers not to eat food that was prepared the day before, which would be Friday! (This quotation will be included in a later discussion.) The “sancity” of the Sabbath was trampled on from the very beginning, at least by the Gentile Christians, and, according to Dr. Bacchiocchi, Sunday observance was “universal” by 140 AD, which means that even Christians of Jewish descent who chose to remain in the Gospel— rather than to become a part of the Sabbath-keeping, Paul-hating Ebionite heresy— never again kept the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word.
CHAPTER FOUR

Where Sunday Observance Came From
And
Where It Didn't Come From

ABSTRACT - The fourth chapter of Book I explains not only where Sunday observance came from, but where it did not come from. Since the first Christians were Jews, they understood the dependency of Sabbath-keeping to the ordinance of circumcision. Reading Genesis and Exodus in their own native Hebrew, they understood that the Sabbath ordinance was not instituted until the giving of the manna at the time of the Exodus. Therefore, when the Council of Jerusalem officially ruled that circumcision was not to be required of the Gentile Christians, the Jewish Christians immediately understood that Sabbath-keeping could never be an issue again. This is why there is no controversy about Sabbath-keeping until the time of the Reformation. Since the Western Church in later centuries dramatically came to eclipse the power and influence of the previously dominant Eastern Church (as it was during the time when Sunday observance “replaced” Sabbath-keeping), and since the power, glory, and influence of the Eastern Church in these early centuries is easily forgotten, we theorize that SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, received a bloated picture of the power of Rome during these formative centuries because he did his studies at the Gregorian Pontifical University at the Vatican. Since Rome was of minor importance during the first few centuries of the development of Christian doctrine and practice, and since the Eastern (Greek Orthodox) Church was the dominant influence for the Faith during this time, Christian doctrine and practice moved from East to West. Since the Eastern Church’s meticulous record keeping proves that it never kept the Jewish Sabbath, and since the Eastern Church established, nourished, and controlled the Church at Rome during the first few centuries, Rome clearly got its Sunday observance from the Greek Orthodox Church. Looking for theories of how Sunday observance might have developed in the West is an exercise in futility, and all of these theories have been refuted not only by biblical scholars but by our own independent study.

Sunday observance replaced Sabbath-keeping in the Early Church, but how that happened was not in concert with the popular fiction as taught by the Adventist church. With Ellen White claiming the pope “changed the day” from the Sabbath to Sunday, it is implied that the Early Church treated and observed Sundays as one would observe the Sabbath. However, the Jewish Christians did continue in the Law, and as such, would have been keeping the Sabbath by resting from labor on that day, remaining for the most part in their dwellings as per the Sabbath commandment. On Sundays, they would have been free to meet in fellowship with their Gentile counterparts for table fellowship along with corporate worship and prayers, which example we see in Acts 20:7.

What, then, if the Gentile Christians were observing Sundays along the lines of the Sabbath? The Jewish Christians would not have been able to have any concourse with the Gentile Christians for the same reasons! What Jesus’ death had accomplished in order to bring the two disparate groups together would have been undone and reversed by the early church had they observed Sundays along the pattern of the Sabbath!

Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; 2That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: 3But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. 4For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; 5Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; 6And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: 7And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. 8For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto
Sundays had no sacredness associated with it in the early Church. Early writings show that Christians either gathered early on Sunday mornings for communal worship and prayers before going off to work on that day, or meeting together after work on that day for the same purpose as well as to share a communal meal.

But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. (Justin Martyr (65-155 AD.) From: The First Apology of Justin, Chapter LXVII.-Weekly Worship of the Christians.)

The early church associated Sundays with the resurrection of Christ. His resurrection ushered in a new beginning that was not to be trivialized.

The first Christians were Jews and they understood, as Hebrews, reading the books of Moses in their own language, that the Sabbath ordinance was not given at Creation. They understood the subordinate relationship of the Sabbath to the ordinance of circumcision. It was Jewish Christians who, at the Council of Jerusalem, vetoed the move by the Pharisaical members to require the new Gentile believers coming into the Church be circumcised. If these Jewish Christians had not recognized that the jurisdiction of the Law had ended at the cross before the Council of Jerusalem, they would have had to realize it after.

What is at stake here, for inquiring Adventists, is whether there is any hope of salvaging Ellen White’s concept that Sunday observance began in the Western Church (Rome). If it did not develop in the Western Church, her claim that God showed her in vision that the pope changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday is clearly fraudulent. In this chapter we focus on the facts that prove (provide evidence beyond any sensible doubt) that the tradition of Sunday observance began virtually immediately in the East and was taken to the West by its missionaries. Keep in mind that the Church at Rome was established as a mission by the Eastern Church, and, as we will see, it was nourished and essentially controlled by it for the first few hundred years of the Christian Faith.

Where The Tradition of Sunday Observance Came From:

The Eastern Orthodox Church

Since Rome became so powerful in later centuries, it is so easy to forget that for the first few hundred years of the Christian Faith, the Eastern Church (think Eastern Orthodox Church) was the center for the development of Christian doctrine and practice. The Eastern Orthodox Church kept excellent records from its very beginning, and those records show that it never kept the Jewish Sabbath. The center of political power shifted to the East (think Asia versus Europe) when Constantine moved the seat of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 324 AD. The emperor didn't move the bishop of Rome to Constantinople with him. Please study Appendix IV for proof of this fact to the point of over-kill.

Therefore, speculating about how Sunday observance might have developed in the West (Rome) is an exercise in futility. All the theories developed by SDA scholars to place the development of Sunday observance in the West have been successfully refuted, and these theories include (1) Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's Jewish Persecution Theory, (2) Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's "Influence of Sun Worship Theory," (3) the Dual Day Theory as developed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and (4) Kenneth W. Strand's Out of Easter Theory.

During the time that Adventists claim all these various influences were forging Sunday observance in the West (Rome), all Christian doctrine and practice was flowing from the East to the West. As the significant councils of the Christian Faith began to be held, they were conducted in the East, and the bishop of Rome traveled to Asia to participate as one of a number of other bishops from the Christian world of their day. These bishops returned at the conclusion of these councils to implement these canonical decisions in their own bishoprics. In a manner of speaking, the bishop of Rome received his “marching orders” from the East as did all the other bishops from around the Christian world.

If we did not already know that Sunday observance and Sabbath breaking was universal by 140 AD– and if we did not already know that the Eastern Church never kept the Sabbath– and if we did not already know that Christian doctrine and practice always originated in the East and flowed to the West– we would conclude that the Western Church (Rome) did
not develop the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking on its own, but that such was imposed on it around 363-365 AD by the Council of Laodicea.

While not classified as one of the “great councils,” the Council of Laodicea, circa 363-365 AD, was also held in the East. Laodicea is located in what is modern-day Turkey, and is not to be confused with the Laodicea in Syria. (See Wikipedia article, “Council of Laodicea.”) This council was convened to address many questions, including which books should be in the Bible and the Sabbath-Sunday question. Please read Canon #29 carefully:

Canon 29: Christians must not judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honouring the Lord's Day; and, if they can, resting then as Christians. But if any shall be found to be judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ. (See http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3806.htm, New Advent is a Roman Catholic web-site.)

Notice that the Council, by its directive to have Christians rest on Sunday IF THEY CAN, purposed to establish Christian practice (think tradition) rather than Christian doctrine in regard to resting on Sunday. If the Council had intended to transfer the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, resting would not been treated as an option. The Council wished to provide a day where Christians could worship God and spend time with their families.

This provision of Canon #29 casts even more doubt on Bob Pickle’s SDA theory that one can still say that the pope changed the Sabbath because this “change” was not complete until rest required by the Jewish Sabbath was transferred to Sunday. This rest was optional, and the intent was not to make the resting provision a Christian doctrine.

Like all the other bishops in the Christian world, the bishop of Rome continued to receive— not impart— Christian doctrine and practice throughout all the centuries through which Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking developed. Note that as discussed in the comments of R.J. Baukham in the next section, the bishop of Rome utterly failed to influence the other bishops of his day to adopt his preferred date for Easter and to enforce the Sabbath fast. It is not very realistic to think that he would have had a chance to improve Sunday observance on the entire Christian church, even if he had tried to do so. A review of the Great Councils of the East clearly demonstrates that the center of Christian thought was in the Eastern Orthodox Church during the entire period of time that Adventists like to talk about the role of Rome in establishing Sunday observance, and even to centuries beyond that point: (See Wikipedia article, “First Seven Ecumenical Councils”):

The First Seven Ecumenical Councils, as commonly understood, are:

1. First Council of Nicaea (325)
2. First Council of Constantinople (381)
3. Council of Ephesus (431)
4. Council of Chalcedon (451)
5. Second Council of Constantinople (553)
6. Third Council of Constantinople (680)
7. Second Council of Nicaea (787)

The first council held in the West, Lateran, was held in the year 1123 in the Basilica in Rome after the Great Schism between the Eastern and Western churches had existed for some time.

Nicaea, the home of the First Great Council, took place about 40 years before the Council of Laodicea in what is now present day Turkey in 321 AD. While Roman Catholics like to claim that it was the Bishop of Rome who was responsible for establishing the doctrine of the full divinity of Christ at this Council, Protestants quote the following Council’s statement that shows that the Bishop of Rome was mentioned only as a peer with the bishops of other major jurisdictions:

“Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis, prevail. Let the Bishop of Alexandria has jurisdiction over all of these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the churches retain their privileges (Canon 6).”

The Wikipedia article, “First Council of Nicaea,” makes this interesting observation:

“According to Protestant theologian Philip Schaff, ‘The Nicene fathers passed this canon not as introducing anything new, but merely as confirming an existing relation on the basis of church tradition; and that, with special
reference to Alexandria, on account of the troubles existing there. Rome was named only for illustration; and Antioch and all the other eparchies or provinces were secured their admitted rights. The bishoprics of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch were placed substantially on equal footing. (Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, pp. 275-276.)

Where The Tradition Of Sunday Observance Did Not Come From

THE CHURCH AT ROME COULD NOT HAVE ORIGINATED IT

Dr. Bacchiocchi theorizes that the Church at Rome, which developed into the Roman Catholic Church some hundreds of years later, might have had a significant role pushing Christians away from the Jewish Sabbath to adopt Sunday observance. Bacchiocchi theorized that it was the supposedly preeminent authority of the bishop of the Church at Rome (the predecessor of the Roman Catholic Church) that influenced the entire church to adopt the “new” practice of Sunday observance (From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 207-212). R.J. Baukham, who lectured in the Department of Theology at the University of Manchester, said this about Dr. Bacchiocchi’s theory in his essay, “Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church:"

This is probably the weakest of Bacchiocchi’s arguments, but it is essential to his thesis. Only this assertion of the primacy of Rome can begin to explain how a custom originating in the early second century could have become as universal in the Christian church as Sunday worship did.

Against Bacchiocchi’s argument, it must be said that the evidence he presents for the authority of the church of Rome in the second century is not convincing. The church of Rome had great prestige, but the kind of jurisdictional authority his thesis presupposes is anachronistic in the second century. No church of that period had sufficient authority to change the weekly day of worship throughout Christendom. Furthermore, Bacchiocchi’s other two examples of liturgical change in the second century, the Sunday Easter and fasting on the Sabbath, do not, as he thinks, support his case, but rather highlight its weakness. Whether or not Bacchiocchi is correct in locating the origin of the Sunday Easter in early second-century Rome, it is quite clear that the see of Rome did not have the authority to impose it on the rest of the church. It was not until the end of the second century that bishop Victor of Rome attempted to convert the Quartodeciman churches to the observance of the Sunday Easter, and his attempt encountered stubborn resistance in Asia. Similarly, the church of Rome was singularly unsuccessful in promoting the practice of fasting on the Sabbath. As Bacchiocchi himself admits, as late as the fifth century it was still confined to the church of Rome, itself and a few other western churches. Both in the case of the Sunday Easter and in the case of the Sabbath fast, the surviving historical records indicate considerable debate and controversy in the churches.

It therefore seems extremely unlikely that already in the early second century the authority of the Roman see was such that it could impose Sunday worship throughout the church, superseding a universal practice of Sabbath observance handed down from the apostles, without leaving any trace of controversy or resistance in the historical records. Bacchiocchi’s own comparison with Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast shows up the difficulty of his explanations of the origins of Sunday worship. Like all attempts to date the origins of Sunday worship in the second century, it fails to account for the universality of the custom. Unlike the Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast, Sunday worship was never, so far as the evidence goes, disputed. There is no record of any Christian group (except the extreme part of the Ebionites) that did not observe Sunday, either in the second century or in later centuries of the patristic era. (From Sabbath to Lord’s Day, Carson, p.271, 272)

Michael Morrision, in his article, “Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories,” posted at the Grace Community International Web-site, provides a list of additional reasons that provide evidence that the Roman Church did not have the power to legislate any particular practice to the other churches in the Roman Empire:

As evidence that Rome did not have such power, we can note:

Ignatius does not greet a bishop of Rome.

Irenaeus disagreed with the bishop of Rome regarding policy toward Quartodecimans.

Polycarp and Polycrates acted as equals with the bishop of Rome.

It was only with difficulty and recorded controversy that Rome pressured a change in the date of Easter for one area in Asia Minor.

Even in later centuries, Rome was unable to force other cities to observe the seventh day as a fast day.
In the fourth century, when many Eastern Christians began to observe the Sabbath as well as Sunday, Rome was unable or unwilling to stop the practice (Kenneth A. Strand, "From Sabbath to Sunday in the Early Christian Church: A Review of Some Recent Literature. Part II: Samuele Bacchiocchi's Reconstruction," Andrews University Seminary Studies (AUSS) 17 (1979), pp. 96-99. Strand also notes that "Christian influences were still moving largely from East to West rather than vice versa" (Sabbath, p. 332, n. 22).

Now we know exactly where Sunday observance came from. It started at the Council of Jerusalem (See Acts 15.), if not before, and immediately became the tradition of the Eastern Church, which from the beginning was the center of Christian belief, practice, and influence for the first 700-1,100 years of the Faith. The practice of Sunday observance spread from the East to the West– not from the West to the East. The doctrines of Rome were imposed on it by the important church councils, all of which were held in the East. There is no evidence that Rome originated and imposed one single doctrine or practice on the Christian world until many centuries after the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking had become the unquestioned, universal practice of the Christian Faith.

**IT DIDN'T COME FROM COMPROMISE WITH “PAGAN” SUN WORSHIP INFLUENCES**

Dr. Bacchiocchi tried to salvage at least a part of Ellen White’s conspiracy/apostasy theory– that pagan sun worship influenced Christians to adopt Sunday observance. The sun has always had its worshipers throughout the world, especially in ancient times. For Dr. Bacchiocchi’s theory to have credibility, he must prove two things beyond reasonable doubt. **First**, he must demonstrate that sun worship was popular enough in the Roman Empire between 100 and 140 AD. to potentially have influenced Christianity in the choice of a day of worship on the basis of a perceived need for commonality. **Second**, he must provide adequate evidence to show a high degree of probability that it actually DID influence Christianity in this manner. The more incredible any theory appears to be, the greater demand there is that the supportive arguments be strong.

In Dr. Bacchiocchi’s book, *Sabbath under Crossfire* (1998), Dr. Bacchiocchi spends nearly an entire chapter discussing the possibility that this sun cult or that sun cult was popular between 70 and 140 AD., but there is no consensus among his sources. **Requirement #1, therefore, is not met.**

In the remainder of this same chapter, Dr. Bacchiocchi attempts to prove that the Romans were using a 7-day calendar that corresponded with the 7-day Jewish calendar. It is painfully evident that he is grasping at straws to show that a 7-day calendar had even limited use anywhere in the Roman Empire during this period of time. Most of the historical sources we could locate indicate that the Romans used an 8-day calendar during New Testament times and that the day named in honor of the sun was the second day of that 8-day week. These sources are fairly consistent in stating that, so far as can be reconstructed, the Romans did not adopt a 7-day calendar until around 300 AD.. On the other hand there are a few sources we found which see evidence that the Roman Empire might possibly have adopted a 7-day week 100 years or more before the birth of Christ, but that the vast majority of Romans continued using the customary 8 day week. Robert Cox, a contemporary of Andrews and White who is quoted in other areas by Andrews, examined this historical question. You would think this book would have been available to J.N. Andrews and Ellen White in that Era. Here is what Cox says in his chapter entitled “Origin And Prevalence Of The Week:”

> The opinion, still frequently expressed, that the week is and ever has been a universal institution, appears to be now untenable. Although anciently employed by the Hindoos, Assyrians, and Egyptians, the week was unknown to the Greeks and Etrurians, and was adopted by the Romans only in the second century, when they borrowed it from Egypt.

In his book *From Sabbath to Sunday*, Dr. Bacchiocchi states that some historians believe that a 7-day calendar was in widespread use in the Roman Empire by the latter part of the Second Century (150-199 AD.). The transition from Sabbath keeping to Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD.. With the day named in honor of the sun only occasionally being the same 24 hour period as the first day of the Jewish calendar (Sunday), how could Christians, prior to 140 AD. have been tempted to adopt Sunday observance so the day of worship would be the same as that of the pagans they were trying to convert? On top of all these challenging questions, we must ask why this entire topic is worthy of discussion, since we have documented proof that at least the Gentile churches were observing Sunday as early as 50 AD. or 70 AD., and on a wide-spread basis by 100 AD..

**Requirement #2, therefore, is not met.** There is no proof; no credible evidence. Almost no amount of imagination can “connect the dots” to fulfill the second requirement demanded by the principles of logic.

Incredibly, Dr. Bacchiocchi concedes the following in regard to his theory of the influence of sun worship on Sabbath abandonment:
The association between the Christian Sunday and the pagan veneration of the day of the Sun is not explicit before the time of Eusebius (ca. AD. 260-340)... From Sabbath to Sunday, p. 264.

Dr. Bacchiocchi concedes, as we have discussed, that the adoption of Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD., but it is not until 260-340 AD. that there are definite traces in historical records to show that one or more sun worshipping cults held Sunday to be a sacred day of cult worship. Prior to that time, however, it is extremely difficult to show any possible connections between sun cults and the phenomenon of the rapid adoption of Christian Sunday observance. As noted before, the Romans used an 8-day week with the day named in honor of the sun being the second day of that 8-day week. The 7-day week was by no means universal in these ancient cultures. It would only make sense that there could be no traces in the historical records that sun-worshipping cults had special ceremonial activities on the “Sun Day” that we know of as the first day of a seven-day week before the cultures in which they existed had adopted a seven-day weekly cycle.

Finally, if Dr. Bacchiocchi’s apostasy theory were true, we would be forced to believe that the early Christians were willing to break the Sabbath, which they supposedly would have believed was an eternal, moral principle, while at the same time they were willing to give up their lives rather than to commit more tangible moral sins such as bowing the knee to an idol or publicly renouncing Christ.

R. J. Baukham, in his essay, “Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church,” answers Dr. Bacchiocchi as follows:

Bacchiocchi argues that the reason why the church of Rome adopted Sunday as the Christian day of worship, instead of the Sabbath, was that the pagan day of the sun, in the planetary week, had already gained special significance in pagan sun cults, and by adopting this day Christians were able to exploit the symbolism of God or Christ as sun or light, which was already present in their own religious tradition.

Bacchiocchi here underestimates the resistance to pagan customs in second century Christianity. The desire for differentiation from paganism had deeper Christian roots than the second-century desire for differentiation from Judaism. It is true that, from Justin onwards, the Fathers exploited the symbolism of the pagan title “Sunday,” but to have actually adopted the pagan day as the Christian day of worship because it was prominent in the pagan sun cults would have been a very bold step indeed. Even if the church of Rome had taken this step, it becomes even more inexplicable that the rest of the church followed suit without argument. (D.A. Carson, ed., From Sabbath to Lord’s Day, p. 272)

Mithraism is the sun cult that Sabbatarian apologists like to blame for being the most influential in causing the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping for the adoption of the so-called “pagan” Sunday as the day of worship for Christians. Bacchiocchi knew of this possible link, but declined to say that he had proof that such was the case. With Mithraism had been present in the Roman Empire for a few centuries before Christ, it did not reach its peak of popularity until a couple of hundred years after Sunday observance had become universal. Here is what The Encyclopedia Wikipedia has to say about the relationship of Mithraism with Christianity. You can read it in its full context at this link:

http://www.faculty.umb.edu/gary_zabel/Courses/Phil%20281b/Philosophy%20of%20Magic/Pythagoras,%20Empedocles,%20Plato/Mithraism.htm

Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the legions from the east in the first century BC. As an action god of armies and the champion of heroes, he appealed to the professional Roman soldiers, who carried his cult to Iberia, Britain, the German frontiers and Dacia.

The cult of Mithras began to attract attention at Rome about the end of the first century AD, perhaps in connection with the conquest of then-Zoroastrian Armenia. The earliest material evidence for the Roman worship of Mithras dates from that period, in a record of Roman soldiers who came from the military garrison at Carnuntum in the Roman province of Upper Pannonia (near the Danube River in modern Austria, near the Hungarian border). These soldiers fought against the Parthians and were involved in the suppression of the revolts in Jerusalem from 60 A.D. to about 70 A.D. When they returned home, they made Mithraic dedications, probably in the year 71 or 72.

Statius mentions the typical Mithraic relief in his Thebaid (Book i. 719,720), around A. D. 80; Plutarch's Life of Pompey also makes it clear that the worship of Mithras was well known at that time.

By A. D. 200, Mithraism had spread widely through the army, and also among traders and slaves. The German frontiers have yielded most of the archaeological evidence of its prosperity: small cult objects connected with Mithras turn up in archaeological digs from Romania to Hadrian's Wall.

At Rome, the third century emperors encouraged Mithraism, because of the support which it afforded to the divine nature of monarchs. Mithras thus became the giver of authority and victory to the Imperial House. From the time of Commodus, who participated in its mysteries, its supporters were to be found in all classes.

Concentrations of Mithraic temples are found on the outskirts of the Roman empire: along Hadrian's wall in northern England three mithraea have been identified, at Housesteads, Carrawburgh and Rudechester. The discoveries are in the Univer-
sity of Newcastle's Museum of Antiquities, where a mithraeum has been recreated. Recent excavations in London have un-
dcovered the remains of a Mithraic temple near to the center of the once walled Roman settlement, on the bank of the Wal-
brook stream. Mithraea have also been found along the Danube and Rhine river frontier, in the province of Dacia (where
in 2003 a temple was found in Alba-Iulia) and as far afield as Numidia in North Africa.

As would be expected, Mithraic ruins are also found in the port city of Ostia, and in Rome the capital, where as many as
seven hundred mithraea may have existed (a dozen have been identified). Its importance at Rome may be judged from
the abundance of monumental remains; more than 75 pieces of sculpture, 100 Mithraic inscriptions, and ruins of temples and
shrines in all parts of the city and its suburbs. A well-preserved late 2nd century mithraeum, with its altar and built-in stone
benches, originally built beneath a Roman house (as was a common practice), survives in the crypt over which has been
built the Basilica of San Clemente, Rome.

Worship of the sun (Sol) did exist within the indigenous Roman pantheon, as a minor part, and always as a pairing with the
moon. However, in the East, there were many solar deities, including the Greek Helios, who was largely displaced by
Apollo. **By the 3rd century, the popular cults of Apollo and Mithras had started to merge into the syncretic cult
known as Sol Invictus, and in 274 CE the emperor Aurelian (whose mother had been a priestess of the sun) made
worship of Sol Invictus official.** Subsequently Aurelian built a splendid new temple in Rome, and created a new body of
priests to support it (pontifex solis invicti), attributing his victories in the East to Sol Invictus. But none of this affected
the existing cult of Mithras, which remained a non-official cult. Some senators held positions in both cults.

However, this period was also the beginning of the decline of Mithraism, as Dacia was lost to the empire, and invasions of
the northern peoples resulted in the destruction of temples along a great stretch of frontier, the main stronghold of the
cult. The spread of Christianity through the Empire, boosted by Constantine's tolerance of it from around 310 CE, also took its
toll - particularly as Christianity admitted women while Mithraism did not, which obviously limited its potential for rapid
growth.

The reign of Julian, who attempted to restore the faith, and suppress Christianity, and the usurpation of Eugenius renewed
the hopes of its devotees, but the decree secured by Theodosius in 394, totally forbidding non-Christian worship, may be
considered the end of Mithraism's formal public existence. Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the
legions from the east in the first century BC. As an action god of armies and the champion of heroes, he appealed to the
professional Roman soldiers, who carried his cult to Iberia, Britain, the German frontiers and Dacia.

While we cannot give Sabbatarians an inch when it comes to the influence of Mithraism on the so-called “change of the Sab-
bath,”, we can join them in conceding that a great deal of the pagan practices, including the date chosen for Christmas and a
host of other such things, can be attributed to its influence. It is sort of like the situation we have with the prophecies of Daniel
that Adventists like to use to prove that the papacy changed the Sabbath. As discussed elsewhere in this book, these proph-
ecies might possibly be applied to the persecuting activities of the papacy, but Sabbath-keeping was universal long before there
was a papacy to do any persecuting at all. Even the prophecy that Adventists like to use to apply to a specific period of papal
persecution, or 538 AD to 1798 AD, calculated by using the inappropriate year-for-a-day principle, had a specific literal fulfillment
in days-- not years-- much earlier in the history of the church.

**IT DIDN'T COME ABOUT AS A RESULT OF DR. BACCHIOCCHI'S “JEWISH PERSECUTION THEORY”**

As we have seen, Dr. Bacchiocchi has conceded himself into a historical box canyon. He admits the early date of 140 AD.
for universal adoption of Sunday observance and wisely refuses to suggest that the Roman Catholic Church changed the
day. He concedes that he cannot prove a link between sun worship and Sabbath abandonment before 140 AD. His last
hope is to prove that the Roman Empire's persecution of the rebellious Jews between100 AD. – 140 AD. caused the
Christians at Rome to distance themselves from Sabbath-keeping in order to escape the possible threat of associated
persecution. Dr. Bacchiocchi presupposes that Christians believed they were still required to keep the Sabbath at that
time-- something difficult to prove since Sunday observance was already widespread by 100 AD. He further theorizes that
the Church at Rome used its influence over the Christians throughout the vast Roman Empire to distance itself from
Sabbath-keeping to escape the possibility of such a persecution on the basis of this key religious practice supposedly
being common to both Jews and Christians. There are all kinds of problems with Dr. Bacchiocchi's desperate theory, but
this approach is really his only hope to explain how Christians came to abandon the Sabbath without admitting they did so
over proper biblical and theological reasons.

By around 100 AD. there were a large number of Jewish Christians in Rome. The Jewish population of the Church at Rome
might have been keeping the Sabbath as part of their Jewish culture, rather than as a requirement for salvation. If they were,
indeed, keeping the Sabbath merely as a part of their Jewish culture, it is reasonable to assume they would be willing to
abandon their Sabbath-keeping to avoid the threat of Roman persecution. On the other hand, if they were keeping the Sabbath
from the perspective of a salvation requirement, as Dr. Bacchiocci supposes, it is very difficult to imagine that they would be
willing to risk their eternal life to avoid persecution. The Christians of this era appeared to be willing to give up their lives for the Gospel in general. Since the Jewish Christians in Rome, as is the case of the Jews in general, understood that circumcision and Sabbath-keeping cannot be separated, they would understand that Sabbath-keeping was not required of them or their Gentile brethren, but that keeping it as part of their cultural heritage was also OK. Paul did not condemn the Christians at Rome for keeping the Sabbath, but urged that the Jews and the Gentiles of the Church be tolerant of one another in matters that were not essential to salvation. Let us look at the likelihood that the threat of Jewish persecution could have been a powerful enough factor to induce Christians to stop their supposed Sabbath-keeping.

There were two major Jewish revolts against the Roman Empire between 100 and 140 AD. However, historians are divided in their assessment of the extent of the Empire's persecution of Christians during this period of time. The Wikipedia article, “Persecution of Early Christians during the Roman Empire,” sums things up this way:

**PERSECUTION UNDER DOMITIAN**

According to many historians, Jews and Christians were heavily persecuted toward the end of Domitian's reign. The Book of Revelation is thought by many scholars to have been written during Domitian's reign. Other historians, however, have maintained that there was little or no persecution of Christians during Domitian's time. There is no historical consensus on the matter.

**PERSECUTION UNDER TRAJAN**

Between 109 and 111 AD, Pliny the Younger was sent by the emperor Trajan (r. 98-117) to the province of Bithynia as governor. During his tenure of office, Pliny encountered Christians, and he wrote to the emperor about them. The governor indicated that he had ordered the execution of several Christians, “for I held no question that whatever it was they admitted, in any case obstinacy and unbending perversity deserve to be punished.” However, he was unsure what to do about those who said they were no longer Christians, and asked Trajan his advice. The emperor responded that Christians should not be sought out; anonymous tips should be rejected as “unworthy of our times,” and if they recanted and “worshipped our gods,” they were to be freed. Those who persisted, however, should be punished.

Domitian reigned from 81-96 AD. (Wikipedia, “List of Roman Emperors”).

Now, for comparison, let us review the Roman Empire's Jewish persecutions (Wikipedia article, “First Jewish-Roman War”:

The first Jewish-Roman War (66–73), sometimes called The Great Revolt (Hebrew: המרד הגדול, ha-Mered Ha-Gadol), was the first of three major rebellions by the Jews of Iudaea Province against the Roman Empire (the second was the Kitos War in 115-117; the third was Bar Kokhba's revolt, 132–135).

There does not appear to be much of a correlation between the Roman Empire's persecution of Jews and the Roman Empire's persecution of Christians. Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory that Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping between 100 AD. and 140 AD. due to the fear that the Sabbath link that Christians supposedly shared with the Jews is extremely difficult to defend. While these facts certainly do not absolutely preclude the possibility that Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory is correct, it would collapse if a better explanation could be offered.

There is no evidence that the Christians in the Early Church were persecuted for an unwillingness to work on the Sabbath. If the Early Church had maintained a Sabbath stance, the Romans would have made record of it. Supporting this idea is the fact that the Jews had such a bad reputation with the Romans for their Sabbath keeping that they were generally exempt from military service and were not valued for slaves, but this was not true for Christians. See Henry Chadwick, The Early Church (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 9-13. See also William Barclay, The Ten Commandments for Today (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973), pp. 31-2; Werner Forster, Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1964), p. 72; Eduard Lohse, art. “Sabbath,” Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 7:9. [Credit for this concept goes to Robert Brinsmead, and it is his references I have cited.]

Brinsmead, in his “A Digest of the Sabbath Question,” provides this observation from a well-respected New Testament scholar:

“Whereas circumcision would have been practicable for Gentile converts, Sabbath observance simply was not. Unless they came inside the Jewish ghetto, where there was an ordered life adjusted to the cessation of work on the Sabbath, they could not earn their living or subsist while observing the Sabbath. If they were slaves, Gentile masters would not release them from work; and if they were independent and earning their own living, they would still have had to pursue their trade on a Sabbath. It was no doubt because circumcision was a practical possibility for Gentile Christians, as the Sabbath was not, that it was the centre of controversy” (Moule, Birth of the New Testament, 1961, p. 49).
Dr. Bacchiocchi claims that the lack of a record of Christians being persecuted by the Romans for keeping the Sabbath is proof that his Jewish persecution theory is true. In view of the fact that historical support for this theory is extremely weak to non-existent, it is more likely that Christians were not persecuted because they were not keeping the Sabbath in the first place. As you recall, Christians were observing Sunday as a day of communal worship on a wide-spread basis by 100 AD and, that the process that led to that situation almost certainly began no later than the Council of Jerusalem (to be explained in greater detail later). Keep in mind that Christian writers were documenting the practice of Sunday worship as early as 50-70 AD.

Again, R.J. Baukham puts Bacchiocchi’s Jewish Persecution Theory into perspective as follows:

Anti-Judaism played its part in second-century Christian polemic against Jewish Sabbath observance, but it does not follow that it motivated the introduction of Christian Sunday worship. For we have already argued that Sunday worship dates back to the first century, while few second-century writers compare and contrast the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday. Derogatory discussions of the Jewish Sabbath do not usually refer to the Christian Sunday. If Sunday were a recent substitute for the Jewish Sabbath, we should expect far more discussion of the superiority of Sunday to the Sabbath. (D.A. Carson, *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*, pp. 270-271.)

**IT DIDN’T HAPPEN ACCORDING TO KENNETH A. STRAND’S “OUT OF EASTER THEORY”**

Even within the Adventist community Dr. Bacchiocchi had his tacit critics, Dr. Ronald du Preez being the most recent one as of the writing of this Fourth Edition. Let us examine two alternative theories, developed by Seventh-day Adventist theologians subsequent to 1977:

Strand theorizes that Sunday observance grew out of the Quartodeciman Controversy, which was regarding which week Easter should be celebrated, and then over which Sunday Easter should be celebrated, and how the days-dates being considered were related to the Jewish calendar. Michael Morrison explains in his article, “Sabbath and Sunday— Adventist Theories,” at the Grace Communion International Web-site:

Strand suggests that weekly Sunday observance grew out of an annual Easter observance. He gives a possible reconstruction for the origin of the Quartodeciman controversy, with some Christians observing Sunday and others a day of the month, both with roots in the Jewish calendar(s). He then notes that some early Christians "not only observed both Easter and Pentecost on Sundays but also considered the whole seven-week season between the two holidays to have special significance. He suggests that Christians began meeting on every Sunday in that season, and then eventually to every Sunday every week: "Throughout the Christian world Sunday observance simply arose alongside observance of Saturday."

*Morrison summarizes the weaknesses of Strand's theory, which are many:*

This theory, however, in addition to being entirely speculative, does not explain the universality of Sunday observance. Either we must suppose that this custom began before the Gentile mission did, or that it was so obvious that Gentiles everywhere came to the same conclusion (and if it was that obvious, then it would have begun before the Gentile mission!). Also, this theory does not work for the Quartodeciman Christians, and all evidence is that even the Quartodecimans observed Sunday. [16] Strand feels that his theory explains why Sunday is a "resurrection festival," but no explanation for that is really needed; it would genuinely be an obvious connection for anyone meeting on a Sunday.

[16] "The Quartodeciman controversy had nothing to do with Sabbath observance; the Quartodecimans appear to have observed the weekly Sunday like most other Christians did at the time.” C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 96.

As we mentioned earlier, the Easter Controversy was settled by the Eastern Church—not by the Western Church

**IT DIDN’T HAPPEN ACCORDING TO THE DUAL-DAY THEORY EXPLAINED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS IN 1988**

Again, Michael Morrison outlines the “Dual Day” Theory as developed by SDA theologians for the official release of a new book designed to provide so-called biblical support for the Church’s 27 key beliefs (*Seventh-day Adventists Believe...: A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines* (Washington, DC.: Review and Herald, 1988), p. 259, footnoting as source Justin, Bacchiocchi, and Socrates 5.22.
By the middle of the [second] century some Christians were voluntarily observing Sunday as a day of worship, not a day of rest. The church of Rome, largely made up of Gentile believers (Rom. 11:13), led in the trend toward Sunday worship. In Rome, the capital of the empire, strong anti-Jewish sentiments arose. Reacting to these sentiments, the Christians in that city attempted to distinguish themselves from the Jews. They dropped some practices held in common with the Jews and initiated a trend away from the veneration of the Sabbath, moving toward the exclusive observance of the Sunday.

From the second to the fifth centuries, while Sunday was rising in influence, Christians continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath nearly everywhere throughout the Roman Empire. The fifth-century historian Socrates wrote: "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this."

If you have been following our discussion of Early Church History, you already see some very serious problems with this alternate theory. Morrison outlines them for us as follows:

This theory has numerous deficiencies and inaccuracies, some of which we have already covered. First, it was in the early second century that some Christians were observing Sunday, and this was in Antioch and Asia Minor as well as at Rome and Alexandria. Rome did not initiate this trend, nor is there evidence that anti-Jewish sentiments motivated them to abandon customs they held in common with the Jews.

Moreover, second-century Christians were not observing two days, but only one. Second-century writers are uniformly negative toward literal Sabbath-keeping. There is no evidence that anyone (other than Ebionites) kept the Sabbath in the second century.

You may recall that the early Christians observed the 7th day of the week as a festival, but went out of their way to distance the nature of it from any Jewish-related requirements. How the Sabbath festival was observed varied from church to church and from area to area, and some of the components included public worship, observance of the communion ordinance, and sometimes even fasting, along with wholesome festivities. It seems that if resting was included, the "resting" was not considered to be part of a Jewish requirement or law, but as an individual and human choice about a convention that would be good for the church.

WHAT ADVENTISTS LEADERS HAVE ALWAYS KNOWN ABOUT THE SABBATH-SUNDAY QUESTION AS IT RELATED TO EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

As we have mentioned before, a review of the Sabbath histories authored by J.N. Andrews proves that he was familiar with virtually every detail of Early Church history. Let us review some of the things he wrote about.

Andrews knew the early church understood circumcision was a prerequisite for sabbath-keeping and that the sabbath was not a creation ordinance.

In Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho," he discusses circumcision and the Sabbath with his Jewish friend, approaching him in a way that respected his friend's Jewish heritage. Notice that Justin Martyr did not cite St. Paul as an authority that the Sabbath is not required of Christians. Trypho, being a Jew, would not have recognized Paul's authority. It is significant that Justin is able to prove that the Sabbath was for the Jews and the Jews only from Old Testament logic alone. Justin Martyr was born in 100 AD. and died in 165 AD.. Here is what Justin Martyr wrote in Chapter Nineteen:

CHAPTER XIX

CIRCUMCISION UNKNOWN BEFORE ABRAHAM. THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES ON ACCOUNT OF THE HARDNESS OF THEIR HEARTS.

"It is this about which we are at a loss, and with reason, because, while you endure such things, you do not observe all the other customs which we are now discussing. This circumcision is not, however, necessary for all men, but for you alone, in order that, as I have already said, you may suffer these things which you now justly suffer.

Nor do we receive that useless baptism of cisterns, for it has nothing to do with this baptism of life. Wherefore also God has announced that you have forsaken Him, the living fountain, and digged for your selves broken cisterns which can hold no water.

Even you, who are the circumcised according to the flesh, have need of our circumcision; but we, having the latter, do not require the former.
For if it were necessary, as you suppose, God would not have made Adam uncircumcised; would not have had respect to the gifts of Abel when, being uncircumcised, he offered sacrifice and would not have been pleased with the uncircumcision of Enoch, who was not found, because God had translated him. Lot, being uncircumcised, was saved from Sodom, the angels themselves and the Lord sending him out. Noah was the beginning of our race; yet, uncircumcised, along with his children he went into the ark. Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High, was uncircumcised; to whom also Abraham the first who received circumcision after the flesh, gave tithes, and he blessed him: after whose order God declared, by the mouth of David, that He would establish the everlasting priest. Therefore to you alone this circumcision was necessary, in order that the people may be no people and the nation no nation; as also Hosea, one of the twelve prophets, declares.

Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God; and after them Abraham with all his descendants until Moses, under whom your nation appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness: wherefore God, accommodating Himself to that nation, enjoined them also to offer sacrifices, as if to His name, in order that you might not serve idols. Which precept, however, you have not observed; nay, you sacrificed your children to demons.”

See how God will destroy the nations to the beat of instruments of music as they also are BURNED.

And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths, that you might retain the memorial of God. For His word makes this announcement, saying, 'That ye may know that I am God who redeemed you.' (Ezek. xx. 12.)

D.M. Canright confronted the Adventist leaders of his day with proof from Justin Martyr's early recorded observation about why Christians did not keep the Sabbath. It is fascinating to see the way these early SDA leaders dealt with this problem. Although a bit long, it is well worth your study. Here is an extended quote from the 1895 edition of Reponses to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists, edited by Uriah Smith. As you study this passage, keep in mind that the entire passage is taken from Reponses to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists, 1895 edition— a SDA book in which Uriah Smith is trying to show that Canright has taken parts of J.N. Andrews' books, The Complete Testimony of the Fathers, and later, Andrews' earlier book, History of the Sabbath, out of context:

[Smith]: Eld. C. quotes from “The Complete Testimony of the Fathers” very unfairly, as a few extracts will show. In putting forth a historical argument to show that Sunday was called the Lord's day and was observed as a sacred day by the Christian church immediately after the days of the apostles, he says:

[Canright]:“The Lord's Day, then, is the day belonging to the Lord Jesus, as 'he is Lord {of all'} (Acts 10:36), and 'Head over all things' (Eph.1:22) in the gospel. We shall find this fact abundantly confirmed in the Fathers. I now quote from 'The Complete Testimony of the Fathers,' by Eld. Andrews:

[Andrews]：“Justin's 'Apology' was written at Rome about the year 140.' 'He is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only forty-four years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos.” It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in the doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt. (pp. 33, 36)

[Canright]:“This is the confession which even the historian of the Seventh-day Adventists is compelled to make. The Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded by Christians within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle. And this is proved by the testimony of the very first Christian writer who mentions the first day after the apostles. Does Eld. Andrews question the genuineness or truthfulness of this statement? - Not at all.”

[Smith]: We have given these three paragraphs in full, that the reader may be able to see fully how Eld. C. can treat the writings of others to suit his purpose. We have expressed surprise at his efforts to pervert and garble testimony. “Garble” is defined to mean, “to pick out or select such parts as may serve a purpose.” - Webster. This quotation from “The Testimony of the Fathers” is made, remember, to prove that the Sabbath was discarded, and that Sunday was recognized as the Lord's day by the Christians of that early time; and now let us see what Eld. Andrews does really say:

[Andrews]:“Justin's Apology” was written at Rome about the year 140 AD. His 'Dialogue with Trypho the Jew' was written some years later. In searching his works we shall see how much greater progress apostasy had made at Rome than in the countries where those lived whose writings we have been examining.”
[Smith]: Thus Eld. Andrews' first reference to Justin is to show that Rome was far in advance of other bodies on the course of apostasy and that Justin was himself a leader in that work. In proof of this he introduces testimony that he treated God's Sabbath with contempt, denied its origin at creation, taunted the Jews that it was given to them because of their wickedness, and denied the perpetuity of the Ten Commandments. Pages 33, 34. As to the next sentence in Eld. C.'s quotation let us give it entire from Eld. Andrews:

[Andrews]: “And it is worthy of notice that though first-day writers assert that 'Lord's Day' was the familiar title of the first day of the week in the time of the Apocalypse, yet Justin, who is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only 44 years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos, does not call it by that title, but by the name it bore as a heathen festival. If it be said that the term was omitted because he was addressing a heathen emperor [just what Canright does now say], there still remains the fact that he mentions the day quite a number of times in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' and yet never calls it 'Lord's Day,' nor indeed does he call it by any name implying sacredness.”

[Smith]: The quotation given from Justin on pp. 34, 35 (“Testimony of the Fathers”), about meeting together on “the day called Sunday,” etc., Eld. C. gives in full to show that Justin did regard Sunday as the Lord's day, though he gives it no such name, nor any title of sacredness. But on p. 37 Eld. A. gives a quotation from Justin's “Dialogue with Trypho,” which shows that he regarded all days alike. He calls the gospel “the new law,” and says: “The new law requires you to keep the perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God.” Upon which Eld. Andrews remarks: “This language plainly implies that Justin held all days alike, and did not observe any one day as a day of abstinence from labor.” Yet the attempt is made by these misrepresentations to wheel Justin in as a witness for Sunday-keeping. Most astonishing to relate, Eld. C. quotes the epistle of Barnabas in favor of his position. Now he well knows that every critic pronounces that so-called epistle the work of a Jew of mean abilities and an absolute forgery. Yet, when reviewing Eld. Andrews in his notice of this work, he says:

[Canright]: “They [the early Fathers] lived early enough to have converse with the apostles themselves, while he [Eld. Andrews] lived eighteen hundred years later! Which would be apt to know best?”

[Smith]: Yes; but here is a man who claims to be a Father who was not; a man who was a fraud, an impostor, a forger. The question is, What do the Scriptures teach? And we have the Scriptures as fully as he. Now we ask, Who would be apt to give us the best exposition of Scripture? An old forger of the second century who wrote things too silly to be repeated, and too shameful to quote? Or a Christian scholar of the nineteenth? It will take no reader a great while to answer. Eld. Canright can take the forger if he prefers. In his fourth article in the Advocate, he says: “Let us see what Seventh-day Adventists say upon the sin of Sunday-keeping: 'All who keep the first day for the Sabbath are pope's Sunday-keepers, and God's Sabbath-breakers.' - History of the Sabbath, p. 502.”

After studying the above extended quotation from the 1895 revision of the SDA book, Replies to Canright, it is difficult to see the relevance of this quotation and its discussion. It appears that the SDA leaders were trying to show that Canright failed to prove his point because Justin Martyr did not attach any sacredness in itself to Sunday and thus supposedly did not equate Sunday with the Lord's Day. The authors of Replies to Canright seem to feel that obfuscation will confuse the readers of their book enough to cause their readers to miss a variety of observations that beg to be made. Whether the Epistle of Barnabas was a forgery or not had nothing to do with the validity of Canright's point, which was that the writers of the Early Church documented the FACT that the first Christians abandoned the Sabbath astonishingly early, well before the existence of the Roman Catholic Church. Andrews could not seem to grasp the concept that the early Christians chose Sunday as a day of worship without attaching any “day sacredness” to it. We see the following things of significance from this quotation from Replies to Canright and the other things we have learned so far:

1. The SDA leaders of Canright's Era knew that Sabbath abandonment was common by 100 AD. and universal by around 140 AD., hundreds of years before a pope or a Roman Catholic Church.

2. They knew Ellen White said it was the pope and the Roman Catholic Church that “changed the day.”

3. They knew Ellen White lied when she said that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day because this change happened far too early for her claim to be true.

4. We see that the SDA leaders of Canright's Era were introduced to the concepts that at least some of the first Christians knew that the Sabbath did not begin at Creation and that there can be no Sabbath-keeping without circumcision.
5. We now know that SDA leaders knew almost everything Canright confronted them with as early as the late 1850’s.

6. We observe that these early SDA leaders could not answer Canright’s arguments and that any reasonable person should have been able to see that there was no satisfactory rebuttal to his point that Sabbath abandonment took place far too early for Ellen White’s Roman Catholic sun worship explanation to be true.

Almost 100 years later, Dr. Bacchiocchi found himself still faced with the problem that Sabbath “abandonment” by Christians was almost immediate. He theorizes that Justin Martyr is rationalizing the Sabbath requirement away, looking for an excuse to justify the fact that Justin Martyr and other Christians were not keeping the Sabbath like they were supposed to. This is circular reasoning because it presupposes that Christians were required to keep the Sabbath. Dr. Bacchiocchi as well as the contributors to the 1895 edition version of Replies to Canright miss the point completely. Whether Justin Martyr was rationalizing or not, he documented the fact that Christians were not keeping the Sabbath at this time. He was born in 100 AD. and died in 165 AD. Whoever may have authored the Epistle of Barnabas, it was written very early, hundreds of years before the Roman Catholic Church came into existence, and it documented the fact that Christians were worshiping on Sunday at the time the document was written. Whether the epistle attributed to him was written by the person who bears its name is not the question. Andrews knew that early Christian writers documented Sunday observance from the very beginning of the faith.

A variety of Early Christian writers documented that Christians chose to worship on Sunday, beginning in 70 AD. and continuing until the Roman Catholic Church came into existence hundreds of years after “Sabbath abandonment” was universal (140 AD.). Using their excerpts to support either point of view is filled with risks and challenges. Great caution must be observed. Cox (The Literature of the Sabbath Question, 1865) provides a wealth of scholarly research which provides plenty of evidence that the writings of the Early Fathers have been heavily edited and even “tampered with.” There are translation problems with documents believed to be legitimate, and some of the documents are believed to be fraudulent. Our research suggests that the biggest mistake Sabbatarians make in using these excerpts is their failure to understand that many of these writers discuss the term “Sabbath” in the context of the Sabbath festival (such as whether to fast) and not in the Jewish sense of a day that is intrinsically holy and requires resting upon it by Divine law. At the same time, our research indicates that in some of the favorite passages we anti-Sabbatarians use, there are enough questions about the correct translation of key words and apparent discrepancies between two excerpts from the same document that suggest that one cannot say with 100% certainty that the passage provides the evidence that challenges the Sabbatarian point of view.

At the same time, taken as a whole, these excerpts demonstrate that the Christian Church during its first 500 years or more worshiped on Sundays and celebrated the Sabbath festival at selected times of the liturgical year. If they rested on these Sabbath festivals, it was because of the festive nature of the tradition, and if they worshiped on them it was because it was a festival established as a tradition to keep alive the memory of the Creation Week. The Lord's Supper was often celebrated on this festival. From the Jewish perspective, the early Christians, then, “broke” the Sabbath on all the Saturdays of the year that were not set aside as a Sabbath festival, and they “broke” it on the Sabbath festival days because the festive activities were not what the Law of Moses would have allowed on the weekly Sabbath of the Law.

While these writers had the advantage of perspective that living very close in time to the days of the apostles, they had, perhaps, less access to the large body of scholarly research and thought that has come down to us over the last 1,000 to 2,000 years. While a study of the opinions of the Early Fathers is interesting and may be useful to a point, it is important to keep in mind that a proper understanding of the Bible itself poses impossible barriers to Sabbatarianism. Just one example is the principle that observing the ordinance of circumcision was a prerequisite to keeping the Sabbath (to be thoroughly discussed later).

Do not suppose for a moment that SDA leaders, historians, and theologians are not keenly aware that the Christian writers of the second and third centuries were not virtually unanimous in their disdain for the Jewish concept of Sabbath-keeping. Michael Morrison of Grace Community International comments that SDA Theologian Mervyn Maxwell, in his book, Early Sabbath-Sunday History, concedes that second and early third-century writers had basically the same negative attitudes toward the Sabbath (see part 3, note 27) and summarizes this concept as follows:

These writers taught that the new covenant had put an end to the old law — and that now the new spiritual Israel, with its new covenant and its new spiritual law, no longer needed the literal circumcision, literal sacrifices, and literal Sabbath. Barnabas observed that God “has circumcised our hearts.” Justin referred triumphantly to the new spiritual circumcision in Christ. Irenaeus taught that circumcision, sacrifices, and Sabbaths were given of old as signs of better things to come; the new sacrifice, for example, is now a contrite heart. Tertullian, too, had a new spiritual sacrifice and a new spiritual circumcision. Each of these writers also taught that a new spiritual concept of the Sabbath had replaced the old literal one...
This supplanting of the old law with the new, of the literal Sabbath with the spiritual, was a very Christ-centered concept for these four writers. God's people have inherited the covenant only because Christ through His sufferings inherited it first for us, Barnabas said. For Justin the new, final, and eternal law that has been given to us was "namely Christ" Himself. It was only because Christ gave the law that He could now also be "the end of it," said Irenaeus. And it is Christ who invalidated "the old" and confirmed "the new," according to Tertullian. Indeed Christ did this, both Irenaeus and Tertullian said, not so much by annulling the law as by so wonderfully fulfilling it that He extended it far beyond the mere letter. To sum up: The early rejection of the literal Sabbath appears to be traceable to a common hermeneutic of Old and New Testament scriptures.-- C. Mervyn Maxwell in Maxwell and Damsteegt, *Early Sabbath-Sunday History,* (pp. 154-156)

Please balance these things in your assessment as you study these excerpts:

1. **The Didache [AD. 70]**

But every Lord’s day . . . gather yourselves together and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one that is at variance with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned" (Didache 14 [AD. 70]). See the critique of the very early analysis of this part of the *Didache* in Appendix II.

2. **The Letter of Barnabas [AD. 74]**

“We keep the eighth day [Sunday] with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead” (Letter of Barnabas 15:6-8 [AD. 74]). This document is almost certainly fraudulent in regard to its claims of authorship, but it still documents the practice of the first Christians, and that practice was to meet for worship on Sunday.

3. **Ignatius of Antioch [AD. 110]**

[Th]ose who were brought up in the ancient order of things [i.e. Jews] 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” (Letter to the Magnesians 8 [AD. 110]). This document may have been tampered with, and its authenticity is questionable. If it was tampered with, it may reflect the opinion of very early Christian “editors.” We use it for the support of our point-of-view with these reservations. Dr. Bacchiocchi acknowledges that the Early Church was seeking to differentiate itself from Judaism as early as this time in his book, *From Sabbath to Sunday,* but seeks to show that Ignatius meant that the OT Jewish prophets did not go around “Sabbatizing,” and that because of this fact, Christians should not do so either.

4. **Justin Martyr [AD. 155]**

“[W]e too would observe the fleshly circumcision, and the sabbaths, and in short all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined [on] you—namely, on account of your transgressions and the hardness of your heart. . . . How is it, Trypho, that we would not observe those rites which do not harm us— I speak of fleshly circumcision and sabbaths and feasts? . . . God enjoined you to keep the sabbath, and impose on you other precepts for a sign, as I have already said, on account of your unrighteousness and that of your fathers” (*Dialogue with Trypho*, 18, 21 [AD. 155]).

5. **Tertullian [AD. 203]**

“[L]et him who contends that the sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day . . . teach us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the sabbath or practiced circumcision, and were thus rendered ‘friends of God.’ For if circumcision purges a man, since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did he not circumcISE him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? . . . Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised and unobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering him sacrifices, uncircumcised and unobservant of the Sabbath, was by him [God] commended [Gen. 4:1-7, Heb. 9:4]. . . Noah also, uncircumcised— yes, and unobservant of the sabbath— God freed from the deluge. For Enoch too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and unobservant of the sabbath, he translated from this world, who did not first taste death in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might show us that we also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God” (*An Answer to the Jews* 2 [AD. 203]) See Appendix III for further information on this key early Christian writer. Sabbatarian apologists quote another passage from Tertullian which appears to be pro-Sabbatarian, but that quote is in reference to the keeping of the Sabbath by the Early Church as a festival. Sabbatarian apologists seek to show that this writer changed his mind about the Sabbath one or more times, but the confusion they experience is the result of their failure to understand that the Early Church observed the 7th day of the week as a FESTIVAL that was deliberately made to be different in its make-up than the Jewish Sabbath but still had religious significance.
6. The Didascalia [AD. 225]

“The apostles further appointed: On the first day of the week let there be service, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the oblation, because on the first day of the week our Lord rose from the place of the dead, and on the first day of the week he arose upon the world, and on the first day of the week he ascended up to heaven, and on the first day of the week he will appear at last with the angels of heaven” (Didascalia 2 [AD. 225]).

7. Victorinus [AD. 300]

“The sixth day [Friday] is called parasceve, that is to say, the preparation of the kingdom... On this day also, on account of the passion of the Lord Jesus Christ, we make either a station to God or a fast. On the seventh day he rested from all his works, and blessed it, and sanctified it. On the former day we are accustomed to fast rigorously, that on the Lord’s Day we may go forth to our bread with giving of thanks. And let the parasceve become a rigorous fast, lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews... which Sabbath he [Christ] in his body abolished” (The Creation of the World [AD. 300]).

8. Eusebius of Caesarea [AD. 312]

“They [the early saints of the Old Testament] did not care about circumcision of the body, neither do we [Christians]. They did not care about observing Sabbaths, nor do we. They did not avoid certain kinds of food, neither did they regard the other distinctions which Moses first delivered to their posterity to be observed as symbols; nor do Christians of the present day do such things” (Church History 1:4:8 [AD. 312]).

9. Eusebius of Caesarea [AD. 319]

“[T]he day of his [Christ’s] light... was the day of his resurrection from the dead, which they say, as being the one and only truly holy day and the Lord’s day, is better than any number of days as we ordinarily understand them, and better than the days set apart by the Mosaic Law for feasts, new moons, and sabbaths, which the Apostle [Paul] teaches are the shadow of days and not days in reality” (Proof of the Gospel 4:16:186 [AD. 319]).

10. Athanasius [AD. 345]

“The sabbath was the end of the first creation, the Lord’s day was the beginning of the second, in which he renewed and restored the old in the same way as he prescribed that they should formerly observe the sabbath as a memorial of the end of the first things, so we honor the Lord’s day as being the memorial of the new creation” (On Sabbath and Circumcision 3 [AD. 345]).

11. Cyril of Jerusalem [AD. 350]

“Fall not away either into the sect of the Samaritans or into Judaism, for Jesus Christ has henceforth ransomed you. Stand aloof from all observance of sabbaths and from calling any indifferent meats common or unclean” (Catechetical Lectures 4:37 [AD. 350]).

12. Council of Laodicea [AD. 360]

“Christians should not Judaize and should not be idle on the Sabbath, but should work on that day; they should, however, particularly reverence the Lord’s Day and, if possible, not work on it, because they were Christians” (canon 29 [AD. 360]).

13. John Chrysostom [AD. 387]

“[W]hen he said, ‘You shall not kill’... he did not add, ‘because murder is a wicked thing.’ The reason was that conscience had taught this before this hand, and he speaks thus, as to those who know and understand the point. Wherefore when he speaks to us of another commandment, not known to us by the dictate of conscience, he not only prohibits, but adds the reason. When, for instance, he gave commandment concerning the sabbath—‘On the seventh day you shall do no work’—he subjoined also the reason for this cessation. What was this? ‘Because on the seventh day God rested from all his works which he had begun to make’ [Ex. 20:10]. And again: ‘Because you were a servant in the land of Egypt’ [Deut. 21:18]. For what purpose then, I ask, did he add a reason respecting the sabbath, but did no such thing in regard to murder? Because this commandment was not one of the leading ones. It was not one of those which were accurately defined of our conscience, but a kind of partial and temporary one, and for this reason it was abolished afterward. But those which are necessary and uphold our life are the following: ‘You shall not kill... You shall not commit adultery... You shall not steal.’ On this account he adds no reason in this case, nor enters into any instruction on the matter, but is content with the bare prohibition” (Homilies on the Statues 12:9 [AD. 387]).
14. John Chrysostom [AD. 395]

“You have put on Christ, you have become a member of the Lord and been enrolled in the heavenly city, and you still grovel in the Law [of Moses]? How is it possible for you to obtain the kingdom? Listen to Paul’s words, that the observance of the Law overthrows the gospel, and learn, if you will, how this comes to pass, and tremble, and shun this pitfall. Why do you keep the Sabbath and fast with the Jews?” (Homilies on Galatians 2:17 [AD. 395]).

15. The Apostolic Constitutions [AD. 400]

“And on the day of our Lord’s resurrection, which is the Lord’s day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent him to us, and condescended to let him suffer, and raised him from the dead. Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day . . . in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food” (Apostolic Constitutions 2:7:60 [AD. 400]). The challenges of interpreting the Sabbath point-of-view of this critically important document is discussed elsewhere in this book. Another passage from the work appears to support Sabbatarianism, but its mention of the Sabbath is almost certainly in the context of the Sabbath as a festival.

16. John Chrysostom [AD. 402]

“The rite of circumcision was venerable in the Jews’ account, for as much as the Law itself gave way thereto, and the Sabbath was less esteemed than circumcision. For that circumcision might be performed, the Sabbath was broken; but that the Sabbath might be kept, circumcision was never broken; and mark, I pray, the dispensation of God. This is found to be even more solemn that the Sabbath, as not being omitted at certain times. When then it is done away, much more is the Sabbath” (Homilies on Philippians 10 [AD. 402]).

17. Augustine [AD. 412]

“Well, now, I should like to be told what there is in these Ten Commandments, except the observance of the sabbath, which ought not to be kept by a Christian . . . Which of these commandments would anyone say that the Christian ought not to keep? It is possible to contend that it is not the Law which was written on those two tables that the Apostle Paul describes as ‘the letter that kills’ [2 Cor. 3:6], but the law of circumcision and the other sacred rites which are now abolished” (The Spirit and the Letter 24 [AD. 412]).

Origen [AD. 185-254]

“But what is the feast of the Sabbath except that of which the apostle speaks, ‘There remaineth therefore a Sabbathist,’ that is, the observance of the Sabbath, by the people of God? Leaving the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be observed by a Christian. On the Sabbath-day all worldly labors ought to be abstained from. If, therefore, you cease from all secular works, and execute nothing to church, attending to sacred reading and instruction, thinking of celestial things, solicitous for the future, placing the Judgment to come before your eyes, not looking to things present and visible, but to those which are future and invisible, this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath.” Origen in Numeras Homilia 23, cited by J.N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath, Chapter 18, from the translation of Origen's Opera, Tome, p. 358, Paris, 1733:

"Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for 'he that does not work, let him not eat.' For say the [holy] oracles, 'in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, not finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. 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 the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, 'To the end, for the eighth day,' on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ." Epistle to the Magnesians (longer form), chap. 9, quoted by J.N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath, Chapter 18.

Note: J.N. Andrews seemed to think that these excerpts from Origen support the idea that the early Christians were still keeping the Sabbath. Upon careful analysis, the comments of Origen demonstrate that Christians were observing FESTIVALS on both Saturday and Sunday. Origen does not appeal to any biblical source, and especially not to the 10 Commandments, to support his views. In fact Origen is careful in both statements to distance his Sabbath remarks from anything related to Judaism. He was a strong supporter of Sunday as the day of worship. Observe that he is instructing Christians not to eat food prepared the day before the Sabbath festival. The Jews were forbidden to prepare food on the Sabbath day, and Friday was considered the “day of preparation” for preparing the meals that would be eaten on the Sabbath. He appears to view the Sabbath festival merely as a Christian tradition designed by the Church to keep the memory of Creation Week before the minds of the believers.
Notice the theology in these statements. Some writers gave better reasons for the abandonment of the Sabbath by Christians than others, but the point is that Christians documented the fact that the Sabbath was not being kept in the Jewish sense of the word from virtually the beginning of the Christian Faith.

Adventist leaders of today know that the facts of early church history demolish the credibility of the Sabbatarian belief model.

Dr. Skip MacCarty refused to discuss the historical aspects of the Sabbath-Sunday question in 2007, stating that the subject was beyond the scope of his book. While this is another unforgivable example of fighting dirty in the Sabbath-Sunday debate, it is no wonder that he won’t touch the historical issues. The very mention of the subject is nearly fatal to his position, even if considered alone. The fact that Seventh-day Adventists know about the immediate adoption of Sunday observance by the first Christians, combined with their insistence on keeping it themselves, suggests that they believe they know more about the Sabbath-Sunday debate than the first Christians did. You may recall that, unlike what Seventh-day Adventists are taught from the cradle on up, Sabbath-keeping Christians were not the heroes of the Early Church. Instead they were the ones who were seduced into following “another gospel.” One excellent example is the history of the Ebionites, who kept the Sabbath but vilified the Apostle Paul, recognizing James as their spiritual leader. In his brilliant anti-Sabbatarian essay, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined,” (former) SDA theologian Robert D. Brinsmead explains what happened to the Sabbath-keeping Jewish Christians:

The picture emerges of Jewish Christianity which, having lost its influence on the predominately Gentile Church became increasingly isolated. It lost vital contact with Gentile Christianity, so that Gentile Christianity was largely cut off from its Jerusalem roots. This has been a tragedy for both branches of the church.

By the time of Irenaeus (in the late second century) Jewish Christianity was regarded as real heresy. Some Jewish Christians were called Ebionites (“the poor ones”), while others were called Nazarenes. They kept the Sabbath and persevered in a Jewish way of life. They were generally vegetarian. Some even refused to eat e...[text unclear] Their hero was James; their archenemy was Paul.

The most serious heresy of the Ebionites was failure to confess Christ's full divinity. Furthermore, although they believed Jesus was sinless, they taught that he possessed sinful human nature like the rest of Mankind. Yet it is a remarkable fact that the heretical Ebionites traced their lineage back to the original Jewish Christians and claim to be their true successors.

The fact that there have frequently been small enclaves of Christians who kept the Sabbath is not proof of any kind that such groups held on to “truth” while everyone else apostatized. We have seen that the Jewish Christians who clung to Sabbath-keeping soon forsook orthodox Christianity, got into heresy, and soon disappeared completely. Throughout history the error or Sabbatarianism has been rediscovered time after time to this very day. These groups may have been, and may still be sincere in their beliefs, but they are not to be honored for their inability to study the Bible inductively.

We have reviewed where Sunday observance came from and where it did not come from. In the light of these facts it is difficult to comprehend why there would be any other reason for sticking to the Sabbatarian belief model other than the fear of the financial disaster that would take place were Seventh-day Adventist leaders to initiate the same doctrinal reforms that its sister church, The Worldwide Church of God, made in 1995.

While a study of the facts of Early Church history is interesting, and while it proves to the point of over-kill that Ellen White lied about the source of her information about how Sunday observance replaced Sabbath-keeping, these facts alone do not provide the absolute (proof beyond reasonable doubt) that the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath is wrong. Let us turn our attention to what the Bible teaches on the subject. We have already previewed the two major concepts— the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, and the concept of circumcision being a prerequisite for Sabbath-keeping. Now we will enter into an expanded discussion of these and other biblical concepts.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMPOSSIBLE BIBLICAL BARRIERS TO SABBATARIANISM

Chapter Five, the final chapter of Book I, provides a review of Advent Movement Sabbath writings that prove even the earliest pioneers of the Advent Movement knew virtually every difficulty with the Sabbatarian belief model except for the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, and the fact that the Decalogue was modeled after the treaties of the day— which always incorporated a ceremonial requirement placed in the middle of the real provisions of the written laws. This chapter demonstrates the impossibility of Sabbatarianism from the biblical point of view, bringing forth passages that prove the Hebrews were sent to war on Sabbath, marched through the wilderness on it, and were dependent on the ordinance of circumcision to have the right of keeping it. It also examines the fatal problems with the most popular proof texts Sabbatarians use to twist the Bible into “proving” the continuity of the Sabbath requirement into the New Covenant. We demonstrate that Colossians 2:14-17 means exactly what it says and represents a command that the apostolic church not require the Gentile converts to keep the Jewish Sabbath. Along the way we examine the biblical and historical problems with the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 11, which Adventists use to support Sabbatarian theory—demonstrating that these events had a far earlier literal historical fulfillment and that SDA leaders were aware of these earlier literal fulfillments no later than 1919.

Hebrew Linguistics Prove The Sabbath Didn’t Start In The Garden Of Eden

THE HEBREW LINGUISTICS OF GENESIS 2

Adventists sometimes offer large sums of money to anyone who can find a proof-text that commands the Sabbath to be changed from Saturday to Sunday. This is a deceptive practice for a number of reasons, including the fact that there is no longer anything to “change” and Christians have, in Colossians 2:14-17, a command by St. Paul that Christians not require the Gentile Christians to keep the Sabbath. By contrast, anti-Sabbatarians like us can safely offer large sums of money to anyone who can find even one proof-text that shows that Adam and Even were commanded to keep the Sabbath. Genesis 2 talks about what God did—not what man should do. There is no mention of the Sabbath ordinance until Exodus 16 with the giving of the manna after leaving Egypt and prior to arriving at Mt. Sinai. No Sabbatarian would ever collect a dime from us, even if we offered $1,000,000 to find it. It is not there. Here are some of the reasons to support our claim.

If a book purports to be “research,” a reasonable expectation of that work is that it discusses the weaknesses and strengths of the arguments for and against the author’s point of view. If the researcher deliberately ignores powerful arguments that challenge his ideas, that work becomes more like propaganda than an effort to seek out truth. The case for Sabbatarianism collapses if it can be shown that the Sabbath ordinance did not start at Creation. Let us evaluate the works of Doctors Bacchiocchi and MacCarty on the basis of what they knew, might have known, or should have known, about the problem posed to Sabbatarianism by Hebrew linguistics.

When Dr. Bacchiocchi published From Sabbath to Sunday in 1977, the advanced Hebrew linguistics of Moses’ account of the 7th day of Creation was just coming to be understood primarily as a result of the work of two separate authors who published, respectively, in 1970 and 1979. He might not have been aware of the fact that the very foundation of his Sabbatarian premise had just been swept away. However, 30 years later when his “disciple,” Dr. Skip MacCarty, published In Granite or Ingrained?, the facts about the Hebrew linguistics of the Sabbath in Genesis and Exodus had been available for around 30 years with key research having been published in 1970 (Genesis 2), 1979 (Genesis 2), and 1982 (Exodus 16 and 20 added by D.A. Carson’s book). MacCarty’s refusal to discuss and to attempt to refute the single most important fact relevant to the outcome of the Sabbath-Sunday debate disqualifies his work for the status of “research.”

Perhaps Dr. MacCarty did not bring up the subject since there is no possible defense against it. The very mention of this subject would call attention to an issue he desperately hopes will not be raised. This particular fact of Hebrew linguistics provides definitive evidence that the Sabbath did not start at Creation. If you combine this argument from Hebrew linguistics with the fact that the Bible does not mention the Sabbath until the time of the Exodus, and add the fact that Moses specifically stated that the covenant which contained the Sabbath commandment was not made with the ancestors of the Exodus generation of Israelites,
we have proof way beyond any reasonable doubt that the Sabbath was given to Israel, and to Israel only, at the time of the Exodus. As this book will demonstrate, the keeping of the Sabbath was given to Israel as a “sign” that would set them apart from all other peoples of the world as God’s chosen people. God designed the Sabbath to be a sign that would distinguish Israel from all the other peoples of the world as His chosen nation. If every nation, kindred, tongue, and people were obligated to keep the Sabbath, as Seventh-day Adventists teach, God could not possibly have used it as a sign to distinguish His people from all the other peoples of the world.

Notice that in Moses’ account of the days of Creation in Genesis 2, the account of the events of each of the first six days ends with the suffix phrase, “and the evening and the morning were the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, or 6th day.” This suffix phrase LIMITS the events discussed on those days to each day itself— one 24-hour period of time. Moses’ account of the events of the 7th day does not have this limiting suffix. In Hebrew, the lack of this suffix phrase causes the events of that day to be unlimited— essentially to last forever. His “rest”, therefore, is limitless. The reciprocal of this indicator is that the memorialization of that day is limited to that day itself, just like a memorial to someone is located in one place— like the George Washington Monument in Washington, DC— but stands throughout time to help us remember the great deeds of the first president of the United States forever. The event memorialized by this day, therefore, could not recycle every seven days. This would only make sense. Once He is finished creating it, He will not work at this process any longer. The entire account of the events of the 7th day talks only about what God did— not what His created humans were supposed to do. God’s rest from creating the Earth was permanent. What He did was not an example for humans to follow.

The reader would not expect any repetitive pattern in regard to the first six days of Creation because of the very nature of the events of those days. There is the POSSIBILITY that you could rest on a repetitive pattern to memorialize the events of the 7th day, but there is no chance that God would create the same things over and over again according to a weekly interval.

This possibility of two meanings in connection with the nature of the events of the 7th day is exactly why Moses needed to choose his words carefully when writing about the events of the 7th day. As an inspired Bible writer, Moses’ wording of this passage was certainly directed by God Himself. Since Moses wrote Genesis after the Exodus, he understood that his readers might arrive at an improper understanding of his words about the events of that seventh day of Creation, even though there was no mention of a Sabbath, because the structure of the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue was modeled after the Creation week in addition to commemorating their rest from the slavery of Egypt that their exodus represented. Let’s apply logic to this situation by examining all the concepts that could possibly need clarification and limitation in arriving at an accurate understanding of what Moses said:

It could stop the day itself from cycling every 7 days. Moses could not use the literary device he utilized because the 7th day of the week did cycle every 7 days, just like all the other days of the week did.

It could differentiate the fact that the 7th day did not involve any creating, but the other six days did. This is an interesting fact (not very interesting), but there is no need to differentiate in this case because this difference is self-evident.

It could indicate that the memorialization represented by the reason given for the day's existence does not cycle every 7 days and that the rest represented by it started on that ONE day and continues indefinitely. This is the only possibility, since the day itself DOES cycle every seven days thereafter, but there is no need for the memorialization of that one day to cycle every 7 days.

Since the discussion is about what God did and not what His people did or were supposed to do, the meaning of this passage must, by the constraints of logic and common sense, mean that the only day ever to stand as a memorial to Creation week is the 7th day of Creation week itself. By the constraints of logic, only God could rest indefinitely from His act of creating the World.

Once we understand that Moses deliberately wrote his account of the days of Creation to make it impossible for a Hebrew reader to see a Sabbath commandment in his remarks about what happened on the 7th day of that week, the very foundation of Sabbatarianism is swept away. Since the Sabbath was given only to the Jews, it should come as no surprise that this shadowy ordinance would end when the Reality steps into full view at the cross. The brightness of the Messiah Himself is so great that the shadow cannot be seen.


A.T. Lincoln, who taught New Testament for five years at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary and later at St. John's College in Nottingham, makes this observation about the open-endedness of the 7th day:

The seventh day is to be seen as representing the completion of the whole creation, and therefore in its blessing the whole creation is blessed. This day is related in this way to the other six, and yet at the same time it is different, for it has no
Cherry Brandstater, in a well-written article posted on her blog spot, *Gently Broken*, reminds us that there are three reasons God gave for giving Israel the Sabbath, two of which apply only to Israel. You can read her complete work at:

http://sogentlybroken.blogspot.com/2008/08/seventh-day-in-creation

1. To see if His Israelite Children would follow His commands. See Exodus 16:4.
2. To remember that He ceased creating on the 7th day of the Creation week. See Exodus 20.
3. To remind them that God had delivered them from slavery, where there was no rest for the weary, and given them a national identify.

4. Brandstater says:

5. “Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.” — Deut. 5:15 (NIV)

6. Here the Sabbath represents a testimony to freedom and redemption because God, the creator of the world, is also the one who released Israel from Egyptian bondage. And he gave not only the Sabbath as a reminder of their redemption but also started their national calendar with that event as if time for them had not existed until then. On that day He became their Redeemer; therefore, they were to keep a calendar and a Holy Day in honor of Him for all the world to see.

It is certainly worth remembering, again, that the Sabbath was designed to set the people of Israel apart from all other nations of the world. It is impossible to use something that applies to everyone to achieve differentiation. The Sabbath for everyone cannot be used for this purpose.

Finally, a look at a literal Hebrew-English equivalency seems to show that the focus of this verse is on what God Himself did on that day. It is an interesting thing to look at as long as one keeps in mind that translating one language into another can be very difficult:

And he is finishing Elohim in (the) day the seventh work of him which he did and he is ceasing
In (the) day the seventh from all of work of him which he did
And he is ceasing in (the) day the seventh from all of work him which he did
And he is blessing Elohim day of seventh and he is making holy him that in him
He ceased from all of work of him which he created Elohim to to do.

Credit = http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/Hebrew_Index.htm

It is most remarkable that the most respected of the Fathers of the Early Church— and the last scholar considered to be a Father of the Early Church, the Venerable Bede (672-735 AD.), and a non-Sabbatarian who viewed the sanctification of the 7th day of Creation as a model for the Sabbath that was later given to Israel and for the rest that Christians would later find in Paradise, was aware of the significance of the fact that the 7th day of Creation did not have an evening and a morning. Here is what he wrote:

Source: Bede: *On Genesis* by Calvin B. Kendall

Google Book, pp. 95,97

[2.3a] And he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. He did this namely with that blessing and sanctification which he revealed more fully to his people in the Law, saying, Remember that you keep holy the sabbath day. Six days shall you labour, and shall do all your works. But on the seventh of the sabbath of the Lord your God, you shall do not work. And a little further on, For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Truly this blessing and sanctification of the seventh day was done as a type of a greater blessing and sanctification. For just as the blood of the Lord's passion, which had to be poured out once for the salvation of the world, was signified by the frequent, indeed, daily sacrifices under the Law, so also by the rest of the seventh day, which always used to be celebrated after the works of the six days, was prefigured that great day of the sabbath, on which the Lord was to rest once in the grave, after having completed and perfected on the sixth day all his works, by which he restored the world, long since lost, which he had completed on the sixth day. On that day also, being mindful, as it were, of the old work, he declared in clear language that he now completed
the salvation of the world. For when he had taken the vinegar, he said, It is consummated. And bowing his head, he gave up the ghost. But also this sanctification and blessing of the seventh day, and the rest of God on that day after his works, signified that they were exceedingly good, because each of us after good works, which he himself works in us both will and to accomplish, struggles toward the rest of heavenly life in which we may enjoy his eternal sanctification and blessing. Hence it is proper that this seventh day is not described as having had an evening, because it truly signifies our eternal rest in it. [Emphasis by authors.]

THE HEBREW LINGUISTICS OF EXODUS 16

Evidence from Definite vs. Indefinite articles

An understanding of the linguistics of Exodus 16 is important to understanding that it is almost certain that this chapter, read in Hebrew by a Hebrew, would see that Moses was very careful to word his account of these events in such a way as to clarify that the Sabbath concept was being introduced for the first time in this passage. It is most interesting to note that a contemporary of Ellen White, Robert Cox, F.S.A. (Scotland), wrote about the linguistics of Exodus 16 in 1865 and summarized the scholarly discussion of this interesting fact over what seems to have been about the previous 200 years. He discusses the indicators in the chapter that help clarify that the Sabbath was given to Israel for the very first time involving the use, in Hebrew, of the definite versus indefinite articles in association with the Hebrew word(s) for Sabbath. I quote Cox from his 1865 edition of the Literature Of The Sabbath Question, published that year in Edinburgh by MacLachlan and Stewart, and in London by Simkin, Marshal, and Company— available to all readers as a Google Book:

In the Hebrew phrase here [verse 23] translated, “the rest of the holy sabbath,” and in that translated “a sabbath” in verse 25, and “the sabbathi” in verse 26, the article is wanting; and consequently, instead of using the definite English article in the first and third instances, our translators [probably referring to the King James Version] ought to have used the indefinite, as they have done in the second instance. The words in verse 23 mean literally, “A resting of a holy sabbath to Jehovah is tomorrow.” In verse 29, where the article is prefixed in the original, we have a correct translation in the phrase “the sabbath,” the institution thus being now spoken of as known to the hearers. This distinction between the 29th and the previous verses in regard to the article, is preserved in the Septuagint, and also in De Wette's translation. Geddes inconsistently gives “a sabbath” in verse 25 and 29, and “the sabbath” in verse 26.

The true rendering of these verses ought to be kept in mind while judging whether or not the sabbath is in this chapter spoken of as an institution previously known to the Israelites. In reference to that question, see Gen. ii. 3 (p. 3); Exod. xx.8-11 (p. 11); Deut. v. 12-15 (p. 25; Neh. ix.14 (p. 35); Ezek. xx. 12 (p. 44).

Here is an explanation that will help us understand why a proper translation of the definite versus indefinite article was so important to Cox. In a language, an ARTICLE modifies a noun (the name of a person, place, or thing), making it either indefinite ("a" or "an") or definite ("the"). Unlike English, Hebrew does not have an indefinite article—just a definite article.

Credit to [www.hebrew4christians.com/grammar/grammatical_terms](http://www.hebrew4christians.com/grammar/grammatical_terms)

The linguistic term ANARTHROUS means, in reference to a noun, that it does not have an article, definite or indefinite, before it (e.g. the Sabbath versus a Sabbath).

Nouns that do not have an article before them in Hebrew are generally translated into English with the indefinite article (e.g. "a" or "an"). However, in the case where the anarthrous nouns are qualitative, the Hebrew noun is often translated without any article.

Credit to [www.hebrew4christians.com/Grammar/Grammatical_terms](http://www.hebrew4christians.com/Grammar/Grammatical_terms)

In Hebrew, the occurrence of an anarthrous noun (one without any kind of an article before it) carries the significance that the whole idea is new. It is of great significance, then, that the Hebrew word for “Sabbath” in Exodus 16:23, Exodus 20:10, and Exodus 35:2-3 is articular in construction.

Additionally, there are only four places in the Pentateuch where this particular form of Hebrew word for Sabbath is found, again indicating that the noun is introducing a concept that is new. In the three latter instances this anarthrous construction occurs within a formula (= Work six days, but on the seventh there is a rest.) The combination of the anarthrous construction within a specified formula gives even more support for the probability that the intention of the Hebrew writer was to emphasize that the concept of the Sabbath was new.

There is abundant scholarly recognition of these aspects of Hebrew linguistics which were researched by Harold H.P. Dressler, who was teaching Old Testament as Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at Northwest Baptist Theological College in Vancouver, BC as of 1982. His paper, “The Sabbath in the Old Testament” is one of the chapters in the book, From Sabbath to the Lord's Day (1982), edited by D.A. Carson. Dressler, provided these scholarly references in footnote number 39, p. 37 in From Sabbath to the Lord's Day:
The anarthrous construction carries significance (i.e. “The whole idea was new”) as pointed out by G. Rawlinson, *Exodus* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., 1906), p.52; A. Dillman, *Die Bucher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: S. Hitzel, 1897), p. 175; P Heinisch, *Das Buch Exodus* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1934), p. 133; G. Henton Davies, *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1967), p. 140. This construction of the word [Hebrew characters not renderable in our word processing program the particular form of the word Sabbath found in this passage] occurs only four times in the Pentateuch, Exodus 16:23; 20:10 (followed in v. 11 with an articular construction) and Exodus 35:2 (followed in v. 3 by an articular construction). In the latter three instances this construction occurs within a formula: “six days work may be done, but on the seventh day there is a Sabbath . . .” The anarthrous construction in Exodus 16:23,25 is unique and may, therefore, well signify the newness of an idea.

The www.bible.ca staff provides a linguistics study that provides even further evidence that the Sabbath was introduced for the first time in Exodus 16. Combined with our understanding of the significance of the anarthrous construction of nouns in Hebrew, it is clear that the majority of the scholars who translate the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament into English have recognized this usage pattern of the Hebrew language for a very long time:

The first time any Jewish holy day is mentioned in scripture, it always lacks the definite article ( “a” Sabbath versus the indefinite “the” Sabbath, for example).

The Jewish holy days are never introduced the first time in Scripture with the definite article “the” but with the indefinite “a” or “an”.

This powerful argument proves that the weekly Sabbath did not exist before Ex 16:23.

What makes it irrefutable is the fact that every Jewish Holy Day follows this same pattern!

**FIRST TIME:** tomorrow is a Sabbath: Ex 16:23

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** the Lord has given you the Sabbath: Ex 16:29

**FIRST TIME:** A solemn rest "a" holy Sabbath: Ex. 16:25

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** “the” Sabbath: Ex 20:11

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** “the” Sabbath: Deuteronomy 5:12

**FIRST TIME:** “a” memorial: Lev. 12:30

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** afterward, “the” Lord’s Passover

**FIRST TIME:**; “an” holy convocation: Lev 23:21

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** “the” day of Pentecost: Acts 2:1

**FIRST TIME:** Unleavened bread: “a” feast: Ex 12:40

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** afterward, “the” feast: Lev. 23:6

**FIRST MENTION:** “an” altar Gen. 8:20

**SUBSEQUENT MENTION:** “the” altar: Gen. 8:20

Not all English translations follow this principle with 100% accuracy, however. In Exodus 16 the NIV appears to supply the indefinite article correctly, whereas the King James Version does not. Here is a comparison of the same passage in both translations:

**NIV translation of Exodus 16:21-26:**

> Each morning everyone gathered as much as he needed, and when the sun grew hot, it melted away. On the sixth day, they gathered twice as much—two omers [b] for each person—and the leaders of the community came and reported this to Moses. He said to them, “This is what the LORD commanded: ‘Tomorrow is to be a day of rest, a holy Sabbath to the LORD. So bake what you want to bake and boil what you want to boil. Save whatever is left and keep it until morning.’”
So they saved it until morning, as Moses commanded, and it did not stink or get maggots in it. “Eat it today,” Moses said, “because today is a Sabbath to the LORD. You will not find any of it on the ground today. Six days you are to gather it, but on the seventh day, the Sabbath, there will not be any.”

King James translation of Exodus 16:21-26:

And they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating: and when the sun waxed hot, it melted. And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the LORD hath said, To morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the LORD: bake that which ye will bake to day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to day; for to day is a sabbath unto the LORD: to day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none.

The Manna Obedience Test

J.N. Andrews, the most respected of the earliest Advent Movement scholars, theorized that some aspects of the “manna test” given to the Hebrews in the early verses of Exodus 16 suggest that the Israelites were already familiar with the Sabbath because God didn’t seem to feel the need to explain His reason for the six days of work followed by one day of rest at that time. This argument has a small degree of merit, and, therefore, is worthy of some consideration. Our analysis of his manna argument resulted in these findings:

1. There is no indication in the Exodus 16 verses to specifically suggest that the people were familiar with the Sabbath concept. If the Israelites were familiar with the Sabbath, they would not need to have been told not to gather manna on the 7th day, since that would represent work.

2. The Hebrews had just come out of Egypt, which utilized a 10-day work week. This is probably the reason why the word for Sabbath for the first time it is mentioned in Exodus 16 is the full form of the word, meaning “a sabbatical celebration, a holy sabbath (Dressler, “The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” Chapter 2 in D.A. Carson (ed.), From Sabbath to Lord’s Day).

3. In Exodus 12, when God is explaining His instructions for the ordinance of the Passover, He does not mention the Sabbath Day when you would otherwise expect Him to do so, and He instructs them to continue preparing food on the seventh day of the Passover Week—a task forbidden by the Sabbath-keeping laws He gave them later:

“This is a day you are to commemorate; for generations to come you shall celebrate it as a festival to the LORD—a lasting ordinance. For seven days you are to eat bread made without yeast. On the first day remove the yeast from your houses, for whoever eats anything with yeast in it from the first day through the seventh must be cut off from Israel. On the first day hold a sacred assembly, and another one on the seventh day. Do no work at all on these days, except to prepare food for everyone to eat—that is all you may do. (NIV)

4. Andrews says this chapter suggests that the Israelites were familiar with the work-six-days/rest-on-the-7th-day pattern because they did not agitate for an explanation regarding it. This is an error of logic, as arguments from silence are among the weakest ones. To the contrary, if Exodus and 16 and Exodus 20 represent a review and re-emphasis of an existing ordinance, it would make little sense to think that the many Israelites who went out to gather manna on the seventh-day in full view of the entire camp would be willing to risk their lives to do so. The Sabbath laws required the death penalty for Israelites who gathered wood on the 7th day.

5. The wording of the passage suggests the test was a new one. If the Sabbath was being kept between the Exodus from Egypt and the giving of the manna, the Israelites would already know that they were not supposed to work on the 7th day, and they would surely understand that gathering manna, like picking up firewood, represented labor:
Then said the LORD unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. – Exodus 16:4

Evidence from Travel Record: Sabbath Breaking From The Red Sea to Mt. Sinai

A theologian characterized by Cox as "pious and profoundly learned," Joseph Mede (died 1638), developed evidence that suggests the Israelites did not keep the Sabbath on their way from the Dead Sea crossing to Mt. Sinai. Here is what he said, quoted by Cox in The Literature of the Sabbath Question, Vol. I, pp.155-156. The entire context of Mede's comments is an argument that the Christians are obligated to keep one day out of 7, since the Sabbath was given at Creation Week, but that which day out of seven they keep doesn't matter, since the Sabbath was probably "re-set" to the day the Hebrews marched out of Egypt at the time of the Exodus. However, your authors are mostly interested in Mede's analysis of time and events of the journey from the Red Sea to Mt. Sinai that seems to prove that the Israelites did not keep the Sabbath during this time:

Certain I am the Jews kept not that day for a Sabbath till the raining of manna. For that which should have been their Sabbath the week before, had they then kept the day which afterward they kept, was the fifteenth day of the second month, and which day we read in the 16th of Exodus, that they marched a wearisome march, and came at night unto the wilderness of Sin, where they murmured for their poor entertainment, and wished they had died in Egypt. That night the Lord sent them quails; the next morning it rained manna, which was the sixteenth day, and so six days together; the seventh, which was the twenty-second day, it rained none, and that day they were commanded to keep for their Sabbath. Now, if the twenty-second day of the month were the Sabbath, the fifteenth should have been, if that day had been kept before; but the text tells us expressly they marched that day; and, which is strange, the day of the month is never named, unless it be once, for any station but this where the Sabbath was ordained, otherwise it could not have been known that that day was ordained for a day of rest, which before was none. And why might not their day of holy rest be altered as well as the beginning of the year was (Exodus xii.2), for a memorial of their coming out of Egypt? I can see no reason why it might not, nor find any testimony to assure me it was not."

Cox comments that if this argument is sound, it endangers the idea that the Sabbath was kept from Creation Week rather from the giving of the manna. To be fair, he points out that an opponent of Mede by the name of Stopford (Scripture Account of the Sabbath, Section X), challenges the validity of his day and time calculations. Cox, paraphrasing Stopford, says of Mede's position:

He [Stopford] contends that Mede (with whom Heylin and Bramhall agree) mistakes in supposing that quails were sent on the evening of the fifteenth day, and manna the next morning.

When studying excerpts like this, context is very important. In the next passage from Cox, the context of his comment that Mede might be totally mistaken is in reference to Mede's belief that because the Sabbath was given at Creation Week, but "re-set" at the time of the Exodus, Christians are morally obligated to rest one day out of every seven days. Cox is not saying that Mede's theory that Israel did not keep the Sabbath on the way from the Red Sea to Mt. Sinai is wrong:

But there is a more vital question, the decision of which in the negative might leave the whole reasoning of Mede without any foundation whatever. Is it allowable to assume that Moses, professing to repeat to the Israelites the laws inscribed on the tables of stone, omitted a part of the Fourth Commandment there written, and substituted something else in its place; expressly telling them at the conclusion of the ten, that the words just repeated were those which the Lord had spoken to them in the mount– to which He had there "added no more"— and which He had written on the tables of stone and delivered to Moses? (See Deut. v.22.) In considering this question, it will not be overlooked by the careful student of the chapter [Exodus 16], that what it records is not a repetition of the sabbath-law, in the sense of its re-inactment or re-imposition, but a retrospective narrative, orally given by Moses, of its enactment on the sole occasion at Sinai, in which narrative he included a historical repetition of the ten commandments which had been then and there proclaimed. [emphasis supplied].

Your present authors observe that there are several indicators within Exodus 16, which, working together, make a good case for the concept that the Sabbath ordinance was given for the very first time with the giving of the manna. This position is consistent with all the other pieces of the puzzle, including the linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 20, that fact that there is no mention of Sabbath-keeping until the giving of the manna, and the purely linguistic aspects of Exodus 16 itself.

THE HEBREW LINGUISTICS OF EXODUS 20

The Hebrew meaning indicators Moses used in his wording of Exodus 20 are complex and apparently require an intimate knowledge of the Hebrew language to identify. Moses went out of his way to quote God's statement in such a way that his Hebrew readers would recognize that although the cultic Sabbath ordinance was modeled after the Creation week, the idea that
the Sabbath ordinance was instituted at the time of Creation is contraindicated. Unfortunately we cannot reproduce the Hebrew characters as they are found in the printed book we are quoting. Again we turn to the results of A.T. Lincoln’s linguistic study:

The last clause of Exodus 20:11 gives the reason for the Mosaic institution and takes up the terminology of blessing and hallowing from Genesis 2:2-3, now specifically applying these terms to the “Sabbath” rather than the seventh day, and is not to be taken as implying that the seventh day of Genesis 2:3 was already the Sabbath set aside by God for humanity. As H.H.P. Dressler points out, the present commandment is based on a previous event, and the significance of the Hebrew construction translated as “therefore”, is crucial to this interpretation, as it often functions to connect causally an event in the past with a situation some time later. In fact scholars often speak of an “etiology” when a present name or practice is explained on the basis of a previous event or story, and [the Hebrew word translated “therefore”] is one of the marks by which an etiology is recognized. Exodus 20:11 indeed contains in addition to this introductory formula a further feature typical of an etiology—the word play between “the seventh day” and “the Sabbath day.” Such etiological passages, after the introductory “therefore” or “consequently now,“ can have the verb in the past tense without implying a strictly past meaning. The presence of these features in Exodus 20:11 suggest that it too is to be seen as providing an explanation of a present institution, the Mosaic Sabbath, by reference to a past event, God’s rest after the creation, utilizing the terminology of Genesis 2:3 and a play on words to make its point. (D.A. Carson, From Sabbath to Lord’s Day, p. 349)

Note that there are two Hebrew usage indicators which work together to clarify to the Hebrew reader that the new ordinance cannot be construed as having its original beginning at a time in the distant past.

Paul evidently well-understood that there was no Sabbath law in existence before the Exodus, as can be deduced by the following passage:

For before the law was given, sin was in the world. But sin is not taken into account when there is no law. — Romans 5:13 (NIV)

All we have to do, here, is to apply some common-sense reasoning. There was no sin in the world before Creation. Adam, Eve, Cain, and their descendants sinned. Paul could not possibly mean that there was no law in effect at all. We know that Adam and Eve had one law given to them at Creation, and that was not to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. We know that God loosely codified a set of laws for all the people of the world during the age of Noah and the Flood, which the Jews refer to as the Noachian laws, and we know that God gave Israel 613 rules and regulations, including the 10 Commandment Covenant, at Mt. Sinai. We know God gave the Sabbath law with the giving of the Manna. We see no Sabbath commandment in Genesis 2 and no Sabbath commandment within the Noachian laws.

CIRCUMCISION AND THE SABBATH ARE INSEPARABLY BOUND TOGETHER

A former Adventist researcher who has chosen to remain anonymous has found proof in the work of Seventh-day Adventist theologians Maxwell and Damsteegt that Seventh-day Adventists have known since no later than 1992 that the Jews have always understood that observance of the ordinance of circumcision was a requirement for keeping the Sabbath. This unnamed former Adventist scholar, whose work we found posted at a web-site which examines the Sabbatarian views of the now defunct Worldwide Church of God, focuses on the research of these SDA biblical scholars, Mervyn, and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992.

So, if the Christians were worshiping on Sunday, why wasn’t there an outcry in the Jewish church in Jerusalem? It was a church that most likely continued to meet on Saturday at the synagogue for several decades to hear the scriptures read. The reason they did not cry out in protest is because Jews believed then, and still believe now, that the Sabbath was given only to Jews. They NEVER expected Gentiles (which made up most of the early church) to keep the Sabbath. Notice the following passages:

“The children of Noah...were given seven Laws only, the observance of the Sabbath not being among them” (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., p. 23], as quoted in C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 75).

The Noachian laws are also listed in Midrash Genesis Rabbah 16:6 (Soncino ed., p. 131), Sanhedrin 56 a, b; and Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah 1:2(5) (Soncino ed. pp. 26-7) (ibid., p. 74). Gentiles could be considered righteous if they observed these laws, which did not include the Sabbath. Nor did they include restrictions about pork. Rabbi Judah could say that there was a time for the “sons of Jacob when unclean beasts were still permitted to them” (Hullin 7.6, as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 74 The rabbis did not think that the Sabbath had been given to Gentiles: “Why does it say, ‘The Lord hath given you’ (Ex. 16:29)? To you hath he given it [the Sabbath], but not to the heathen. It is in virtue of this that the Sages stated [Sanh. 56b] that if some of the heathen observed the Sabbath, then not only do they not receive any reward [but they are even considered to be transgressing]”(Midrash Exodus Rabbah 25:11 [Soncino ed., p. 314], as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 74).
"A non-Jew who observes the Sabbath whilst he is uncircumcised incurs liability for the punishment of death. Why? Because non-Jews were not commanded concerning it... The Sabbath is a reunion between Israel and God, as it is said, 'It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel' (Ex. 31:17); therefore any non-Jew who, being uncircumcised, thrusts himself between them incurs the penalty of death... The Gentiles have not been commanded to observe the Sabbath" (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., pp. 23-4], as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 75).

Further evidence of the antiquity of this rabbinic understanding comes from the second-century BC book of Jubilees:

"The Creator of all blessed it, but he did not sanctify any people or nations to keep the Sabbath thereon with the sole exception of Israel. He granted to them alone that they might eat and drink and keep the Sabbath thereon upon the earth" (Jubilees 2:31, James Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, [New York: Doubleday, 1985], vol. 2, p. 58).

As noted by William Hohmann, it was the fact that the Jews understood that the Sabbath was only for the Jews that combined with the decision of the Council of Jerusalem not to require the new Gentile converts to be circumcised that prevented any controversy over the official discontinuance of the ordinances of circumcision and the Sabbath at that time.

http://www.wcg.org/lit/law/sabbath/history1.htm

Our unidentified web-host and former Adventist researcher sums up his observations regarding the significance of the findings of Maxwell and Damsteegt:

Based on these quotes above, we can see from the Jewish writings, and from the Adventist documents that the Gentiles were never expected to keep the Sabbath. This was the understanding of the Jews, to whom the Sabbath was given, and whom Christ never corrected on this matter. So, this begs the question, Why do Adventist's and others keep the Sabbath rather than the Lords day, which according to the writings of early Christians, was kept during the time of the Apostles?

http://www.sda2rc.com/e-mail_sda2rc.html (Names not disclosed on web-site.)

We will spend a considerable amount of time examining the circumcision-Sabbath connection because the concept is so critically important to the Sabbath question. A proper understanding of this principle helps us understand what St. Paul was thinking when he wrote about the law, circumcision, and the Sabbath. Paul was a Jewish lawyer, and he would have thought about these things the same way as other Jewish lawyers.

Israel viewed the Law of Moses as one integrated, inseparable body of 613 equally important “covenant” points of law. You break one of these 613 laws, and you have broken them all, violating the covenant. The Decalogue was only a part of the Law of Moses, and it was strikingly incomplete. Take the 7th Commandment that proscribes adultery—a sexual relationship between a married person and someone of the opposite sex to whom he or she is not married. The Decalogue section of the Law of Moses does not forbid sexual relationships between a man and a woman who are not married. By the very definition of the word, adultery, two unmarried persons cannot possibly commit this sin. Any attempt to say that adultery covers all sexual sins ignores the facts of the English language. In English, fornication is the definition of a sexual relationship between a man and a woman who are not married. Even more striking is that the Decalogue portion of the Law of Moses does not address homosexual behavior or human sexual relations with animals.

Evidence of the interpretive restrictions imposed by the existence of the separate definitions of these English words is that God chose to cover these additional areas of sexual sins—fornication, homosexuality, and bestiality outside of the Decalogue “section” of the Law of Moses. The Jews believed that all 613 of these laws were equally important. Thus, when St. Paul says that circumcision is a token of bondage to the entire law, we are confronted with the principle that without the requirement for circumcision, there is no requirement for keeping the Sabbath. Keep in mind that the abrogation of the Decalogue does not do away with the 7 moral laws God gave to all the peoples of the world, which the Jews speak of as the Noachian laws. Here is what Paul said:

Again I declare to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obligated to obey the whole law. (Galatians 5:3)

The Torah, remember, contains the Sabbath commandment and is included in the 613 laws of Moses. There is sufficient evidence that Gentile men who chose to locate within a Jewish community had to be circumcised if he wanted his family to be able to participate in any of the ordinances that God had given to Israel. Before the Law of Moses was given at Mt. Sinai, God required the foreigner who wished to participate in the Passover to be circumcised:

“An alien living among you who wants to celebrate the LORD's Passover must have all the males in his household circumcised; then he may take part like one born in the land. No uncircumcised male may eat of it.” (Exodus 12:48)
In the Old Testament we see that Gentiles were only required to keep the Sabbath if they chose to unite with a Jewish community mentioned as we see in this passage from Isaiah 56– a text which Sabbatarians like to use to demonstrate the perpetuity of the Sabbath:

3 Let no foreigner who has bound himself to the LORD say, “The LORD will surely exclude me from his people.”
And let not any eunuch complain, “I am only a dry tree.”

For this is what the LORD says:
“To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me
and hold fast to my covenant—

to them I will give within my temple and its walls
a memorial and a name
better than sons and daughters;
I will give them an everlasting name
that will not be cut off.

And foreigners who bind themselves to the LORD
to serve him,
to love the name of the LORD,
and to worship him,
all who keep the Sabbath without desecrating it
and who hold fast to my covenant—
theses will bring to my holy mountain
and give them joy in my house of prayer.
Their burnt offerings and sacrifices
will be accepted on my altar;
for my house will be called
a house of prayer for all nations.” (NIV)

In our study of the validity of Sabbatarianism, our interest is as much in how the Israelites viewed the concept of law and its relationship to the Sabbath as we are in the actual teachings of the Scripture regarding it. What we do know is that by the time of the life and times of Jesus, the keeping of the Torah– the Law of Moses– was thought of to be for Jews only, and Gentiles were not welcome to participate in its ordinances unless they were circumcised.

The Council of Jerusalem decided not to impose circumcision on the Gentile converts, thus ending the Sabbath question forever. Dr. Bacchiocchi teaches that the exemption (contrary to the law) for circumcision was for the Gentiles only and was still required for the Jewish Christians. (See Bacchiocchi’s essay, “How Did Sabbath Keeping Begin,” in the section titled, ‘Attachment to the Law.’) If the issue involved here is truly a moral one, God could therefore not make a distinction between what Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians were required to do! We are at a total loss to see why Dr. Bacchiocchi would suggest such an idea. It is inconsistent with what the Bible teaches about God, Who is known not to be a “respecer of persons.” Dr. Bacchiocchi’s willingness to split the requirement for Sabbath-keeping between the Jew and the Gentile is an outrageous and desperate attempt on his part to extricate himself from the illogical web into which he has fallen. How could Sabbatarians, then, teach that a Gentile like you and us must now start keeping the Sabbath?

The biblical understanding of circumcision as taught in Scripture and Jewish rabbinical writings is close to absolute proof that Sabbath-keeping ended at the cross and was officially put to rest at the Council of Jerusalem.

As we mentioned earlier, Jewish thought regarding Gentiles and the Sabbath is based on the Jewish belief that the Sabbath was not given to Adam and Eve at the Creation. Understanding the linguistics of their own Hebrew language, they clearly perceived that Moses worded his account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in such a way as to make certain they could not possibly read a Sabbath commandment in what he said.

The Jews understood that the Sabbath commandment was given only to Israel. The Jews recognized two different sets of laws– the Noachian laws– which were given to everyone at the beginning of the world, and the TORAH laws that were given to Israel at the time of the Exodus. Please study these quotations from the Jewish Encyclopedia carefully:
The Seven Laws.

Laws which were supposed by the Rabbis to have been binding upon mankind at large even before the revelation at Sinai, and which are still binding upon non-Jews. The term ‘Noachian’ indicates the universality of these ordinances, since the whole human race was supposed to be descended from the three sons of Noah, who alone survived the Flood. Although only those laws which are found in the earlier chapters of the Pentateuch, before the record of the revelation at Sinai, should, it would seem, be binding upon all mankind, yet the Rabbis discarded some and, by hermeneutic rules or in accordance with some tradition (see Judah ha-Levi, “Cuzari,” iii. 73), introduced others which are not found there. Basing their views on the passage in Gen. ii. 16, they declared that the following six commandments were enjoined upon Adam: (1) not to worship idols; (2) not to blaspheme the name of God; (3) to establish courts of justice; (4) not to kill; (5) not to commit adultery; and (6) not to rob (Gen. R. xvi. 9, xxiv. 5; Cant. R. i. 16; comp. Seder Olam Rabbah, ed. Ratner, ch. v. and notes, Wilna, 1897; Maimonides, “Yad,” Melakim, ix. 1). A seventh commandment was added after the Flood—not to eat flesh that had been cut from a living animal (Gen. ix. 4). Thus, the Talmud frequently speaks of “the seven laws of the sons of Noah,” which were regarded as obligatory upon all mankind, in contradistinction to those that were binding upon Israelites only (Tosef., Ab. Zarah, ix. 4; Sanh. 56a et seq.).

He who observed the seven Noachian laws was regarded as a domiciled alien (Ab. Zarah 64b; see Proselyte), as one of the pious of the Gentiles, and was assured of a portion in the world to come (Tosef., Sanh. xiii. 1; Sanh. 105a; comp. ib. 91b; “Yad,” l.c. viii. 11).

Here is a more extensive quote from the Jewish Encyclopedia which supports the concept that the Jews are very serious about their belief that the Sabbath was given to Israel alone. This passage is particularly interesting because it has a direct bearing on the Sabbath question for Christians as viewed by the Jews (Jewish Encyclopedia, article, “Gentile,” section “Gentiles May Not Be Taught the Torah”):

Resh Laish (d. 278) said, “A Gentile observing the Sabbath deserves death” (Sanh. 58b). This refers to a Gentile who accepted the seven laws of the Noachideæ, inasmuch as “the Sabbath is a sign between God and Israel alone,” and it was probably directed against the Christian Jews, who disregarded the Mosaic laws and yet at that time kept up the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. Rabbina, who lived about 150 years after the Christians had changed the day of rest to Sunday, could not quite understand the principle underlying Resh Laish's law, and, commenting upon it, added: “not even on Mondays [is the Gentile allowed to rest]”; intimating that the mandate given to the Noachideæ that “day and night shall not cease” (=“have no rest”) should be taken in a literal sense (Gen. VIII. 22)—probably to discourage general idleness (ib. Rashi), or for the more plausible reason advanced by Maimonides, who says: “The principle is, one is not permitted to make innovations in religion or to create new commandments. He has the privilege to become a true proselyte by accepting the whole Law” (“Yad,” Melakim, x. 9). R. Emden [An unrenderable Hebrew symbol follows the word “Emden,” ed. note] In a remarkable apology for Christianity contained in his appendix to Seder Olam (pp. 32b-34b, Hamburg, 1752), gives it as his opinion that the original intention of Jesus, and especially of Paul, was to convert only the Gentiles to the seven moral laws of Noah and to let the Jews follow the Mosaic law— which explains the apparent contradictions in the New Testament regarding the laws of Moses and the Sabbath.

There are a number of concepts we can learn from a combination of Jewish traditional theology and the Bible which impact the Sabbath and its implications for Christians:

1. The Jews knew the Sabbath didn't begin at Creation.
2. The Jews believed the Sabbath was given to Israel and Israel alone.
3. The Jews, who are known to be excellent historians, knew that Christians abandoned the Sabbath almost immediately, and the most extreme of the rabbis in the early Christian era taught that Christians and others who kept the Sabbath should be put to death. (See page 33 for the comments of the Jewish Encyclopedia regarding.)
4. Similarly, the gateway to keeping the TORAH, even for an Israelite, was circumcision. Circumcision represents the bondage of an Israelite to the Torah.
5. The Sabbath was not part of Noachian Law.
6. God sent his prophets to rebuke many Gentile nations, but there is no record in the Bible that God ever rebuked them for Sabbath-breaking.
7. Jesus viewed both the Sabbath and circumcision to be ceremonial in nature. He did not condemn the Jews for breaking the Sabbath to circumcise a child on the 8th day following his birth according to the laws of Moses: John 7:21-23 (NIV) Jesus said to them, “I did one miracle, and you are all astonished. Yet, because Moses gave
you circumcision (though actually it did not come from Moses, but from the patriarchs), you circumcise a child on the Sabbath. 23 Now if a child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the Law of Moses may not be broken, why are you angry with me for healing the whole man on the Sabbath?"

8. The Weekly Sabbath is listed in Leviticus 23 as one of many ceremonial ordinances.

At the Council of Jerusalem, the Apostle Paul, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was able to persuade the other Early Church leaders to avoid saddling the new Gentile converts with a burden that neither they nor their Jewish fathers were able to bear. Once the decision was made not to require the Gentile converts to be circumcised, the Sabbath question was settled forever. There was no chance for the Sabbath question to surface again without first reviving the requirement that Christians practice circumcision. This understanding helps us to see why the requirement to keep the Jewish Sabbath was never indicated in any Scripture that post-dated this historic council.

The link between circumcision, the TORAH, and the Sabbath is clear. Acts 15:4 - Acts 15:5 (NIV):

4And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them.

5But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.

Both Christians and Jews understood that TORAH law was designed to keep Jews and Gentiles separate. The TORAH, with the Sabbath and its dietary laws, had to come to an end before the Gospel could include the Gentiles. While it may not matter what day Christians choose to worship God, choosing to retain the Sabbath as a day of rest is like rebuilding the same wall of separation that cost God so much to tear down. Here is how Paul talks about this concept in Ephesians Chapter 2:

Therefore, remember that formerly you who are Gentiles by birth and called “uncircumcised” by those who call themselves “the circumcision” (that done in the body by the hands of men)— remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world. 14 But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far away have been brought near through the blood of Christ. For He himself is our peace, who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit. Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God’s people and members of God’s household, 2 built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone. In Him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord. And in Him you too are being built together to become a dwelling in which God lives by His Spirit. (NIV)

Jews and Christians can now eat together and worship together. The barrier erected by the Jewish ordinances of the Sabbath, the Jewish dietary laws, and circumcision have been destroyed by what happened at the cross.

The Jews, according to the rabbinical writings down through history, have believed the Sabbath was given to them at the Exodus as a sign to differentiate them from all the other peoples of the world. In fact the very words of God Himself explain why He gave the Sabbath to Israel:

“Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the LORD your God has commanded you. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor the alien within your gates, so that your manservant and maidservant may rest, as you do. Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.” (NIV-Deuteronomy 5:12-15)
The only people ever brought out of slavery from Egypt by the hand of God were the Hebrews. Christians have never been rescued from slavery in Egypt. Moses is quoting God's words in this passage. Moses' wording of Exodus 20 does not explain any reason for the giving of the Sabbath ordinance at that time when the Hebrew linguistics of the text is understood. Instead Moses explains the rationale for the model of the new Sabbath ordinance in Exodus 20. It is unlikely that their Egyptian masters recognized a seven day week. The Egyptian "week" might have been 7 days, 8 days, 10 days, 14 days, or 28 days, or they might have marked time only by the month and year. By relating the 7 days of the Creation week to the recurrence of the Sabbath every seven days, God established a memorable rationale for its structure. After 400 years of slavery in Egypt, the Hebrews likely needed an orientation to the 7-day week concept, and they certainly needed some rest.

Furthermore, the Jews believed the Gentiles would be eternally saved if they kept the basic moral laws given to mankind in the Book of Genesis. The rabbinical writings make this fact very clear as documented in the Jewish Encyclopedia. It is no surprise that the Jews would view the Sabbath this way, since they read the books of Moses in their own language. The meaning indicators that are invisible to us are perfectly clear to them. They have recognized, "from the beginning," that Moses contraindicated a Sabbath commandment at the time of Creation. In his classic "A Digest of the Sabbath Question," Robert D. Brinsmead says:


The Jews referred to these universal moral laws given to mankind in the Book of Genesis as the “Noachian Laws.” The Sabbath was not a part of Noachian Law. Therefore, the Jews believe that the Gentiles who keep the Noachian laws will be saved without having kept the Sabbath, and there is no indication in the rabbinical records that the Jews ever believed otherwise. God never sent an Israelite prophet to rebuke a heathen nation or city for Sabbath-breaking, but He did so for disregarding Noachian Law. If Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Adam were saved without keeping the Sabbath, Christians can be saved without keeping it also.

The logic of set theory demands that one cannot use a trait that is characteristic of all the members of the set to create a subset. C.S. Lewis once said that nonsense is nonsense even when you are talking about God. One of the reasons God explained for giving the Sabbath to Israel was to create a sign that would differentiate them from all the other nations of the world. If all the nations, kindred, tongues, and people of the world kept the Sabbath, it would be impossible for God to use the Sabbath as a distinguishing sign. In fact God wished to keep Israel separate from the Heathen during the dispensation of the Torah (Exodus to the Cross) for good reasons. The Israelites were a stubborn and stiff-necked people according to God's own assessment. He knew the Hebrews would easily be corrupted by associating with the Heathens. The ordinances of the Sabbath, circumcision, and the Jewish dietary laws placed a high wall of social separation between Israel and the Gentiles. If people don't eat together, they are less likely to become friends. Along similar lines, the ordinance of circumcision made it a very painful process for the head of a Gentile household to make a decision to join an Israelite community and to live as a proselyte. Contrast this with God's expressed New Covenant purpose to tear down this barrier between Jews and Gentiles after the cross. St. Paul was God's specially designated ambassador of the Gospel to the Gentiles according to Scripture.

It should be clear, now, that the Adventist interpretation that only the "ceremonial" laws were nailed to the cross is not possible for a number of reasons. The Sabbath was a ceremonial law designed to keep Israel and the Gentiles separate, and that barrier must come down if Jews and Gentiles are to be united in the Gospel. The Old Testament, as well as Jewish traditional theology, views the TORAH as absolutely inseparable.

At least in the years subsequent to the writing of From Sabbath to Sunday, Dr. Bacchiocchi was fully aware of the Jewish concept of the circumcision-Sabbath connection, although he never acknowledged the existence of the biblical foundation for this principle. In a later book he acknowledges that the opinion of Jewish rabbinical thought for hundreds of years before the birth of Christ was that the Sabbath was given to Israel at the time of the giving of the manna, that it was given only to Israel, and that circumcision was a prerequisite for both Israelites and proselytes to Judaism for keeping the Sabbath. Here is proof of what he knew, quoting a section of that book.

Please keep in mind you are about to read a statement by a pro-Sabbatarian, Seventh-day Adventist author who had access to scholarly studies that, by the time he wrote this, had thoroughly disproved the concept that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance as researched by the D. A. Carson team and discussed elsewhere in this book. He offers no proof that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance, perhaps because there is no such proof to offer and all the evidence is against this point-of-view. We do not approve of the content of the following quoted passage:

**QUESTION:**

Have not Rabbis and Church Fathers taught that the Sabbath is a Mosaic institution established by Moses for Israel alone?

Does not this historical view negate the creation origin and universal validity of the Sabbath?
**ANSWER:**

Mosaic Institution. Some Palestinian Rabbis and some early Church Fathers did reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance for mankind to a Mosaic institution for the Jews. Their teaching, however, does not negate the validity of the Biblical view of the creation origin and universal scope of the Sabbath, because the teachings of the Scriptures are not "a matter of one’s own interpretation" (2 Pet 1:20).

**Jewish Identity.** Furthermore, note should be taken of the factors which contributed to the adoption of the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. It was the strong desire to preserve a Jewish identity, at a time when Hellenistic forces were pressing for the abandonment of the Jewish religion, that apparently led Palestinian Rabbis to reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance established for mankind to a Mosaic ordinance given exclusively to Israel.

Such a development occurred in response to the determined efforts of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes to implement a program of radical Hellenization of the Jews through the prohibition of sacrifices and Sabbath-keeping (175 BC). The result was that many Jews fell away, "sacrificed to the gods and desecrated the Sabbath" (1 Macc. 1:43).

Pious Jews passionately resisted the Hellenization efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes, preferring to be slaughtered rather than desecrate the Sabbath (1 Macc 2:32-38). The need to preserve a Jewish identity at that critical time inspired an exclusivistic and nationalistic view of the Sabbath.

The notion was introduced at this time by some Rabbis that the privilege of Sabbath-keeping was denied to the Gentiles and reserved exclusively for Israel. As stated in the book of Jubilees, "He [God] allowed no other people or peoples to keep the Sabbath on this day, except Israel only; to it alone he granted to eat and drink and keep the Sabbath on it" (2:31). If the patriarchs are sometimes mentioned as keeping the Sabbath, this is regarded as an exception "before it [the Sabbath] was given" to Israel.

**A Secondary Development.** The notion of the Sabbath as an exclusively Jewish institution, established not at creation for all mankind but by Moses for Israel alone, Makes God guilty, to say the least, of favoritism and discriminatory practices.

It must be said, however, that the notion of a Mosaic origin of the Sabbath represents a late secondary development rather than an original tradition. This is borne out by the fact that in Hellenistic (Greek) Judaism the Sabbath was viewed as a creation ordinance for mankind. Moreover, even in Palestinian literature (both apocalyptic and rabbinic) frequent mention is made of God, Adam, Seth, Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph as scrupulously observing the Sabbath.

**Apologetic Need.** The early Fathers adopted the notion of the Mosaic origin and exclusive Jewish nature of the Sabbath, to challenge those Christians who defended the binding obligations of the Sabbath commandment in the Christian dispensation. The standard and frequent argument is that the patriarchs and righteous men before Moses did not observe the Sabbath, and thus the day must be regarded as a temporary ordinance, deriving from Moses, and enjoined exclusively on the Jews on account of their unfaithfulness.

The reduction of a creation ordinance to an infamous sign of Jewish disobedience may reflect the need for short-term apologetic arguments, but it lacks a comprehension of the permanent and lofty values placed upon the Sabbath by Scripture.

(Dr. Bacchiocchi, from The Sabbath in the New Testament, Answers to Questions, Chapter 8, “Questions About The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” posted at Dr. Bacchiocchi's web-site, Biblical Perspectives.)

Again, our purpose in providing the above reference from Dr. Bacchiocchi is simply to show that he was well aware of facts that make his Sabbatarian views very difficult to sustain.

**JESUS SAID THE SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN DOES NOT MEAN IT WAS GIVEN TO ALL MANKIND (MARK 2:27)**

Jesus' statement that the Sabbath was made for man looks like a possible defense for Sabbatarianism if you isolate the statement from everything else we know about the Bible. The Sabbath did not begin in Eden. It was given to the Jews as a sign to distinguish Israel from all the other peoples of the world. Sabbath-keeping requires circumcision, which was given only to Israel. The Jews have always believed that the Sabbath was given to Israel and Israel alone. This statement of Jesus' is open to a degree of interpretation. Yes, the Sabbath was "given" to "man", but at what time and under what circumstances? A former member of The Worldwide Church of God, Michael Morrison, explains why the Pharisees would have been very upset if they had interpreted Jesus' statement to mean that the Sabbath was given to all nations. Here is Morrison's excellent commentary on this question from this former World Wide Church of God writer:
After the Pharisees criticized Jesus for allowing his disciples to pick some grain on the Sabbath day, Jesus said, “The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath” (Mark 2:27). Was he saying that God made the Sabbath for both Jews and gentiles—all human beings?

No, that was not the point. Jesus did not say that the Sabbath was made for all people. The Pharisees believed that the Sabbath was for Jews only. If Jesus had said that the Sabbath was made for gentiles, it would have created another controversy.

The Pharisees were concerned about the behavior of the disciples, not the gentiles. If Jesus responded by teaching that the Sabbath was made for everyone, it would have supported the Pharisees’ concerns instead of refuting them.

The Pharisees were overestimating the importance of Sabbath restrictions. Jesus responded to them not by expanding the Sabbath, but by reducing it.

We can see what Jesus meant by looking at the next phrase: “and not man for the Sabbath.” His point was that the Sabbath was made to serve people, instead of people being created to serve the Sabbath. The Sabbath was a servant, not a master. He was addressing the relative importance of the Sabbath, not which specific people were given the Sabbath.

We could just as easily say, “Circumcision was made for humans, not for angels.” This statement is true, but we should not focus on the first half as if it meant that circumcision was made for all humans. It was given to Israel only, not the rest of the world.

Similarly, Jesus said that the Sabbath was made for humans, but he did not say, nor did he mean, that it was made for all humans.

Michael Morrison

You can reference this quotation at the following web address: wcg.org/lit/law/sabbath/mark227.htm

Finally, turning to A.T. Lincoln’s expertise on biblical languages once more, we find still additional understanding of this passage. Since we are unable to render the Greek characters, I have adapted Lincoln’s remarks to convey his meaning without the use of them:

One further text is often used to support the view that the Sabbath was a creation ordinance, namely Mark 2:27, which contains the saying of Jesus, “The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.” It is claimed that the [Greek] verb for ‘was made’ refers more naturally to the creation than to the giving of the law and that [the Greek word here for “man”; ‘anthropos’] is generic in meaning and thus can include a reference back to the first man. Suffice it to say that in its context Mark 2:27 simply does not have such notions in view. The words of Jesus point to the purpose of the Sabbath— it was brought into being by God for a person’s benefit. Neither the temporal origin of the Sabbath nor its scope are relevant to this saying achieving its intended effect. (D.A. Carson, ed., From Saturday to Lord’s Day, p. 349,350)

Bill Hohmann has just completed a thorough study of this passage for his own new book, Christianity 101, and we are pleased to incorporate this research in the second and third editions of Lying For God. His work assists the Christian reader to understand how the failure to apply the basic principles of logic to a study of the Bible can result in interpretations that send Christians off on a tangent. You can read his entire book at Robert K. Sander's web-site, www.truthorfables.com . The following is from Chapter Six, "Methods of Deception:"

EISEGESIS (A.K.A. PROOF TEXTING)

This is the practice of taking a passage of Scripture out of context, and focusing on it in such a way as to conclude something beyond the scope of the context. For example, Sabbatarian legalists are fond of quoting Mark 2:27:

And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

The context was about Jesus explaining to the Pharisees that the “man” was not made or created for the Sabbath, but rather the Sabbath was made for the man, seeing as the mindset of the Jews and especially the Pharisees was one of a strict and burdensome interpretation and application of the sabbath commandment. To conclude though that the “man” in this instance is to be interpreted to mean all of mankind is to take this way beyond the scope of what was being discussed. What “man” was given the sabbath and required to keep it? The Israelites via a covenant between them and God. To interpret anthropos as being all of humanity in this example is to be sloppy in one’s scholarship. But when you are trying to “prove” a false belief, anything goes, and careful scholarship is the first thing to suffer. In response, I point this out:

And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. — Matthew 10:22
All men would rightly include other Christian believers, would it not? But the Sabbatarian attempts to ignore the obvious by insisting “men” is not in the passage; that “men” is implied. Fair enough then. If men is implied, then who are these “all?” all animals? Who or what has the ability to hate? Other people; all of them. So is “all” all inclusive here, or not? Or, is the Sabbatarian legalist going to resort to Clintonian semantics now?

If anthropos is going to be understood in Mark 2:27 as meaning all mankind, then shouldn’t we apply the same standard to the word “all” here?

What we also need to do is examine how the writer, in this case Mark, uses the same word “man” (anthropos) in the gospel of Mark in order to establish whether Mark always uses the word to mean “all mankind.”

In that same passage, Mark relates that Jesus used the term: “Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.”

The word “man” here is the same anthropos. Is the “Son of man” literally the son of all mankind? No. The word “man” here is used in a more figurative sense. Already we can see that anthropos as used by Mark, does not always mean “all mankind” as the Sabbatarian insists.

And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. — Mark 3:1

The word “man” here is anthropos. Again, does the word mean “all mankind?” No, for not all mankind was standing there with withered hands. Mark is referring to just one man.

The word anthropos is not a rigid word. It can mean anything from a single man, to a man or men in general. To assign to it arbitrarily the meaning of all mankind simply because it is in line with one’s theological beliefs is scholastically dishonest. It is poor and lazy scholarship.

The context of Mark chapter two in regards to this example shows the duplicitous way the entire passage is used by those who are deceived. The Pharisees claim Jesus’ disciples were doing that which was illegal to do on the Sabbath; picking grain to eat. The Sabbatarian insists this was not unlawful, thereby ignoring the context even more so. They claim that picking and eating grain on a Sabbath was one of the many added restrictions to the law the Pharisees were renowned for, yet Jesus does not dispute their claim regarding the legality of the claim. It was indeed against the law to pick the grain, even as it was unlawful for David to eat the showbread. To cover up this flaw in logic and reason, the Sabbatarian often resorts to the excuse of the rights of kings, yet David was not at that time king, and the law did not provide a king with special privileges. All were treated equally under the law. This in itself is an example of using one falsehood to prop up another falsehood.

It was illegal for the Israelites to go out and attempt to gather manna on a Sabbath, even though there was no manna available on a Sabbath. It was illegal to go out and gather sticks. The flawed logic of the Sabbatarian would have us believe that to go out into a field to gather grain to eat was not a violation of the Sabbath Commandment, yet trying to go out to gather manna to eat, that wasn’t even there, was a violation!

Let us recap. The Sabbatarian quotes Mark 2:27 and makes the claim that “man” means all of mankind, and further concludes all mankind is therefore required to keep the Sabbath, thereby treating the passage eisegetically.

By using just some of the methods of proper scholarship, we have determined the claims to be false, for the premise that anthropos means “all mankind” is shown to be false based upon the further writings by the same author. We also recognize the passage as being used eisegetically by the Sabbatarian, and eisegesis is not a proper method of scholarship. It is one of the many methods employed in deceptions and falsehoods.

The context of Scripture shows that only the Israelites were required to “keep the Sabbath” and that the Sabbath was the sign between God and Israel in relation to their covenant. We can find no example of anyone prior to the children of Israel keeping the Sabbath, nor do we find any example of anyone else being commanded to keep the Sabbath, let alone all mankind. The claim by Sabbatarians that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation is but another example of attempting to prop up one false belief with another false belief. The seventh day may well have been established as the last day in a seven day weekly cycle, but there is no evidence of Adam and Eve being commanded to rest on that day, or anyone else until God commanding the Israelites to do so. It was God who rested on that seventh day of creation, and not Adam and Eve. The first man and woman did not work the previous six days; God did. Adam and Eve were created the day before that seventh day. Strange, don’t you think, that Sabbatarians would insist the sabbath day rest was instituted at Creation for all mankind when neither Adam and Eve had been working?

You can access Bill’s article at http://asbereansdid.blogspot.com/ or www.truthorfables.com.
There is evidence from Jewish thought, including something Jesus said Himself, that strongly suggests that Jesus intended that His statement that the Sabbath was made for "man" be interpreted as made for Israel. As we have noted earlier in our discussion of Mark 2:27-28, the Jews would have been very angry with Jesus if He had suggested that the Sabbath was made for everyone. The Jews thought of and referred to the Gentiles as "dogs" or wild animals. Jesus revealed the existence of this tragic Jewish attitude in his effort to teach his disciples that God loved even the heathen people of the world in the way he worded His statements in regard to the incident of the healing of the possessed child of the Phoenician woman. She remarked to Jesus, as you will remember, that even the dogs are allowed to eat the crumbs that fall from the master's table, and Jesus healed her child as a result of that humble, faithful plea in the presence of his disciples.

Here is an eye-opening insight from John Gill’s *Exposition of the Bible*. John Gill preached in the same church as Charles Spurgeon 100 years earlier, and his work is in the public domain. He quotes the medieval Jewish Torah scholar, Moses Maimonides (1135 to 1204 A.D.):

**Mark 2:27**

And he said unto them, continuing his answer to them, and adding, in confirmation of what he had said, and for the further vindication of his disciples, the sabbath was made for man; for his good, and not for his hurt; both for the good of his soul, that he might have an opportunity of attending divine worship, both in public and private; and for the good of his body, that he might have rest from his labour; and this was the end of the original institution and appointment of it; and therefore works of necessity are not forbidden on this day; such as are for the necessary comfort, support, and preservation of life; or otherwise it would be apparent, that the sabbath was not appointed for the good, but for the hurt of men. By “man”, is not meant all mankind; for the sabbath was never appointed for all mankind, nor binding upon all; only the Jews, who are emphatically called “man”, or “men”; see (Ezekiel 34:30 Ezekiel 34:31), upon which the Jewish writers remark that “they are called (Mda), “man”; but the idolatrous Gentiles, and nations of the World, are not called “men”; but dogs, beasts Our Lord may here be thought to speak in their language, as he does in Mt. 15:26, (See Gill on Matthew 15:26). And that the observation of the seventh day, was only designed for the children of Israel, seems manifest from (Exodus 31:16 Exodus 31:17), “wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant; it is a sign between me and the children of Israel”; and not between him and the rest of the world: and in (Exodus 31:14), “ye shall keep the sabbath, for it is holy unto you”: on which the Jews make this remark, (Nymme) (ravl alw Mkl) , “to you, and not to the rest of the nations”: nor did they ever think that the Gentiles were obliged to observe their sabbath, only such who became proselytes to their religion; even those who were proselytes of righteousness: for a proselyte of the gate, was not bound to observe it; for so says Maimonides,

“those who take upon them the seven commandments of Noah only, lo! they are as a proselyte of the gate, and they are free to do work on the sabbath day for themselves, openly, as an Israelite on a common day.”

Yea, they not only say, they were not obliged to keep the sabbath, but that it was not lawful for them to observe it; and that it was even punishable with death them to regard it; for so they say, “a Gentile that keeps the sabbath before he is circumcised, is guilty of death, because it is not commanded him.”

They judged them unworthy of having this precept enjoined them, as being not men, but beasts, and worse than they, and had not the privilege the ass has: hence one of their commentators says,

``concerning the rest of an ass, thou (O Israelite!) art commanded; but concerning the rest of a Gentile, thou art not commanded."

And not man for the sabbath; who was in being long before that was appointed and enjoined.

**FOOTNOTES:**

F16 Zohar in Exod. fol. 26. 4.
F18 Debarim Rabba, sect. 1. fol. 234. 4.

< Mark 2:26 Mark 2:28 >
This account of Jesus’ encounter with the Canaanite woman illustrates the fact that the Jews of Christ’s day referred to the Gentiles as dogs:

Leaving that place, Jesus withdrew to the region of Tyre and Sidon. A Canaanite woman from that vicinity came to him, crying out, “Lord, Son of David, have mercy on me! My daughter is suffering terribly from demon-possession.” Jesus did not answer a word. So his disciples came to him and urged him, “Send her away, for she keeps crying out after us.” He answered, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel.” The woman came and knelt before him. “Lord, help me!” she said. He replied, “It is not right to take the children’s bread and toss it to their dogs.” “Yes, Lord,” she said, “but even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their masters’ table.” Then Jesus answered, “Woman, you have great faith! Your request is granted.” And her daughter was healed from that very hour. — Matthew 15:21-28 (NIV, Bible Gateway.Com)

A conservative apologist for Adventism has proposed the theory that the Hebrew article preceding the word for “man” in the Creation story is a definite article and that the Greek article preceding the word Mark used in the Greek in Mark 2:27-28 for “man” is also a definite article. He asserts that the use of a definite article in both cases proves that Jesus meant that the Sabbath was given to all the people of the world. This is an interesting theory because the languages are different, and to our knowledge there is no difficult-to-translate meaning “indicator” convention in either language that provides that when a definite article is used before a noun, it makes the noun to mean “all.” What is useful to observe is how NT writers in the Greek were careful to designate when ALL was intended. An entry at the Resurgence 2.0 web-site by contributor Arnold Gamboa explains:

This dispute with the Pharisees arose not over the question of who was supposed to keep the Sabbath, but rather over how the Sabbath was to be kept and who had the authority to determine how the law was to be applied. The SDA belief that here Jesus is teaching that all mankind must keep the 7th day Sabbath is not found in the text. Jesus and the Pharisees knew that the Sabbath was only for the Jews. Neither Jesus nor the Pharisees were concerned with the question of who must keep the Sabbath. Such a concern is limited to the SDA church and other Sabbatarians. Let us note that in the text it does not say “all mankind” but just “man”. Compare this fact with other universal text found in the New Testament and you will see a marked difference. “Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations” (Matthew 28:19). “I will pour out a portion of my spirit on all mankind” (Acts 2:17). “…for he wants all men to be saved” (1 Timothy 2:4). “The grace of God has appeared, offering salvation to all men” (Titus 2:11). These universal texts contain the word “all” that is missing from Mark 2:27. The reason for this is that Mark 2:27 is not a universal text. It refers to the Jews only. This interpretation is in complete harmony with the rest of Scripture (see Exodus 16:22-23; 20:8-11; 31:16-17; Deuteronomy 5:12-15; Nehemiah 9:13-14; Ezekiel 20:12, 20).


THE DECALOGUE HAS A CEREMONIAL COMPONENT MODELED AFTER THE TREATIES OF THE NATIONS AROUND ISRAEL AT THE TIME

Robert Brinsmead’s intense research prior to the publication of his 1981 essay, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined,” uncovered the fact that the 10 Commandments were modeled after the Hittite treaties of the time. (See “Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East,” George E. Mendenhall, 1954; and “The Two Tables of the Covenant,” Meridith Kline, Westminster Theological Journal 22 (1960) 133-46, both available on the Web). Brinsmead says:

The ceremonial nature of the Sabbath law has been confirmed by Mendenhall’s 1954 discovery that the Ten Commandments conform to the structure of treaties between Hittite kings and their vassals. Annexed to the stipulations of a Hittite treaty was a provision for a periodic ceremony to rehearse the treaty between the lord and the vassal. Meredith Kline beautifully demonstrates that the Sabbath law in the middle of the Ten Commandments is the counterpart of a Hittite treaty memorial celebration with respect to its provision for the rehearsal of God’s covenant. The Sabbath law, therefore, was a law requiring a ceremony of covenantal rehearsal.

The evidence is that the Sabbath was a ceremonial rite given to Israel to help the Chosen People remember that God was the One responsible for bringing them out of the slavery of Egypt into the rest and freedom that having their own nation provided. It would be so very much like God to communicate His plan for them in the context of their contemporary culture because the people could understand this concept more easily. Moses, in Leviticus 23, lists the weekly Sabbath as one of the many ceremonial festivals given to the Israelite nation to be observed, labeling them “appointed feasts.” The evidence
in this section combines with the fact that a study of the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story proves that God did not give the Sabbath commandment to the people of the world in the Garden of Eden.

NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY CHURCH HISTORY OFFER NO SUPPORT FOR SABBATH-KEEPING AFTER THE CROSS

It is interesting to note that in discussions of right and wrong for Christians, the New Testament writers comment about sins that are related to all of the Ten Commandments of the Decalogue with the exception of the 4th Commandment— the Sabbath. While arguments from silence are among the weakest form of evidence and fail to qualify as “proof,” taken alone, this is still a most interesting observation. Combine this fact with everything else we now know about the Sabbath from biblical concepts, and its significance is very great for the Jews. In fact Israelites who deliberately broke the Sabbath were, in some cases, to be stoned.

It is entirely reasonable to suppose that if Sabbatarianism were to be true, the new Gentile converts coming into the Church would have needed some kind of official guidance in regard to the Sabbath. Many Gentile converts had attended the Jewish synagogues where Paul had preached and had a degree of familiarity with the Sabbath concept already. However, many other Gentile converts came directly out of heathenism. The apostles, and especially Paul, gave them instructions in almost everything else, including whether or not they could eat meat sacrificed to idols. Paul instructed Christians not to use their freedom from the LAW to fall into sin, and in one passage he gives a list of 23 examples of the kind of sins that a person who lives by the Spirit will not commit. As in every New Testament case where a mention of the sin of Sabbath-breaking would be anticipated, Paul does not mentioned the “sin” of Sabbath breaking in this list. The emphasis of the true Gospel of Jesus, as articulated by the Apostle Paul, is that Christians are not guided by principles of any set of laws, but rather by the Holy Spirit in the heart.

Without exception, every time the New Testament mentions Christians getting together as Christians, they met on the first day of the week— never on the Jewish Sabbath.

Christians went to the Jewish synagogues to witness to their Jewish brethren that Jesus was the Messiah. There is no indication they went there for any other purpose.

Sabbatarians teach that the reference to “The Lord’s Day” in the Book of Revelation is a reference to the Sabbath (See Rev. 1:9.). However, this concept is not in keeping with linguistics and word usage studies. There is abundant evidence that the term “The Lord’s Day” was consistently a reference to Sunday, the first day of the week. In regard to the Sabbatarian idea that it was a reference to the Jewish Sabbath, Wikipedia has this to say in the article, “The Lord's Day:"

Some seventh-day Sabbatarian writers have argued that because Jesus identified himself as “Lord even of the Sabbath day” (cf. Matt. 12:8), kyriake hemera in Rev. 1:10 should be interpreted as a reference to seventh-day Sabbath. However, in almost every other instance where kyriake hemera or kyriake is used, the unambiguous meaning is Sunday, but there are no early witnesses to the use of kyriake hemera as a name for Saturday.

The Wikipedia article does not provide an authoritative citation for this fact. Notice, however, that the researchers at the Encyclopedia Britannica have concluded that the reference to the Lord's Day in Revelation is to Sunday and that the Lord's Day is to be equated with Sunday (See the Encyclopedia Britannica's Web entry for “Lord’s Day.”):

First day of the week; in Christianity, the Lord’s Day, the weekly memorial of Jesus Christ’s Resurrection from the dead. The practice of Christians gathering together for worship on Sunday dates back to apostolic times, but details of the actual development of the custom are not clear. Before the end of the 1st century ad, the author of Revelation gave the first day its name of the “Lord’s Day” (Rev. 1:10). Saint Justin Martyr (c. 100–c. 165), philosopher and defender of the Christian faith, in his writings described the Christians gathered together for worship on the Lord’s Day: the gospels or the Old Testament was read, the presiding minister preached a sermon, and the group prayed together and celebrated the Lord’s Supper.

A “Sabbath” (Gr. sabbatismos; “God’s rest”) is mentioned in Hebrews 4 to explain the rest that Christians find in the freedom of the Gospel. The apostles went to the synagogues to witness to the Jews on Sabbaths. However, when there is a reference to Christians meeting with other Christians, their meetings always occur on Sunday.

Sabbatarians point to the fact that Jesus kept the Sabbath, and He is our Example. Jesus had chosen to live under the terms of the Mosaic Covenant at that time. The TORAH had not yet been nailed to the Cross. Jesus didn’t marry and he raised the dead. Are we to follow Jesus’ example in these things also? If He had wanted Christians to keep the Sabbath, He would not have instructed Paul, through the Holy Spirit, to write Colossians 2:14-17, which forbids the enforcement of
Sabbath-keeping on the Gentile converts. Greg Taylor in his book, Discovering the New Covenant: Why I Am No Longer a Seventh-day Adventist, makes an excellent case that Jesus was preparing His followers for Colossians 2:14-17 by breaking the Sabbath Himself and citing examples of others who had broken the Sabbath and also were guiltless.

Although there was not much that could be added to D.M. Canright’s exhaustive research on the pagan sun worship idea, additional discoveries were made, and none of them favorable to Ellen White’s apostasy theory. By the 1960’s it had become very clear that the Heathen did not rest from work on Sunday. One historian put it this way:

“In the early centuries of the Church’s history down to the time of the Emperor Constantine it would, in any case, not have been practical for Christians to observe Sunday as a day of rest, on which they were obliged, for the sake of principle, to abstain from work. The reason for this was simply that no one in the entire Roman Empire, neither Jews, nor Greeks, nor Romans, stopped work on Sunday” (Willy Rordorf, Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968, pp. 154-155).

Pliny’s famous Letter to Trajan (c. A.D. 111-112) is also clear evidence that early Christians had no free day of rest. They met for worship early in the morning (probably on the first day of the week), and then they went to work. (See Bruce, New Testament History, pp. 423-24.)

ISAIAH 66 AND THE SIEGE OF JERUSALEM
ARGUMENTS DON’T HOLD WATER

Adventists cite Isaiah 66 as proof that the Sabbath will be kept in Heaven as well as later on the New Earth. See the excellent study on the Sabbath by Robert K. Sanders in Appendix I for a good treatment of the serious problems with this interpretation. While there may be more than one way to interpret this passage, it cannot mean that the Sabbath will be kept in the New Earth. What about all the dead bodies lying on the ground? What about the fact that this passage, if it could be interpreted in this manner, would also indicate that the annual and monthly sabbath feast days would also be kept there? Even from an Adventist perspective, Seventh-day Adventists believe that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross, and the annual and monthly sabbath feast days are viewed by Adventists as ceremonial. Furthermore, their Church prophetess, Ellen White, said that God showed her that all the ceremonial parts of the law were nailed to the cross.

Additionally, Adventists cite the fact that Jesus instructed his disciples to pray that the future siege of Jerusalem would not take place on the Sabbath day, thus “proving” that the Sabbath should be kept way into the future. This argument does not stand up to scrutiny. Jewish law required that the gates of Jerusalem be closed for the duration of the Sabbath. Whether or not the Jews were doing this at the time Jesus spoke these words is not particularly important, and it was an action of the Jews– not the Christians– that determined whether the gates were open or closed. The gates were supposed to be locked for the duration of the Sabbath, and if those gates were locked, His followers would find escape from the city much more difficult than if the gates were open.

THE TORAH WAS TO BE TEMPORARY: THE EXODUS TO THE CROSS

As we studied earlier, an interpretation of Moses’ account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in Hebrew shows that he went out of his way to indicate to his Hebrew readers that the recurring Sabbath rest did not start in Eden. None of the patriarchs kept the Sabbath, and they are eternally saved. Why, then, is it so difficult to understand the concept that Christians are not required to keep it now?

Moses stated that the Covenant was not given before Sinai: Their fathers prior to Egypt did not keep the Sabbath: Deut. 5:2-3:

“The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. The Lord did not make this covenant with our fathers, but with us, with all those of us alive here today.”

God gave them the Sabbath law at Sinai. He did not remind them about it: Nehemiah 9:13-14:

“You came down also on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them just ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments. You made known to them Your holy Sabbath, and commanded them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses Your servant.”

It is clear that the Sabbath command did not exist before the Exodus.
In other chapters we will study more about the temporary nature of the TORAH. Colossians 2:14-17 tells us when the reign of TORAH law ended.

COLOSSIANS 2:14-17 MEANS EXACTLY WHAT IT SAYS

In the 1895 version of *Replies to Canright*, we have proof that Adventist leaders of his time knew that they could not substantiate their arguments against what he said about Colossians 2:14-17. This book quotes the following passage from Canright's book. Instead of addressing his key argument at his foundational point, they show that just a year or two earlier, he argued in favor of a Sabbatarian interpretation of this key passage. They list his own arguments for a Sabbatarian-friendly reading of the passage and attempt to make him appear to flip-flop back and forth to prove that his thinking is inconsistent. Here is a portion of what Canright said about Colossians 2:14-17. His basic premise is not addressed by his critics:

“But it is argued that as 'the sabbath days' of Col.2:16 'are a shadow of things to come' (verse 17), and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same; for the Sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it cannot point both ways? The Passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Ex.12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Col.2:16,17. 'Even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us,' 1Cor.5:7. So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know.... Paul says plainly that sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of Inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasonings. This is in harmony with Paul's argument in Heb.4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really cannot mean what it says; but there it stands, and mocks all our theories. The Sabbath is a type, for Inspiration says so.”

Canright in *Advocate* of Oct. 1, 1887.

Looking back at the Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1888-1889, it is compelling to note that Canright knew all the cheap arguments that he had used himself in arguing for the Sabbath; saw that they were cheap, and was willing to face the truth that he had been wrong. Since Canright had been a top leader of the Adventist Movement, he was in a better position to know the struggles the Church had experienced in trying to explain away this devastating anti-Sabbatarian passage of Scripture. His terse comments are proof that early Adventist leaders knew there was a serious problem with the text and knew they did not have any satisfactory answers for it.

By leaving the employment of the Church, Canright was able to practice his more orthodox version of Christianity without any further fear of being terminated for his convictions. The unwillingness of other, less noble, Adventist leaders has plagued Adventism from its very beginning. Here is what we now know about the impossibilities of the traditional Adventist defense of Colossians 2:14-17. We are not suggesting that Canright knew all of these arguments. He knew most of them. These are the facts as we know them today, which have been researched from the time of Canright down to our own time:

1. Sabbatarians attempt to discredit the fact that the third reference in the passage is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue by saying that Paul used the plural form of the word, which would signify it was one of the other kind of ceremonial sabbaths. This attempt to evade the plain meaning of the passage doesn't work because there are about 20 other places in Scripture where the plural form of the word Sabbath, *Sabbaton*, is used where context demands the meaning be the weekly Sabbath. The Greeks didn't have the same concern over plural versus singular forms of words that is found in the English language.

2. The sentence structure FESTIVAL, NEW MOON, SABBATH is a phrase used in the Hebrew to imply the three aspects of Jewish festival structure and designates the order of ANNUAL, MONTHLY, WEEKLY. This same annual, monthly and weekly sequence appears five times in the Septuagint—i.e., 2 Chron. 2:4; 31:3; Neh. 10:33; Ezek. 45:17; Hosea 2:11. All through the history of the Israelites we have annual Sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and weekly Sabbaths. If the word Sabbath as translated here means monthly sabbaths, the sentence would read, “Annual sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and monthly sabbaths.” If it were an annual sabbath Paul meant here, the sentence would read, "Annual sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and annual sabbaths."


4. In the Old Testament, annual Sabbaths are always called “a Sabbath of rest” in the Septuagint. This Greek version of the Old Testament always, or nearly always, translates this as *Sabbata Sabbaton*—not simply *Sabbaton*—as here in Colossians 2:14-17.
5. Paul clearly states that these four things—diet, annual feasts, monthly feasts, and the weekly Sabbath—are not to be made a test of Christian belief and practice because they are merely shadows of things that were to come, whereas Christ is the Reality that did come. To try and salvage Sabbatarianism, the Adventists say that Paul could not possibly have meant a weekly Sabbath here because the Sabbath was a memorial pointing backwards to Creation. This SDA approach fails miserably because the most significant Jewish memorials pointed both backward and forward at the same time. In Colossians, prior to this passage, Paul refers to Adam as a symbol of Christ. In fact it is possible that all the major Jewish ordinances point both backward and forward at the same time.

6. Paul was a Jew, and the Jews, for thousands of years, have used the Sabbath as a symbol of the rest that will come in the after-life. This fact is well-documented in Jewish literature, both ancient and modern.

7. Since the Jews viewed the TORAH as 613 equally important, inseparable laws, it is impossible that St. Paul meant that only the “ceremonial” laws were nailed to the cross. Before Dr. Bacchiocchi, Adventists taught that if the Sabbath mentioned by Paul in Colossians 2:14-17 was a reference to the weekly Sabbath, it was different than the other items in Paul’s list of several Jewish ordinances because it was an eternal, moral principle. Note that Dr. Bacchiocchi refused to use this argument because the Jewish concept of the inseparability of TORAH law will not permit it, and the sentence structure of the passage requires that the Sabbath mentioned in the list is the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue.

As Mrs. Jennifer Rector points out in her personal essay on the Sabbath:

Charles C. Ryrie, formerly Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary, explains that “unless the New Testament expressly says so, part of the law cannot be ended without doing away with all of it” (242). The Jerusalem council’s decision to declare circumcision obsolete did away with the entire old covenant law- the seventh-day Sabbath included.”

http://sabbatismos.com/the-sabbath/new-covenant-sabbath-rest/

(Rector is quoting from Ryrie; Charles C. “The End of the Law.” Bibliotheca Sacra 124:495 (1967), pages 240-247.) After the Council of Jerusalem the issue of Sabbath-keeping could never arise again. It would have been settled forever, and this is exactly what we observe about the New Testament record. There is not a single comment about a Sabbath-keeping requirement for Christians from Matthew to Revelation, and there is a command that Sabbath-keeping is not to be required.

Now read this passage again with the understanding that the Sabbath referenced in this text cannot be anything else but the weekly Sabbath. The text is from the NIV:

Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ. — Colossians 2:16-17

A deeper study of Colossians 2:14-17, reviewing these principles in greater detail, will be covered in Chapters XI and XII. We will also study two other anti-Sabbatarian passages from the writings of St. Paul.

HEBREWS FOUR CAN NOT BE USED TO SUPPORT SABBATARIAN THEOLOGY

If you use circular reasoning to assume Sabbatarianism to be true, Hebrews Chapter 4 looks, on the surface, like a great proof-text to use in defense of the Sabbath. However, a careful analysis of Hebrews 1-11, using the most elementary principles of literary interpretation, reveals that the author of this book is using the Sabbath rest as a symbol of the rest that the Christian finds in the Gospel. It is also interesting to note that the writer’s emphasis on the events of the 7th day of Creation is what God did— and not what man was supposed to do. A thoughtful analysis of this passage clearly demonstrates that the Sabbath is used here as a symbol of the rest the Gospel brings to the Christian through the Gospel's assurance of salvation as taught by the author of Hebrews. (While many biblical scholars think Paul may have written this book, there is no proof that he did, and some scholars point out some style characteristics of this book that do not seem characteristic of him.) Read this passage carefully, paying special attention to the symbolism utilized by the writer. This text has nothing to do with proof that Christians are still required to keep the Sabbath:

Therefore, since the promise of entering his rest still stands, let us be careful that none of you be found to have fallen short of it. For we also have had the gospel preached to us, just as they did; but the message they
heard was of no value to them, because those who heard did not combine it with faith. Now we who have
believed enter that rest, just as God has said, “So I declared on oath in my anger, ‘They shall never enter my
rest.’ And yet his work has been finished since the creation of the world. For somewhere he has spoken about
the seventh day in these words: “And on the seventh day God rested from all his work.” And again in the
passage above he says, “They shall never enter my rest.” It still remains that some will enter that rest, and
those who formerly had the gospel preached to them did not go in, because of their disobedience. Therefore
God again set a certain day, calling it Today, when a long time later he spoke through David, as was said
before: “Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts.” For if Joshua had given them rest, God
would not have spoken later about another day. There remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God;
for anyone who enters God’s rest also rests from his own work, just as God did from his. Let us, therefore,
made every effort to enter that rest, so that no one will fall by following their example of disobedience. (NIV-
Bible www.Gateway.com)

Despite the fact that God gave Israel the Sabbath, they never enjoyed the rest that God had intended for them because of
their unbelief. By contrast, the belief of the Christian in the assurance of salvation they find in Jesus provides the rest that
God intended Israel to have. This text says nothing that can be construed to support the requirement that Christians
observe the ceremony of the weekly Sabbath.

MATTHEW 5:17-19 CAN NOT BE USED TO SUPPORT THE SABBATH

Both Sabbatarians and their anti-Sabbatarian antagonists try to use Matthew 5:17-19 to support their points of view. Our
assessment of this situation suggests that it is impossible for Sabbatarians to use it for their purposes and next-to-
impossible for anti-Sabbatarians to use it. This passage says nothing definite about the Sabbath question. It is very
difficult to translate it from the original Greek into English:

1 “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to
 fulfil them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least
stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished.” (Matt 5:17-18
NIV)

Sabbatarians claim this text proves that the 10 Commandments will last until Heaven and Earth disappear, which takes the end
of the Law and the Prophets to way beyond the cross. Since the Sabbath is a part of the 10 Commandments, this passage
supposedly teaches that the Sabbath was not nailed to the cross and its observance is required of Christians today.

This meaning is impossible because the law set here is the TORAH, the entire set of the books of Moses, and it contains
613 moral and ceremonial laws which the Jews would never think could be divided. If none of these laws were nailed to
the cross, Christians would have to do ceremonial washings and keep all the Jewish feasts.

Paul Kroll explains the problem and possible solutions in the following Internet article, “The ‘Law’ of Matthew 5:17-19.” A
Google search will provide you with access to the entire paper, which is well-worth reading:

The meaning of “until everything is accomplished” has several possibilities. It is suggested by the Tyndale New
Testament Commentary that the translation: “Until what it [the Law] looks forward to arrives” gives the best sense of
this phrase. This links the thought with the idea of “fulfillment” in verse 17. This also seems to be the thrust of
Paul’s comments regarding the relationship of the Law and Jesus’ earthly ministry (Galatians 3:19, 23-25).

The Tyndale New Testament Commentary expresses the interpretation of “accomplished” in these words:

“The law remains valid until it reaches its intended culmination; this is now doing in the ministry and teaching of Jesus. This
verse does not state, therefore, as it is sometimes interpreted, that every regulation in the Old Testament law remains binding after
the coming of Jesus. The law is unalterable, but that does not justify its application beyond the purpose for which it was
intended” (page 115).

The Tyndale commentary also makes the same point in these words:

“This passage does not therefore state that every Old Testament regulation is eternally valid. This view is not found
anywhere in the New Testament, which consistently sees Jesus as introducing a new situation, for which the law
prepared (Galatians 3:24), but which now transcends it. The focus is now on Jesus and his teaching, and in this light the validity of Old Testament rules must now be examined. Some will be found to have fulfilled their role, and be no longer applicable...others will be reinterpreted” (page 117).

This explanation must be the correct one, or else the early Christian church and the apostles violated Matthew 5:17-19 by telling gentile Christians that circumcision and keeping the Law of Moses was not necessary. The book of Galatians would also have been in error on this point. And the book of Hebrews would have been in extraordinary violation of Jesus’ words, too, since it states that the entire sacrificial system, the temple worship and Levitical priesthood had been annulled.

http://www.gci.org/bible/matthew517

St. Paul said that Christ is the end of TORAH law: Rom.10:4 (NIV): “Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for everyone who believes.” Under the New Covenant, the “law” is written on the hearts of the people.

Bill Hohmann offers the following observation in his new blog-based book, Christian Basics, Chapter 5, “Methodology of Truth:"

One of the Sabbatarian Legalist's favorite passages is Matthew 5:17-19 where it is concluded that the legalities of the law remain inviolate even down to the strokes of the letters of the law. Even a cursory examination of the passage shows this interpretation to be flawed. The context of what Jesus was referring to was the law and prophets. In this context it should be understood that this refers to the first 5 books, commonly called “the law” and the writings of the prophets being “the prophets” as well as the context of Scripture overall. Sometimes the term, “the law” could indeed refer to the entirety of the old testament writings.

There are no laws codified in the prophets. You cannot fulfill or destroy something in the prophets that is not there. What then is found in both the law and prophets that has the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed? Prophecies. Did Jesus state He had come to fulfill the prophesies that were written about Him in the law and prophets, i.e. the old testament writings? Yes, He most emphatically did.

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. – Luke 24:44

What then is the excuse of the Sabbatarian for rejecting this explanation in light of Matthew 5:17? They point out that Jesus did not fulfill everything while He walked the earth in human form. Well then, what do they think the very next verse addresses? Things that were not fulfilled prophetically that are escatalogical in nature that will be fulfilled at that time, before heaven and earth pass away.

Let's humor the Sabbatarian a bit here, seeing as they insist this is about the legalities of the law. When then is the conclusion in regards to verse 18? When heaven and earth passes, so to passes this law after it is “filled to the full.” So the law passes away; the same law they claim is eternal. Also, if this is all about the legalities of the law being inviolate down to jots and tittles, what about the context of the same chapter where Jesus proceeds to alter points of that law way beyond jots and titles, and even negating points of law?


THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL CAN NOT BE USED TO SUPPORT THE SABBATH AND THE 1844 INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT THEORY

As we have noted before, the 1844 Investigative Judgment (2,300 day) “prophecy” is the foundation upon which Adventism rests. Without the truth of this speculative prophetic interpretation, there is no special group of people raised up after 1844 to take a special message of Sabbath judgments to the world. Now we find that, not only is this convoluted doctrine based on a mistranslation of Daniel 8:14 by the translators of the King James Bible, but that the prophecy upon which it is based applied to an actual historical event that occurred around 2,000 years earlier. And, on top of all that, we now know, thanks to the discovery of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes, Adventists appear to have known something about the prophecy's literal, earlier historical fulfillment.

Former SDA, Chris Lee, writing in the April-May-June 2011 (Volume 12, Issue 2) edition of Proclamation! Magazine (produced by Dale Ratzlaff and Life Assurance Ministries) draws a very uncomfortable comparison between the convoluted theological gymnastics of the 1844 interpretation of the 2,300 day prophecy with the same kind of self-serving prophetic twisting utilized by Harold Camping after his prophecy that the world would end on May 21, 2011 utterly failed.
Just like when Jesus didn’t return in 1844, Camping claimed afterward that although he was wrong in one way, he was right in another, because additional study of the Bible demonstrated to him that a major judgment event took place in Heaven on May 21, 2011. Lee calls this technique “the old false-prophecy-becomes-deceptive-doctrine ploy.”

Your authors have devoted a significant amount of space to this topic because it is so important to understanding the fatal flaw of Adventism. As we pointed out earlier, the Sabbath cannot possibly be the seal of God, even if Sabbatarianism were to be true, if the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment is not true. A number of Sabbatarian groups believe in Sabbath-keeping but do not believe that those who do not keep it will lose their eternal life if they are briefly exposed to the teaching and do not accept it. The Investigative Judgment concept puts Seventh-day Adventists at odds with virtually every other Christian group in existence. Everyone who is not Adventist who does not already have the Mark of the Beast now will have it later if they are ever exposed to the Sabbath “truth” and reject it, and they will be lost eternally as a result.

No Need To Make The Sabbath Part of These Prophecies

For a very long time many non-Sabbatarian scholars have sought to apply the prophetic time periods of the Book of Daniel to the persecuting activities of the papacy, and they have been able to build convincing cases for doing so without reference to a Sabbath component. The papacy has persecuted dissenting Christians for over 1,500 years, but seldom for the specific reason that they kept the Jewish Sabbath. As former Sabbatarians with our relatively new personal knowledge that Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD, the likelihood that the Catholic Church would persecute a non-conforming group of Christian believers specifically for keeping the Jewish Sabbath is small. Any historians who might wish to do further research in this area would do well to look at any such groups held up by Seventh-day Adventists as such examples to see if they would have been persecuted anyway for other reasons.

Your authors acknowledge that there may never have been a time when there were no Sabbath-keeping groups in existence. Just like proof-texting methods of Bible study have created Sabbatarian groups today, it has done so numerous times in the past.

Adventists teach that the little horn of Daniel 7 is the papacy, and they view the King James translation of Daniel 7:25– that this entity would be known for changing times and laws– to suggest that this power would attempt to change God’s 4\textsuperscript{th} Commandment— or, in other words, to change the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday:

Daniel 7:25-- And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

Notice that a time and times and dividing of time in Dan 7:25 is: time =360 days; times 2x360 = 720 days; and dividing of time 360/2 = 180 days. Total days is 360+720+180= 1260 days. This would be 1260 days or 3.5 years, not 1260 years. God never uses a day for a year formula using “times” language to mark periods of prophetic time.

There are two places in the OT, Numbers 14:33-35 and Ezekiel 4:5-6, where God used the day-for-a-year in a prophecy and it was God who made it clear when it was to be used.

Num 14:33-35 (NIV) Your children will be shepherds here for forty years, suffering for your unfaithfulness, until the last of your bodies lies in the desert. For forty years—one year for each of the forty days you explored the land—you will suffer for your sins and know what it is like to have me against you.’” 1, the LORD, have spoken, and I will surely do these things to this whole wicked community, which has banded together against me. They will meet their end in this desert; here they will die.”

Ezek 4:5 - 6 (NIV) 1 have assigned you the same number of days as the years of their sin. So for 390 days you will bear the sin of the house of Israel. “After you have finished this, lie down again, this time on your right side, and bear the sin of the house of Judah. I have assigned you 40 days, a day for each year.

There are prophecies of years where God did not assign a day-for-a-year such as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar. If we use the day for a year, as SDAs do with Daniel 8:14, the seven times of Daniel 4:16-25 would be seven prophetic years at 360 days x 7 years = 2520 day/years. This formula would require Nebuchadnezzar to live 2520 years after the curse.

Dan 4:6 (NIV) Let his mind be changed from that of a man and let him be given the mind of an animal, till seven times pass by for him.
Daniel 7:25 refers to the same king, and says that he shall speak against the Most High. והנה means, properly, against or at the side of, and is more expressive than ויה. It denotes that he would use language by which he would set God aside, regard and give himself out as God; cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:4. Making himself like God, he will destroy the saints of God. שמח, Pa., not "make unfortunate" (Hitzig), but consume, afflict, like the Hebr. 1 Chronicles 17:9, and Targ. Jes. Daniel 3:15. These passages show that the assertion that ויה, in the sense of to destroy, never takes after it the accusative of the person (Hitz.), is false. Finally, "he thinks to change times and laws." "To change times" belongs to the all-perfect power of God (cf. Daniel 2:21), the creator and ordainer of times (Genesis 1:14). There is no ground for supposing that ויה is to be specially understood of "festival or sacred times," since the word, like the corresponding Hebr. תקנות, does not throughout signify merely "festival times," cf. Genesis 1:14; Genesis 17:21; Genesis 18:14, etc. The annexed וי never does point to arrangements of divine worship, but denotes "law" or "ordinance" in general, human as well as divine law; cf. Daniel 2:13, Daniel 2:15 with Daniel 6:6, Daniel 6:9. "Times and laws" are the foundations and main conditions, emanating from God, of the life and actions of men in the world. The sin of the king in placing himself with God, therefore, as Kliefth rightly remarks, "consists in this, that in these ordinances he does not regard the fundamental conditions given by God, but so changes the laws of human life that he puts his own pleasure in the place of the divine arrangements." Thus shall he do with the ordinances of life, not only of God's people, but of all men. "But it is to be confessed that the people of God are most affected thereby, because they hold their ordinances of life most according to the divine plan; and therefore the otherwise general passage stands between two expressions affecting the conduct of the horn in its relation to the people of God."

See Keil and Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: http://bible.cc/daniel/7-25.htm

Recently the prophetic interpretations of Isaac Newton have come to light with the re-discovery of over a thousand pages of his commentaries on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. While this is a subject for another book, Newton put the same prophetic periods that Adventists use to calculate that the final events of this world's history will begin in about the year 2060. So far his interpretation of these prophecies correlates better with what is happening in our world now than the self-serving interpretations of the Seventh-day Adventists. Here is what http://www.isaac-newton.org has to say about these prophetic periods. Adventists should recognize two of them immediately:

Newton, like many historicist prophetic commentators of his age, believed that the prophetic time periods 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2300 days actually represent 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2300 years using the "day-for-a-year principle".

For Newton these time periods (especially the 1260 years) represent the time span of the apostasy of the Church (for Newton this means the Trinitarian Church, chiefly the Catholics). Thus, he looked in history for the likely date when the apostasy formally began (one sign of this for him was the date when the papal church obtained temporal power). From there it was a simple matter of adding the time period to the beginning date. However, things are rarely so simple with Newton. As already mentioned, Newton looked askance at "date-setting", and for this reason he rarely wrote out the end date for a time period once he had settled on a beginning date. There are a small number of exceptions, and the date 2060, found twice in the Yahuda MSS at Jerusalem, is one of them. The date 2060 is also significant because in addition to the rarity of end dates in Newton's writings, the calculation giving the 2060 date comes from fairly late in his life and is asserted with uncharacteristic vigour.

In 1933, New Zealand Adventist critic, R. Vowless, called attention to the dishonest use of these prophetic dates by Seventh-day Adventists. He knew a lot about the subject, having been an Adventist for many years before he apostatized:

And why were William Miller's and Mrs. White's divinely endorsed dates of 508-538, 1798 and 1844, been altered by the Conference Committee at Washington to 503, 533, 1793 and 1838? It is true that 1798 and 1844 are still carried, possibly as a sop to conservatives, but these new dates are a part of the diagram. This never occurred before—why now? Start asking your good elders questions about these dates and you will find them doing similar to the good Elder Stevens, of Detroit, who went limping from the platform when someone put such questions to him. If this proves too embarrassing for them to answer, then write a line to Washington asking them to send you the Committee report, and turn to page 265 and see for yourselves. R. Vowless, The White Elephant of Adventism, New Plymouth, New Zealand, P. F. Burrows Ltd., Elliot Street, New Plymouth, p.23.

Access this fascinating document at: http://www.truthorfables.com/white_elephant.htm
The Sabbath ordinance was not instituted at Creation, was given to Israel and Israel only during the Exodus, was subordinate to the Ordinance of Circumcision, and was simply a part of a special set of Noachian laws with an added ceremonial component placed right in the middle (like all treaties of the nations that surrounded Israel at the time of the Exodus). Sabbath-keeping officially ended at the Council of Jerusalem when the apostles decided not to enforce the Ordinance of Circumcision on the Gentile believers, and in reality it ended with Jesus’ death on the cross. Therefore it is impossible that the papacy could have changed the Sabbath, since there was nothing to change. At times the papacy claimed that it had changed the Sabbath, but those words were empty—good for boasting, but not the truth. The papacy persecuted any dissenters, whatever the reason for their failure to pay homage to the Mother Church. But even if such groups were persecuted specifically because they kept the Sabbath, it is not proof that the Church changed to Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

The Little Horns

As Christians we have no particular reason to not want the 70 week prophecy (from the command to re-build Jerusalem to the coming of the Messiah = 490 years) to be true. There are some problems with the start date of 457 BC, but our research shows that several authors have made a somewhat credible case for it, although not all problems are solved even if 457 can be established and the start date. Similarly, as Christians we would have no particular reason not to want the 70 week prophecy to be true. The dates Adventists use for this period of papal persecution, 538 AD to 1798 do not fit the facts of the period of papal persecution. Thus, if interpreted in the way that Adventists interpret it, the prophecy falls short of the 100% accuracy required for true prophets. The research of Dirk Anderson of Amazing Fiction.Org discusses the serious problems with the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 11, and his work deserves the most careful consideration by Seventh-day Adventists who have been taught that these prophetic periods are solidly supported by the facts of Scripture and history. On the other hand, Christians have a duty to oppose the twisting of the prophecies that fit the deed of Antiochus to a “T” into questionable “wheel within a wheel” symbolism we have seen them utilize to “prove” that these literal 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices represent 2,300 prophetic years that conveniently stretch to 1844—a date that gives Adventists their very reason to exist.

The Little Horn of Daniel 7

The historical fact is that the Roman Emperor, Nero, meets the prophetic time period of the 1,260 literal days of Daniel 7 right down to the very day and fulfills all the rest of the prophecy’s requirements as well. Dirk Anderson of Amazing Fiction.Org, a former Adventist and now an expert on problems in Adventism, explains exactly why Nero is the subject of this prophecy. It is interesting to note that Christians have applied this prophecy to Nero for a very long time. Also, keep in mind that the participants of the 1919 Bible Conference mistakenly tried to apply the prophecy of this little horn to Antiochus's desecration of the temple, but were somewhat on track in their comprehension of the more immediate, actual historical application. Anderson writes:

Who is the little horn?

It is an established historical fact that the little horn of Daniel 7 is Nero. Consider the incredible correlations between Nero and the little horn of Daniel 7:

He will uproot "three of the first horns" (7:24) - Three Emperors, Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius were assassinated to make way for Nero, who was not in the line of succession.18

"He shall speak words against the Most High" (7:25) - Nero encouraged emperor worship and had a huge statue of himself erected in Rome. Inscriptions found in Ephesus called him "Almighty God" and "Saviour..." 19

He "shall wear out the saints of the Most High" (7:25) - Nero was the first Roman Emperor to launch a persecution against Jews and Christians. Some of the saints slain during his persecution include the Missionary Paul and the Apostle Peter. Historians have described the persecution as "the most cruel that ever occurred."20

The saints "shall be given into his hand for time, times, and half a time (7:25) - Nero's persecution began in November of 64 AD, and ended with his death in June of AD 68, a period of exactly 42 months (1260 days).21

"His dominion shall be taken away" (7:26) - The Roman Senate eventually voted to put Nero to death, thus effectively taking away his dominion.

The kingdom "shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High (7:27) - It is a mistake to think this passage is a reference to God's eternal kingdom. It is a reference to God's spiritual kingdom, which was established in approximately 30 AD when John the Baptist announced, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2). Christ talked about the "kingdom" as being contemporary (Matt. 12:28; 16:19; 23:13), not in the far distant future. Daniel
talks about a kingdom that gradually fills the earth, and Jesus speaks of a Mustard seed which grew into a great tree. (Dan. 2:34-35; Matt. 13:31-33) Therefore, the giving of the kingdom (Rome) to the saints of the Most High began when Christ established his kingdom on this earth, and the kingdom continued to grow until one day Christianity would become the dominant religion in the Roman Empire.

See: http://www.amazingfiction.org/little-horn.shtml

The Little Horn Of Daniel 8 and 11 And The Key Date Of 1844

A study of Daniel 8 does not state or imply any start date for the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices other than when the defilement of the temple actually begins. It is pure assumption on the part of Adventist adherents to the 2,300 “day,” 1844 prophecy, that these 2,300 “days” began at the same time another prophetic period began— the 70 weeks, or 490 years— that began around 457 BCE and was to reach to the appearance of Christ. Yet it is this assumed start date for the 2,300 “years” that is necessary to take the self-serving Adventist interpretation of the prophecy to 1844. Dirk Anderson of Amazing Fiction.Com gives us the specifications of the correct interpretation of this prophecy:

The 2300-day prophecy witnessed an amazing fulfillment during the terrifying reign of Antiochus. Could it be that God foresaw this terrible threat coming 400 years before it happened, and sent a message to Daniel to comfort and reassure His people that He would ultimately give them the victory? Amazingly, God told the Jews precisely how long His sanctuary would be profaned: 2300 evening and morning sacrifices would be suspended while the sanctuary was profaned.

How does the Jewish Calendar Work?

The Jewish lunar year contains 354 days, or 12 lunations of the moon. In a cycle of 19 years, an intercalary month (Veadar) is introduced seven times in order to render the average year nearly correct. Leap years occur in the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th years of the cycle. One day is added to the month of Adar, and a 13th month (Veadar), containing 29 days is inserted, before Nisan. This adds 30 days to the year. Depending upon whether the latter year is regular, perfect, or defective, a leap year may consist of 383, 384, or 385 days. Thus, six years would be 6 multiplied by 354 days (an ordinary common year), plus four alternating months of 29 and 30 days each, plus two intercalary months of 29.

According to the Jewish calendar (see box on right), the 2300 days works out to be six years, three months, and 18 days. This time period began on the fifteenth day of the month Cisleu, in the year 145 of the Selucidae, in which Antiochus set up the Abomination of Desolation upon the altar of God:

"Now the five and twentieth day of the month they did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God." (1 Maccabees 1:59)

This was the beginning of a period of intense suffering for those in Israel who chose to remain faithful to God. Judas Maccabeus was outraged over the injustice done to God's sanctuary:

"Alas! Why was I born to witness the ruin of my people and the ruin of the holy city, and to sit by while it is being given up to its enemies, and the sanctuary to aliens? Her temple has come to be like a man disgraced... Behold, our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory have been laid waste, and the heathen have profaned them." (1 Maccabees 2:7,8,12)

Maccabeus rose up and started a revolt against Antiochus. For over three years he struggled and fought against the armies of Antiochus. Finally, he was victorious over Nicanor, on the thirteenth day of the month Adar, Anno 151, and the power of Antiochus over Judea was broken.

After his victory, when Judas entered Jerusalem, he found "the sanctuary desolate." (1 Mac. 4:38) Judas immediately directed the sanctuary be rebuilt and cleansed so that it could be used again for sacred services (1 Mac. 4:41-51). The Jews commemorate the triumph of Judas with an annual feast called the Feast of Dedication (or Hanukkah). The Savior honored this feast by His presence (John 10:22).

Reckoning the 2300 Days

There are two principle methods of reckoning the 2300-day period: 1.Reckoning from the fifteenth day of the month Cisleu, in the year 145 of the Selucidae, in which Antiochus set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar (1 Maccabees 1:59), to the victory obtained over Nicanor by Judas, on the 13th day of the month Adar, Anno 151, are 2300 days. The Jews kept an annual feast on the 13th of Adar, in commemoration of the victory.
2. The period began with the defection of the people from the pure religion by the Jewish high priest Menelaus, on
the 6th day of the 6th month of Anno 141. According to Josephus, Menelaus went "to Antiochus, and informed him,
that they were desirous to leave the laws of their country, and the Jewish way of living according to them, and to
follow the king's laws, and the Grecian way of living." (Antiquities, bk. 7, ch. 5.1) The period ended on the twenty-
fifth day of Cisleu in the year 148, when the Jews offered the daily sacrifice on the new altar of burnt offerings (1
Maccabees 4:52). This is a total of 2300 days.

Using either method results in a 2300-day period. There is also a method, not presented here, which calculate an
1150-day period. [Editor's note. The next section will present the 1150-day period and contrast it with the 2,300 day period.]

The Sanctuary was "cleansed" by Judas Maccabeus when he purified the holy places, sanctified the courts, rebuilt
the altar, renewed the vessels of the sanctuary, and put all in their proper places:

"Then Judas appointed certain men to fight against those that were in the fortress, until he had cleansed the
sanctuary. So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law: Who cleansed the
sanctuary, and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place. And when as when they consulted what to do with the
altar of burnt offerings, which was profaned; They thought it best to pull it down, lest it should be a reproach to
them, because the heathen had defiled it: wherefore they pulled it down, And laid up the stones in the mountain of
the temple in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to shew what should be done with them. Then
they took whole stones according to the law, and built a new altar according to the former; And made up the
sanctuary, and the things that were within the temple, and hallowed the courts. They made also new holy vessels,
and into the temple they brought the candlestick, and the altar of burnt offerings, and of incense, and the table. And
upon the altar they burned incense, and the lamps that were upon the candlestick they lighted, that they might give
light in the temple. Furthermore they set the loaves upon the table, and spread out the veils, and finished all the
works which they had begun to make." (1 Maccabees 4:41-51)

Thus we can see a stunning fulfillment of prophecy as Judas Maccabeus cleansed and vindicated the sanctuary of
God at the end of a 2300-day period of desolation.

See http://www.amazingfiction.org/2300.shtml

The 2,300 day And 1,150 Day Calculations Clarified

David Guzik's Commentaries on the Bible clarifies both methods of applying this prophecy to Antiochus's persecution of
the Jews and the defilement of the temple:

b. How long will the vision be? Daniel didn't ask this question; he heard the holy ones speaking together and one
asked the question. They wanted to know how long the sacrifices would be suspended and how long the sanctuary
would be desecrated.

c. For two thousand three hundred days: Literally, Daniel heard a holy one say "two thousand three hundred
mornings and evenings." Bible students debate if this means 2,300 days or 1,150 days. 2,300 days is almost seven
years.

i. Either understanding is possible, but it is more likely that this means 2,300 days. The date when the temple was
cleansed is well established as December 25, 165 BC If we count back 2,300 days from then, we come to the year
when Antiochus Epiphanes began his persecution in earnest (171 BC).

ii. However, if we take it to mean 1,150 days it can refer to the time the temple was actually desecrated. Philip
Newell makes this case: "For a duration of time during which 2300 daily sacrifices would ordinarily have been
offered, one at evening and one in the morning, as specified in Exodus 29:38-43. Since there are two of these daily,
the actual time period involved is 1150 days, or slightly over three years. This, in fact, was the time of the
Maccabean tribulation, 168-165 BC, at the end of which the sanctuary was 'cleansed' by Judas Maccabeus in his
restoration of the evening and morning sacrifices (2 Maccabees 10:1-5)."

iii. This passage has been a favorite springboard for elaborate and fanciful prophetic interpretations. A popular
and tragic interpretation of this passage took one year for every day, and William Miller used 2,300 "year-days" to
calculate that Jesus would return in 1844 (2,300 years after Cyrus issued the decree to rebuild the temple). His
movement ended up giving birth to the Seventh-Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and several other movements.

iv. We can know that Miller and other "year-day" theories are wrong because this passage was fulfilled before the
time of Jesus. Jesus recognized that the temple was properly cleansed and rededicated when He attended the Feast of
Lights, commemorating the cleansing and re-dedication of the temple after the desecration brought by Antiochus Epiphanes (John 10:22).


Because Seventh-day Adventists have a do-or-die need to stretch this literal prophecy to 2,300 literal years so it will reach to 1844, they have a particular love for the King James version of the Bible, which mistranslates several words in Daniel 8:14 "in their favor."

Days is translated by two words H6153, ereb, meaning dusk/evening, and H1242, boqer, meaning morning. Days is always translated yamim– never ereb-boqer.

The context of this prophecy is Daniel's vision of the Prince and his army taking away the daily sacrifice and defiling the sanctuary. The question is then asked, "How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?"

Dan 8:14 (KJV) 14 And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

Seeing this is about the daily evening and morning sacrifices the text should read; 2300 morning and evening sacrifices. There was one sacrifice in the evening and one in the morning, thus two sacrifices a day. Therefore we have 1,150 days of sacrifices or a little under 3 ½ years.

Modern translations have corrected the KJV mistranslation such as the NIV, NASV, and NRSV.

Dan 8:14 (NRSV) 14 And he answered him,"For two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state."

The third KJV word correction; Cleansed H6663, tsâdâq. Dr. Raymond Cottrell notes in “The Sanctuary Doctrine Asset or Liability?” that the Hebrew word, nitsdaq, never means "cleansed" as the KJV translates it. Nitsdaq is the passive form of the verb, tsâdaq, "to be right," and means "to set right," or as the NRSV renders it, “to be restored to its rightful state.” “Had Daniel meant “cleansed” he would have used the word taher, which does mean “cleansed” and always refers to ritual cleansing in contrast to tsâdaq, which always connotes moral rightness.”

The sanctuary was made right or justified not by the Day of Atonement animal sacrifices for the sins of Israel, but by Antiochus' departure from the temple in Jerusalem and the subsequent cleansing ceremonies conducted by the Jews after he left which restored the temple to its right and holy uses.

The pioneers of the Adventists as well as the modern Adventists' interpretation of Daniel 8:14 is exegetically incorrect. The Sanctuary to be “justified” (cleansed in the KJV) is contextually located in the earthly Jerusalem, not in Heaven. There is nothing in the text to suggest a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844 taught by Ellen G. White.

There are two places in the Old Testament, Numbers 14:33-35 and Ezekiel 4:5-6, where God used the day-for-a-year in a prophecy and it was God who made it clear when it was to be used. Adventists should have taken note of this principle.

A very complete discussion of the problems of the Adventist interpretation of the little horn of Daniel 8 and 11 can be found at Dirk Anderson's web-site, Amazing Fiction.Org. There is no better way to show our readers just how much SDA leaders had learned about the problems with their prophetic interpretations by 1919 than to provide you with an extensive portion of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes from July 8, 1919. Keep in mind that you will see the participants acknowledge the serious problems of the single-most important prophecy to Adventism, observe them discuss how to hide the facts from SDA students, and watch them desperately try to to justify a “wheel within a wheel” strategy of biblical symbolism to establish the legitimacy of the 1844 cleansing of the sanctuary in Heaven, and therefore prop-up their prophetess, Ellen G. White.

We want you to see for yourselves the great difficulties these top SDA leaders were having with the leap from the literal to the symbolic in Chapter 11, which is widely accepted to be a continuation of the explanation of the little horn of Daniel 8. To do this, we are providing an extensive portion of the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes for you to study. We have taken the liberty to make obvious corrections to the stenographer's type-written manuscript, which is rendered at the General Conference Archives as scans of the original pages as they came out of the stenographer’s typewriter almost 100 years.
ago. Note especially the portions of text we have highlighted in red. Additionally please observe that there are editorial comments inserted within the transcript to show scholarly opinion that tends to support or contradict the various interpretations of these prophecies as proposed by the participants. These commentaries are in green so they can easily be distinguished from the transcript's text.

Again, keep in mind that Seventh-day Adventists traditionally have viewed the little horns of Daniel 7 and Daniel 8 and 11 as the same power. As we pointed out earlier, these delegates seem to be unaware that the 1,260 days of the little horn of Daniel 7 fit the exact number of days that Nero persecuted the Christians in the Roman Empire, and they mistakenly acknowledged the probability that the prophecy applied, initially, to Antiochus Epiphanes. This misunderstanding, however, provides strong evidence that these delegates knew that one way of calculating the time that Antiochus desecrated the temple came to 3.5 years. In this passage they are discussing the little horn of Daniel 8 by discussing the prophecies of Daniel 11, which are widely viewed as relating to the little horn of Daniel 8, and widely acknowledged to apply in a spectacular way to Antiochus Epiphanes:

W.E. Howell: Not only has God showed the great mountain peaks of prophecy, but in Daniel 11, especially the first part, he has descended to-the minutest detail of the privacies of personal life, and these are thus shown to be under his supervision just as truly as the rise and fall of Empires. The modern critics are saying that the book must have been written after the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, because the statements are as accurate as a history written in his time. But we believe it was written 200 years before the days of Antiochus Epiphanes and that God could look down and see that man's whole career. Let me read the 25th Verse:

He shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army, and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him. Is this Antiochus Epiphanes, and the two armies are the armies of these two men.

H.C. Lacey: (reading his paraphrase): Daniel 11:25: “And he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall stir up (BC 171) his power and his courage against the king of the south (Ptolemy Philopater) with a great army (“a great multitude”); and the king of the south (Ptolemy) stirred up with a very great and mighty army (“very many and exceedingly strong horses”) and the king of the south (“Ptolemy Philopater) shall not stand (“was afraid and fled”): for they shall forecast devices him (Eula, his minister, Maroon, a premier, the Alexandra ins). 36: Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (Ptolemy's) Meat (his ministers, Eula, Maroon, etc.) shall destroy (by corrupting and betraying) him (Ptolemy Philopater), and his (Ptolemy's) army shall overflow and many shall fall down slain.”

A.G. Daniells: What does it mean by overflowing?

H.C. Lacey: They dispersed and were defeated. In the old view Rome shall overflow, and many shall fall down slain.

A.G. Daniells: Does overflow mean to disperse and to run out?

H. C. Lacey: Exactly the same criticism may be applied to both views. I suppose we could turn this thing around and make it apply to Rome. . . . is the language in I Maccabees 1:16,16,18,19. (Reads)

You see that the language both in the bible and the apocryphal book is practically identical.

27 “And both these kings’ hearts shall be do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper; for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.”

Upon his arrival at Memphis, Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopater frequently ate and conversed together “at one table, Antiochus pretending he would favor the cause of Ptolemy as against the usurpation of his brother, Physson. This Antiochus pretends to espouse the cause of this older nephew against his brother, Ptolemy, laying the blame of the whole campaign upon Eulasus, his majesty who betrayed him, and professing great obligations to his uncle Antiochus. But these protestations of friendship were “lies” on his part. As soon as Antiochus had withdrawn, the two brothers, Ptolemy and Physson, made peace through the mediation of their sister, Cleopatra, and agreed to reign conjointly in Egypt. But even this did not prosper. The two monarchs came to blows at the time appointed.

Let us read into the Scripture the names of these kings: “And both these kings’ hearts shall be do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table (in apparent friendliness), but it (this patched up peace between them) shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.”

38: Then shall he return into his own land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do
exploits, and return to his own land.” That is the prophecy.

Antiochus, hoping that the two Egyptian brothers would ruin each other in civil war, returned to Syria. He took with him immense treasures from the captured towns of Egypt. The verse says, “He shall return . . . with great riches.” History says he took immense spoils from the captured towns of Egypt. In 1 Maccabees 1:19-20 it is stated, “Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof.” That is the history.

Notice it says “his heart shall be against the holy covenant.” The next verse—(1 Maccabees 1:20) “And after that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he return again in the hundred forty and third year (312 of the ---- era, which is BC 169), and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the showbread, and the pouring vessels, and the vials, and the censers of gold, and the veil, and the crowns, and the golden ornaments that were before the temple, all which he pulled off. He took also the sliver and the gold, and the previous vessels; also he took the hidden treasures which he found. And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly.

That is the history. The prophecy reads thus: ‘and his heart shall be against the holy covenant.’ There is more to that than this, too,— “his heart shall be against it.” When he was in Egypt a false report had been circulated of his death. Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest—(Antiochus Epiphanes had done this) Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest, returned to Jerusalem, drove his brother, Wenelaus, out of office, and cruelly ill-treated the citizens. Antiochus, thinking the whole nation had revolted, and hearing that they had made great rejoicing at the report of his death, besieged Jerusalem with a great army, took the city by storm, and vented his anger upon the helpless Jews. He slew 40,000 of them, and sold 40,000 more, polluted the temple, offered swine’s flesh on the altar of God, restored Wenelaus to the priesthood, and made Philip, a barbarian, governor of Judea. “He shall do exploits,” and then “return to his own land,” just as these events here are brought forth.

**PROF. ANDERSON:** What verse in the chapter do you allude to when you speak of the pollution of the temple, as you read in the history?

**PROF. LACEY:** In the 11th chapter, when we get down to verse 30, there is the point. All these modern scholars, I believe—I don’t like to say “all,” but the majority of scholars, you will find, as I have stated, claim indisputably the events occur under Antiochus Epiphanes to Verse 30; but after Verse 30 it is a little hazy, and you cannot group them all around Antiochus Epiphanes. Modern scholars have attempted to do it. Verse 30 speaks of the defiling of the temple. But we will come to that a little later on. In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn—extremely alike, and I did not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekiel expresses it—a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of Daniel 7, can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the eleventh down the line, three were plucked up in his place (names were mentioned), he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the Law of the Most High; things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years. And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, suppose you and I had been living in that day we would have thought that that prophecy met its fulfillment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great anti-Christ, of which Antiochus was here the personal representative.

(Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted.)

**ELDER DANIELLS:** You would not want to say that you have just said now to a class of students, would you?

**PROF. LACEY:** I do not think that I would ever say it.

**ELDER DANIELLS:** I hope you won’t, because the next thing you know some of our boys will be out over the country saying that is the little horn.

**VOICE:** They have said it already.

**PROF: LACEY:** I have never said it. But I do not see why you object if we take this prophecy as a wheel within a wheel.

**ELDER DANIELLS** – When we come to the discussion, that will come in.

**PROF. LACEY:** Pass on to verse 29: “At the time appointed he shall return and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.”

At the time appointed Antiochus, perceiving that his cunningly planned scheme failed—that is, to get these two loggerheads fighting against each other—and seeing that Ptolemy and his brother, Eusalus, had made up and were prepared to resent
[resist] his aggressions, he was so offended that he immediately made war and laid siege first to the two brothers of Alexandria. But this expedition was not as his former one, for the reasons given in the next verse.

Let us re-read this verse with the names opposite: “At the time appointed.” Two years later, this is where he comes to his end,-- both of the kinds come to an end, and Rome arises. “At the time appointed (BC 168) he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall return and come toward the South (Egypt), and it (the Egyptian campaign) shall not be as the former (campaign—the Egyptian campaign of verse 25), or as the latter (the Jewish campaign of verse 28). Notice why—

Verse 30: For the ships of Chittim shall come against him”—the ships of Chittim apply to the Romans, in Italy, the term being applicable to that whole coastal region—they “shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do:”—and the verse proceeds.

Now we would like to know just what did occur just at that junction. “The ships of Chittim shall come against him (Antiochus Epiphanes).” While pressing the siege of Alexandria a Roman embassy reached him and demanded that he desist instantly from his war with Ptolemy and Eulasus. Marcus Popillius Lenas, the head of the embassy, was the old friend of Antiochus, but he drew a circle in the sand around the king, and peremptorily demanded in the name of the Senate and Roman people that he give an immediate answer to the stipulations. As the report of the Battle of Pydna, 168 BC, had just been carried to Antiochus, he assented at once to the request of Popillius, and returned from Alexandria. So we see this campaign was not like the other two. He was pressing the siege, but he was demanded to withdraw, and he obeyed.

This is where Rome comes in contact with Antiochus in the same way that Greece and Persia came together. In that verse Rome and Greece come together. Just a moment longer we follow Antiochus, for it says, “he shall be grieved and return.” Does that way to his own land? No. Just “he shall be grieved and return. Now Polybius uses almost the exact language; “He led back his forces into Syria, grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient to yield to demands for the present.” --- That is the history, it is not the prophecy – “grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient to yield to demands for the present.”

ELDER DANIELS: Where historians use practically the same thing that the prophet used, you consider that some weight of evidence, do you, that the history meets the prophecy?

PROF. LACEY: O yes, in a case like this. Not just an isolated reference.

The next expression: “and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do.” On his way back this Antiochus further vented his spite and his ill temper upon the unfortunate Jews, dispatching Apolloneus with 30,000 men to Jerusalem, who slew great multitudes, plundered the city, set fire to it in various places, pulled down houses and walls, slew those who attended the temple, defiled again the Holy Place so that the whole service was discontinued. The city was forsaken of the Jews and strangers only remained in it. On his arrival at Antioch he published a decree obliging all upon pain of death to conform to the religion of the Greeks. So the Jewish laws was abrogated, and heathen worship was set up in its stead, and the Temple itself was consecrated to Jupiter Olympus.

QUESTION: What was the date of that?

ANSWER: BC 158

PROF. LACEY: “They set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar. They did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God.” 1 Mac. 1:54,59

You see that they placed the abomination of desolation in the Holy Place. The very language of the Bible, “the abomination of desolation,” is placed in the temple; and this is history. I do not see why you object to taking this in a small way as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, -- as a wheel within a wheel view of this prophecy. Living in those times we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfillment, but in this time we see it has a large fulfillment, but in this time we see it has a larger fulfillment, we get a present message from it; as we read any chapter and make other slight allusion to those days and how it applies today. Sister White herself recognized the double application method.

“And he (Antiochus) had intelligence with them that forsook the holy covenant.” That is, Antiochus had intelligence with those who forsook the holy covenant, for there were many Jews who complied with his request and became converts to heathenism.

W.C. WILCOX: The Revised Version says “Regard.”

Verse 31: “And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.” Here I do not see why we cannot take the word which some of you prefer – “Out of him yet shall stand.” Exactly the same word is used as in Daniel 8:9, when you come down to the Greek power, and out of the four horns, out of one of them a little horn waxed exceeding great. That “out of one of them”
is the same word, and when we explain that we say that that little horn is Rome, and it came out of Greece--

Not racially and ethnically, but it was incorporated and rose a universal power. So here we have the same point – Out of him, or out of this power, shall come arms; another view of Rome. There is clearly strength and consistency in this view. We have not once doubled back on our track. We have made a steady march down. It is uninteresting history, but the Lord has given us these details, and they carry us right on down, so that the people in those days living as they were in that terrible time of persecution might have help, and now we come down to the latter part, which applies more essentially to us. Rome arises.

QUESTION: Did the people back there know anything at all about the book of Daniel—wasn’t it a sealed book?

PROF. LACEY: I do not know that it is just right to think that the sealing meant that they were to know nothing about the book of Daniel. They must have understood something about it. When it said that the goat was Greece, they must have understood that. When Alexander came to Jerusalem the high priest went out and pointed out the prophecy of Daniel to Alexander, and said, You are the horn of the goat.

PROF. SORENSON: Mentioned the text, “Whoso readeth let him understand.”

PROF. LACEY (CONTINUING STUDY) - Out of them arms shall stand up.” Arms for this power which followed Rome shall stand up or shall arise.

W.C. WILCOX: Refers to a translation which says, “After him shall arms stand up.”

PROF. LACEY: Many have repudiated the translation, but good scholars have accepted it.

NOTE: (Elder Daniells requests that there be an uninterrupted continuation or presentation of the study.)

PROF. LACEY: Out of him—meaning emerging from that power, arising out of Greece, represented first by Antiochus, from him “arms” – a wonderful symbol of the Roman Empire. He included both the king of the north and the king of the south, and so he is not called the king of the north—it is “arms.” The north and the south were in arms. It is Rome Pagan and Papal in this chapter, and the duality is suggested by that term “arms.” On the Roman standard, as I pointed out, two arms or extended hands were printed—a striking symbol of Rome. By a natural transition the thought of the prophet passes from this Seleucidaen king to that of the Romans, who came into prominence in the very year brought to view in the previous verse—BC 168.

Now these arms, this power, shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and this has a double aspect. Pagan Rome, Imperial Rome, polluted the earthy sanctuary of strength, and that section of this power represented by “arms,” or Papal or ecclesiastical Rome, polluted the heavenly sanctuary of strength; the former in the year A. D. 70, and the latter, if we want to fix a day, in the year 503. That is the date accepted as we understand for the taking away of the daily mediation the sanctuary. Anticipate that just as soon as Rome is struck in the line of prophecy, then the commentaries which are presented by the same authorities on Daniel 8 and 9 emphasis should be laid on the warfare raised by this power on the sanctuary of God in its double aspect.

“And they shall place the abomination of desolation.”

There the Pagan element gradually disappears, and they place the abomination that maketh desolate – when Rome, or the Papacy, rather, was established in the year 533 to 538, by the decree of Justinian.

May I state at this juncture that the matter---- is perfectly authentic. The matter was raised the first day as a question, and I did not like to say anything because I wanted to look it up. I had a copy of it, but you have to read 35 or 36 pages more beyond the place where the letter of Justinian to the Pope is mentioned; letter to---- Bishop of Constantinople.

And so the year 533, this is an established date. We are brought down to that. Let us pass rapidly down over the following verses:

Verse 32: “And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupted by flatteries. (The Papacy would win over those apostate Christians who proved disloyal to the covenant. We have shown that this is correctly Papal Rome.) But the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.” Here the saints of God are brought to view; the faithful saints of God living during the Dark Ages, who maintained the faith of Christ,-- the Waldenses, Albigennes, Huguenots, etc. And so this prophecy is fulfilled.

Editor's note: This text does not appear to have anything in it that suggests that its meaning should be applied to the power of Rome hundreds of years later. The vast majority of biblical scholars apply it to Antiochus. Gill's Commentary, for example, says this about verse 32:
And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupted by flatteries,... That forsook the law of God, the book of the covenant, and did things contrary to it; and particularly violated the covenant of circumcision, drawing on the foreskin, and becoming uncircumcised; as well as rejected other ordinances of religious worship the Jews by covenant were obliged to observe: these apostates Antiochus corrupted by good words and fair speeches, by gifts and presents; and they became his tools, to do his pleasure, and were his instruments to seduce the Jews to renounce their religion, and give in to his idolatry; such as Jason, Menelaus, and others; in the Apocrypha:

"Now when the kingdom was established before Antiochus, he thought to reign over Egypt that he might have the dominion of two realms." (1 Maccabees 1:16)

"Now such was the height of Greek fashions, and increase of heathenish manners, through the exceeding profaneness of Jason, that ungodly wretch, and no high priest;" (2 Maccabees 4:13)

"Yet was he not content with this, but presumed to go into the most holy temple of all the world; Menelaus, that traitor to the laws, and to his own country, being his guide:" (2 Maccabees 5:15)

"But they that had the charge of that wicked feast, for the old acquaintance they had with the man, taking him aside, besought him to bring flesh of his own provision, such as was lawful for him to use, and make as if he did eat of the flesh taken from the sacrifice commanded by the king." (2 Maccabees 6:21) but the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits; such who knew the Lord God of Israel to be the true God, and owned and acknowledged him as such; and not only professed him, but served and worshiped him, having a spiritual knowledge of him, and communion with him; and therefore could not be drawn off from him and his worship by flatteries or frowns, by promises or menaces: these were strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; they held fast their religion, and the profession of it, and were proof against all allurements or threatenings, and endured racks and tortures, all sorts of punishment, and death in every shape, with the greatest constancy and courage; such as Eleazar, the mother and her seven sons, and others; as well as others did many valiant actions in the defense of themselves and country, as Matthias, Judas Maccabeus, and his brethren; to which heroic actions the apostle refers in Hebrews 11:34, so Josephus (i) says, "that many of the Jews indeed, some willingly, and others through fear of punishment, obeyed the king's commands; but the more approved, and those of generous minds, had a greater regard to the customs of their country than to the punishment threatened to the disobedient; and for this being continually harassed, and enduring grievous punishments, died; some were scourged, and their bodies mutilated, and being yet alive and breathing, were crucified; women and their children, whom they crucified, were by the king's orders strangled, and hanged about the necks of their parents that were crucified;"

PROF. LACEY: Verse 33: Those “which understand among the people shall instruct many.” This refers to the teaching of the various reformers—Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Luther, etc. And those “that understand among the people shall instruct many (as against the Papacy), and yet they (the saints of God) shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, days. It does not say “time, times, and the dividing of time,” but “days,” which includes that. It may refer to that entire period of persecution suffered by the people of God, the 1,260 years, when millions were martyred, but it is also a general statement, referring to the people of God, the saints of God.

Editor's Note: These prophecies still appear to apply to the events surrounding the Jewish persecution by Antiochus. Gill's Commentary for Daniel 11:33 says this:

And they that understand among the people shall instruct many,... Such as had a better understanding of divine things than others, had more light and knowledge in the sacred Scriptures, in the law of God, and in his mind and will, and were capable of teaching others; and such as these the Lord raises up among his people in the worst of times, in the times of the greatest apostasy and declension; and these are enabled to perform their duty, to instruct the people in theirs, teach them what they should do, and how they should behave; exhort them to retain the doctrines and ordinances of their holy religion, and not embrace the doctrines and inventions of men, will worship, superstition, and idolatry; and so they instructed the ignorant, strengthened the weak, and established the wavering; such were Mattathias the priest of Modin, and Eleazar, one of the chief scribes, in the Apocrypha: "In those days arose Mattathias the son of John, the son of Simeon, a priest of the sons of Joarib, from Jerusalem, and dwelt in Modin." (1 Maccabees 2:1) "Eleazar, one of the principal scribes, an aged man, and of a well favoured countenance, was constrained to
open his mouth, and to eat swine's flesh." (2 Maccabees 6:18)

Auk applies this to the times of the apostles, who he thinks are here meant; so Sir Isaac Newton:

yet they shall fall by the sword; by the sword of Antiochus and his soldiers; as multitudes of the Jews did, even both the instructors and the instructed, who would not comply with his orders: and by flame; some were burnt alive in caves, where they fled for shelter; and others as the mother and her seven sons, were cast into heated caldrons of brass; in the Apocrypha:

"And others, that had run together into caves near by, to keep the sabbath day secretly, being discovered by Philip, were all burnt together, because they made a conscience to help themselves for the honour of the most sacred day." (2 Maccabees 6:11)

"3 Then the king, being in a rage, commanded pans and caldrons to be made hot: 4 Which forthwith being heated, he commanded to cut out the tongue of him that spake first, and to cut off the utmost parts of his body, the rest of his brethren and his mother looking on. 5 Now when he was thus maimed in all his members, he commanded him being yet alive to be brought to the fire, and to be fried in the pan: and as the vapour of the pan was for a good space dispersed, they exhorted one another with the mother to die manfully, saying thus," (2 Maccabees 7) by captivity; so it is expressly said of Antiochus, that he carried captive women and children and at another time ordered the women and children to be sold for slaves, in the Apocrypha:

"Insomuch that the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled because of them: whereupon the city was made an habitation of strangers, and became strange to those that were born in her; and her own children left her." (1 Maccabees 1:38)

"He sent also that detestable ringleader Apollonius with an army of two and twenty thousand, commanding him to slay all those that were in their best age, and to sell the women and the younger sort:" (2 Maccabees 5:24)

and by spoil many days; being plundered of their substance, their houses rifled, and their goods carried away; and this distress lasted "days", a short time only; Josephus (k) reckons it at three years and a half. All this Cocceius interprets of the persecutions of the Christians by the Romans; and likewise Sir Isaac Newton.

(k) De Bello Jud. l. 1. c. 1. sect. 7.

PROF. LACEY – CONTINUED:

“The time of the end.” The time of the end, according to the book of Daniel is 1844. Let us read Daniel 8:13,14,17-19. I do not say it could not be 1798 just as well.

“Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said under the certain saint which spake, ‘How long shall the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleaned.”

Now the time brought to view here is 1844.

Vs: 17: “So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, “understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision.” The Revised Version says: “The vision belongeth to the time of the end.”

What is the great objective of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9? 1844. It belongs to the time of the end. Then the time of the end (according to this new application) is 1844.

Vs. 19: “And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.” Revised Version reads: “It belongeth to the appointed time of the end.” By this then before we come to the 11th chapter the time of the end is referred to as 1844.

Vs. 35: (R.V.) “Because it was yet for the time appointed.”

The true indication here is that on this side of 1798 there may be a revival of persecution—to that time, and into it.
Even to the time of the end; because it is yet for a time appointed; these distresses, calamities, and persecutions, would have an end, and the time for it was appointed of God; as yet it was not come, but quickly would, and then an end would be put to the third or Grecian monarchy; a hint of the Roman power over that being given, Daniel 11:30, hence we have no further account of Antiochus or his sons. Very remarkable are the words of Aemilius Sara (m), "the Assyrians first were possessors of monarchy; then the Medes; afterwards the Persians; then the Macedonians; from that time the kings, Philip and Antiochus, who sprung from the Macedonians, being conquered, not long after Carthage was subdued, the supreme power of empire came to the Roman people;" of whom, under one character or another, the following part of the prophecy is chiefly to be understood. So another historian says (n), Antiochus being drove out of Asia, the Romans first set footing there; and another (o) observes, that Antiochus being defeated by L. Cornelius Scipio, he took the name of Asiaticus, because he had conquered Asia; as his brother was called Africanus, from his subduing Africa: wherefore Asia and Africa being now in the hands of the Romans, the supreme power might well be said to be with them; and therefore, henceforward, are only spoken of, and particularly the Roman antichrist.


"And shall magnify himself above every God." There has been no heathen god honored as the Pope of Rome has been honored. And it could include the very God of heaven, too. He has magnified himself against God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, by taking away the continual mediation and calling attention to himself instead of to Christ, claiming he (the pope) was the vice-regent of God. The prophecy would far more fittingly apply to him than to the French nation.

Editor's note: These words may apply to the coming anti-Christ, and even the papacy. Keil and Delitzsch' Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament comments on Daniel 11:36 says:

This exaltation of the king is here introduced by the formula כרצנו ועשה, which expresses the self-will and the irresistible might of his proceeding; cf. Daniel 3:16 and Daniel 8:4 - "a feature common to Antiochus and Antichrist" (Klief.). He shall raise himself above every god, not merely "subjectively in his lofty imagination" (Hitzig), but also by his actions. כל אל, every god, not merely the God of Israel, but also the gods of the heathen. This does not agree with Antiochus. He is speaking of the temple and its worship; not as the temple of the God of Israel, but as the temple of the heathen. This clause expounds and strengthens the מלח דבורש, wonderful, i.e., impious and astonishing things, against the God of gods, i.e., the true God. This clause expounds and strengthens the מלח דבורש, which is said of the enemy at the time of the end, Daniel 7:8, Daniel 7:11, Daniel 7:20. In this he will prosper, but only till the anger of God against His people (זעם as Daniel 8:19) shall be accomplished. Regarding see at Daniel 9:27. This anger of God is irrevocably
determined (נחרצה), that His people may be wholly purified for the consummation of His kingdom in glory. The perf. נעשה does not stand for the imperf. because it is decreed, but in its proper meaning, according to which it represents the matter as finished, settled. Here it accordingly means: "for that which is irrevocably decreed is accomplished, is not to be recalled, but must be done."

He was to speak marvelous things against the God of gods. This is a parallel expression to that found in Daniel 7:8,12,27. There it says the little horn would speak great things, and then very great things. Revelation 13:6 says, “And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.” Take the claims of infallibility of the Bishop of Rome for instance, and the doctrine that the priests have power to create their Creator. They point to that as the wonderful power that is vested in the Roman priesthood.

“And shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished.” He shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished, that is, down to the falling of the plagues,

“For that is determined shall be done.”

Vs 37: “Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers.” He Hebrew word reads (for ‘regard’) “to understand” “to attend.”

“Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women.” That does not mean that he denies the desire of women nor denies there is any god. It means he shall not “attend” to them; he will not heed them. It means he shall not “attend” to them; he will not heed them. How has the Papacy done that? To regard God is to worship him, to obey Him, to worship Him. How does He speak to me? In His word. The Word of God is the bible; and we disregard God when we disregard the Bible. Now it is a significant fact that the Bible has been eliminated in the Papal system. It always tries to keep the Bible away from the people. It does not “attend” to God or “regard” God. Now no matter what the history has been,-- the papacy claims it has “disregarded” the laws of God—disregarded God Who made that law, the Creator of Heaven and earth, and whose law is a sign of His authority.

It does not mean that he denies the being of God, but disregards God.

We would never have thought the old view of applying this prophecy to the French nation if it has not been suggested in “Thoughts on Daniel.”

“Nor the desire of women.” What is one of the cardinal teachings of the Papal system? The celibacy of the priesthood and the virginity of the nuns.

**Editor's Note:** It is possible, but not necessary, to apply this papacy to the Catholic Church's celibacy teachings. *Jamieson-Fausset-Brown Bible Commentary,* has this to say:

37. Neither . regard . the desire of women-(Compare Eze. 24:16, 18). The wife, as the desire of man's eyes, is the symbol of the tenderest relations (2Sa 1:26). Antiochus would set at naught even their entreaties that he should cease from his attack on Jehovah's worship [Polanus]. Maurer refers it to Antiochus' attack on the temple of the Syrian Venus, worshiped by women (1 Maccabees 6:1, &c.; 2 Maccabees 1:13). Newton refers it to Rome's 'forbidding to marry.' Elliott rightly makes the anti-typical reference be to Messiah. Jewish women desired to be mothers with a view to Him, the promised seed of the woman (Ge 30:23; Lu 1:25, 28).

“Nor regard any god.” The papacy does not regard any god. It is entirely irreligious in spirit.

**H.C. LACEY:** This celibacy of the priests, involving the virginity of the nuns, which follows as a natural consequence, is one of the great items in the papal doctrine. He does not regard any god, that is, he is entirely irreligious in spirit. Now it is this to which Paul alludes in 2 Tess. 2:4: “Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitter in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.”

Notice how it says here [in Daniel] “neither shall he regard any god, for he shall magnify himself above all.” This is the thought quoted in 2 Thess. We never deviate from applying that to the papacy, and this in Daniel which is the basis of the verse in Thessalonians, should also be applied to the papacy.

“But in his estate.” Instead of calling his attention to the God of the bible, he shall honor the God of forces. It is a very peculiar word translated forces. The Hebrew is Mahosser, meaning “god protect us.” He shall honor the god of forces. What are the facts of the case? The Catholics have thought to turn to the saints. Every Catholic has some saint to whom he or she looks. The saints come instead of Christ and God. And they are known as the tutelary saints. Perhaps I would better read something from some of these authorities on this point. In the ages past, repeatedly cities have been placed under the
It is not surprising that so many high profile Seventh-day Adventist leaders have left Adventism, willingly or unwillingly, because they could not find biblical support for the Investigative Judgment interpretation of the 2,300 day prophecy. The SDA interpretation of Daniel 8:14 got off on the wrong foot by making too much out of the word, “cleansed” in the King James Version:

14And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

The Young's Literal Translation is more in keeping with the intent of the original language, as is less susceptible to a fanciful interpretation:

He saith unto me, Till evening -- morning two thousand and three hundred, then is the holy place declared right.

The delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference may have been unaware that the 2,300 days worked out to exactly the number of literal days that Antiochus Epiphanes polluted and profaned the temple at Jerusalem. Instead they appear to have mistakenly believed that the 1,260 day prophecy of Daniel 7's little horn applied to the persecuting activities of Antiochus as well as to a symbolically arrived at 1,260 years of papal persecution and supremacy. It appears that without any definite start date specified for the beginning of the 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices, they made another assumption, and that was that the start date for this prophetic period was the same one as the 70 week prophecy (490 years from the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the Messiah), or 457 BC. Recall that there are serious problems with the 490 year prophecy as well.

Whatever the varied views of the SDA leaders of Adventism in 1919 may have been, they recognized that the fact that at least one of the little horns represented the persecuting activities of Antiochus Epiphanes was so dangerous that this fact should be withheld from SDA students.

The truth is that the facts of the little horn prophecies of Daniel 7,8 and 11 have nothing to do with the Sabbath-Sunday Question or 1844. Nothing fits perfectly, as Bible prophecy would require, if these prophecies of Nero (Daniel 7) and Antiochus (Daniel 8,11) are symbolically stretched to the almost believable date of 1798 and the incredible date of 1844. Although this quote from the Keil and Delitzsch Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament for Daniel 7:25 is long, it provides, in one place, an excellent summary of the problems involved with these speculative, symbolic interpretations, and it gives an excellent summary of why the 1,260 day prophecy might be a valid concept if we seek to understand it on the basis of the linguistics of the passage:

This tyranny God's people will suffer "till, i.e., during, a time, (two) times, and half a time." By these specifications of time the duration of the last phase of the world-power is more definitely declared, as a period in its whole course measured by God; Daniel 7:12 and Daniel 7:22. The plural word תmouseout (times) standing between time and half a time can only designate the simple plural, i.e., two times used in the dual sense, since in the Chaldee the plural is often used to denote a pair where the dual is used in Hebrew; cf. Winer, Chald. Gr. 55, 3. Three and a half times are the half of seven times (Daniel 4:13). The greater number of the older as well as of the more recent interpreters take imte (יִמְתָּע) as representing the space of a year, thus three and a half times as three and a half years; and they base this view partly on Daniel 4:13, where seven times must mean seven years, partly on Daniel 12:7, where the corresponding expression is found in Hebrew, partly on Revelation 13:5 and Revelation 11:2-3, where forty-two months and 1260 days are used interchangeably. But none of these passages supplies a proof that will stand the test. The supposition that in Daniel 4:13 the seven times represent seven years, neither is nor can be proved. As regards the time and times in Daniel 12:7, and the periods named in the passages of the Rev. referred to, it is very questionable whether the weeks and the days represent the ordinary weeks of the year and days of the week, and whether these periods of time are to be taken chronologically. Still less can any explanation as to this designation of time be derived from the 2300 days (evening-mornings) in Daniel 8:14, since the periods do not agree, nor do both passages treat of the same event. The choice of the chronologically indefinite expression מַעַה, time, shows that a chronological determination of the period is not in view, but that the designation of time is to be understood symbolically. We have thus to inquire after the symbolical meaning of the statement. This is not to be sought, with Hofmann (Weiss. i. 289), in the supposition that as three and a half years are the half of a Sabbath-period, it is thus announced that Israel would be oppressed during half a Sabbath-period by Antichrist. For, apart from the unwarrantable identification of time with year, one does not perceive what Sabbath-periods and the oppression of the people of God have in common. This much is beyond doubt, that three and a half times are the half of seven
times. The meaning of this half, however, is not to be derived, with Kranichfeld, from Daniel 4:13, where "seven times" is an expression used for a long continuance of divinely-ordained suffering. It is not hence to be supposed that the dividing of this period into two designates only a proportionally short time of severest oppression endured by the people of God at the hands of the heathen. For the humbling of the haughty ruler Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 4:13) does not stand in any inner connection with the elevation of the world-power over the people of God, in such a way that we could explain the three and a half times of this passage after the seven times of Daniel 4:13. In general, the question may be asked, Whether the meaning of the three and a half times is to be derived merely from the symbolical signification of the number seven, or whether, with Lemmert, we must not much rather go back, in order to ascertain the import of this measure of time, to the divine judgments under Elias, when the heavens were shut for three years and six months; Luke 4:25 and James 5:17. "As Ahab did more to provoke God to anger than all the kings who were before him, so this king, Daniel 7:24, in a way altogether different from those who went before him, spake words against the Most High and persecuted His saints, etc." But should this reference also not be established, and the three and a half times be regarded as only the half of seven times, yet the seven does not here come into view as the time of God's works, so that it could be said the oppression of the people of God by the little horn will last (Kliefoth) only half as long as a work of God; but according to the symbolical interpretation of the seven times, the three and a half, as the period of the duration of the circumstances into which the people of God are brought by the world-power through the divine permission, indicate "a testing period, a period of judgment which will (Matthew 24:22; Proverbs 10:27), for the elect's sake, be interrupted and shortened (septenarius truncus)." Leyrer in Herz's Real. Enc. xviii. 369. Besides, it is to be considered how this space of time is described, not as three and a half, but as a time, two times, and half a time. Ebrard (Offenb. p. 49) well remarks regarding this, that "it appears as if his tyranny would extend itself always the longer and longer: first a time, then the doubled time, then the fourfold - this would be a seven times; but it does not go that length; suddenly it comes to an end in the midst of the seven times, so that instead of the fourfold time there is only half a time." "The proper analysis of the three and a half times," Kliefoth further remarks, "in that the periods first mount up by doubling them, and then suddenly decline, shows that the power of the horn and its oppression of the people of God would first quickly manifest itself, in order then to come to a sudden end by the interposition of the divine judgment (Daniel 7:26)." For, a thing which is not here to be overlooked, the three and a half times present not the whole duration of the existence of the little horn, but, as the half of a week, only the latter half of its time, in which dominion over the saints of God is given to it (Daniel 7:21), and at the expiry of which it falls before the judgment. See under Daniel 12:7.

In conclusion, the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes show that the participants suffered from confusion about the meaning of these prophecies in their attempt to reconcile the historical facts, and in some cases, the well-accepted interpretations of these prophecies, with Ellen White's teachings. They understood that the fact that at least one of the little horn prophecies had its literal fulfillment almost 2,000 years before 1844 and believed that this information should be hidden from the church workers because it was dangerous to Adventism.

**REVELATION 14:12 AND REVELATION 12:17 CAN'T BE USED TO TEACH THAT THE TRUE CHURCH KEEPS THE SABBATH**

**Revelation 14:12** - Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

**Revelation 12:17** - And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

There are many commandments from God, but we have to look at to whom God was speaking and under what circumstances. For example, one of His Old Testament commandments was that Sabbath-breakers be stoned to death. Adventists assume that the word "commandments" in these passages refers to the Decalogue, but there is no justification in these texts, the context of these passages, or a proper understanding of the major themes and concepts of the Bible to indicate that the writer has any such intentions. It is a desirable assumption on the part of Sabbatarians. Adventists like to puff up their Sabbatarian position by saying something like, "God means ALL 10 of the 10 commandments."

When Paul talked about Christian behavior, he did not mention the 10 Commandments, and although he listed 23 sins that would keep a person from going to Heaven, Sabbath-breaking was not one of them. Paul's list included sins of the heart and was a much more comprehensive set of guidelines that the Decalogue. The writer may have been thinking...
about the things in Paul’s list, the Noachian laws, Jesus’ statement that the greatest commandments are that we should love God supremely and other people as we love ourselves. A little logic may help right here. The Decalogue does not proscribe the sins of homosexuality or fornication, but Paul’s list did. The author of the Book of Revelation, therefore, could not possibly have designated the Decalogue in these cases.

It is wrong to ADD words to the Bible, and this is what Adventist do when they abuse these passages. Adding words to Scripture is a good way to arrive at false doctrines, and, as William Hohmann points out, Christians are forbidden to add or remove any words from Scripture. Hohmann cites Revelation 22:18-19 and points out that no one has the right to alter Scripture or its application, and that when they do, this results in the twisting of Scripture that leads to deceptions and lies. Making the Sabbath a salvation issue attempts to impose upon Christians the conditions of a covenant they were never a party to, and a covenant that ended. That obsolete covenant had 613 points of law, and keeping each and every one of them was necessary to comply with its requirements. It cannot be a salvation issue, since St. John flatly states that Jesus broke the Sabbath and that his disciples broke the Sabbath by picking and eating grain on it. Hohmann adds that Christ never commanded even one Christian to keep the 10 Commandments or to keep any of the Old Covenant laws. Here is what Revelation 22:18-19 says:

18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.
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CHAPTER SIX
The Cover-Up 1844 to 1899

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has everything to gain by keeping the truth about its developmental history masked behind a cloak of deceit and lies. Beginning in the 1970's, a series of blockbuster revelations ripped the veil of this curtain of deception from the bottom to the top, exposing the foundation of lies upon which the entire Adventist belief model is based. How could a faith that needs the support of so many lies be true? By around 1983, and certainly by 1985, enough proof was available to demonstrate, even to the staunchest Adventist leaders of the time, that there is no biblical or historical support for the Sabbath and Investigative Judgment doctrines. Proof that Ellen White was a fraud had been known by top Adventist leaders of the time since the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes were discovered in 1974/1975. Here is an event log of the real history of Adventism along with observations about the significance of these events and how they interconnect with each other. This history is gleaned from a variety of sources, but we owe special thanks to Dirk Anderson at www.ellenwhiteexposed.com, and Tom Norris at www.AllExperts.com, Walter Rea’s unpublished book, *Pirates of Privilege*, the collection of early Adventist writings at Robert K. Sander's web-site, Truth or Fables.

ELLEN WHITE & CHURCH LEADERS COVER UP THE PAST AND THE SABBATH DOCTRINE IS DECIMATED BY CANRIGHT.

This period in the history of Adventism reflects the beginning of a new religious system based entirely on a comedy of errors. As the early years go by, various individuals recognize that Ellen White’s visions are not from God, leave the Church, and write about their observations. The absence of mass communications makes it possible for the Whites to move from place to place as her fraudulent claims become known in each locality. The Whites cover up the fact that Ellen taught the Shut Door Doctrine for years beyond what she claimed, but even the discovery of this lying deception is not enough to deter Adventist leaders from using her to keep the Church financially strong. A few decades later, they are also faced with undeniable evidence that the Sabbath doctrine is impossible, but it is too late to turn back. Reform would destroy the Church and cut off the easy supply of tithe monies needed to run the Church’s operations. There is growing evidence that Ellen White’s prophecies are usually failures, but this fact is ignored by leaders who apparently see her as a tool to use to solidify the view that God is personally at the helm of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The Sabbath Crisis of 1887-1889, precipitated by D.M. Canright, threatens the very existence of the Church, but he is not telling its leaders much that they do not already know about the extreme difficulties of the Sabbath idea. They have known most of what he told them from the late 1840’s. However, the slow communications of the age limit the damage.

By the end of the century, Ellen White has reached an income level that would easily classify her as wealthy, enabling her to travel the world, but she has caused so much trouble within the Church that the General Conference exiles her to Australia.

1844 – Jesus doesn’t return as Miller had predicted. Later Ellen White, the Church's prophetess, claims that God put His hand over the Bible truths that would have prevented this mistake in order to test His people. A few Advent believers stick together, searching for the meaning of what has happened. An Advent believer by the name of Hiram Edison claims he was shown in a cornfield that the sanctuary that was to be “cleansed” in 1844 was in Heaven— not the Earth. How the sanctuary in Heaven came to be in a condition that it needed cleansing is never explained. The small Advent flock continues to believe that the “door” to salvation is closed to those who rejected the message that Jesus was to return to Earth in 1844. The Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment is adopted by Ellen White from an Advent believer by the name of O.R. L. Crosier, who articulated it, promoted it for a short while, and later repudiated it. This brilliant tactic enables Ellen to snatch victory out of the jaws of defeat. Later she will claim to have been shown in vision that William Miller's failed prophetic chart was accurate and was exactly the way God would have it. (*Early Writings*, p. 64, 1882 edition). Even a cursory reading of William Miller's prophetic interpretations demonstrates the absurdity of his methods. In writing like this, Ellen White insults the integrity and omnipotence of God, Who she makes to look as if He is unable to understand His own
Bible and interpret it with any kind of sensibility. God becomes the “false prophet”, and not Ellen White. (For an explanation of William Miller’s prophetic methodology, see Dale Ratzlaff’s book, *Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists*.) Here is an outline of five of Miller’s crazy calculations as furnished by E. F. Ballenger in his (circa) 1950 book, *Facts about Seventh-day Adventists*:

**MILLER’S FIVE PROPHETIC PERIODS**

Miller had a fertile mind in selecting time prophecies that he thought terminated in 1843. He presented at least five.

**The 2300 Days**

His most important date was the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14, which he started from 457 BIC., at the time of the beginning of the 70 weeks of Dan. 9:24.

SDA’s retain only the 2300 days of Miller's five periods, even though Mrs. White mentions “periods” (plural) eleven times in *Early Writings*.

The Earth is 6000 Years Old in 1843.

The 7th millennium would begin at that time.

**The 2520 Years**

“I will punish you seven times more for your sins.” Lev. 26:18. This he interpreted to mean seven prophetic years of 360 days of 2520 literal years. This period had to begin when Manasseh was taken captive to Babylon, in 677 BC.

**The 50th Jubilee**

The Jews had a special celebration every fiftieth year, called a Jubilee year. The last one they held, according to Miller, was in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, 607 BC. The fiftieth Jubilee of Jubilees would be held in 1843. That is 49 Jubilees had been missed, a period of 2450 years, and the coming of the Lord would introduce this fiftieth Jubilee.

**The 1335 Days**

Miller had the 1335 days of Dan. 12:12 begin in 508 AD. and terminate in 1843.

In *Early Writings* Mrs. White no less than eleven times speaks of “prophetic periods” (plural) as terminating in 1844, yet the denomination retains only one of these periods — the 2300 days.

1845 — The Trial of Israel Dammon takes place, exposing the shocking fanatical behavior of Ellen White and the other members in attendance at a brawling “Pentecostal” meeting that includes men and women in questionable positioning with one another, so-called amazing manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and an arrest of the host of the meeting, Israel Dammon, for disorderly conduct. Ellen White’s testimony of the account, which supposedly demonstrated the power of God, totally contradicts that of the police and other witnesses. This level of prevarication suggests that Ellen White cannot be trusted to tell the truth of things. This means that there is no way to know, in any given instance, whether she has told the truth or not. (See also 1986.)

1846 – Ellen White receives a vision of the planets at Topsham, Maine in the house of a Mr. Curtis. An influential man by the name of Captain Joseph Bates is present. She is “shown” that Jupiter has four moons. Then she describes a planet with 8 moons, which Bates took to mean Saturn, and then she was “shown” a vision of Uranus with six moons. This scientific “accuracy” of this vision and the fact that Bates believed Ellen White had no knowledge whatsoever of astronomy convinces him that Ellen's visions are from God. Bates then lends his influential support to the Whites and her visions. (See 1892.)

1847 – Ellen White writes a letter to Joseph Bates affirming her belief that the door to salvation is closed for those who rejected William Miller's 1844 message. This teaching is referred to as the Shut Door Doctrine. Adventist leaders have denied that Mrs. White taught this perverted doctrine until a General Conference photographer, Skip Baker, photographed the letter in 1980 and subsequently published the photos. (See Skip Baker's article, “The Secret Letter.”
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1847 – James and Ellen White publish their pamphlet, “A Word to the Little Flock.” This paper clearly teaches the doctrine of the Shut Door. Several years later the White’s begin to cover-up the fact that they had written in favor of the Shut Door doctrine in this paper. They lie about the contents of the pamphlet until their deception is unmasked by A.C. Long in 1882. (See 1882.)

1848 - The Present Truth, a periodical published by James White, teaches the Shut Door Doctrine— the belief that salvation was closed to everyone except the Adventists who believed the Advent message in 1844. (See 1950.) Down through the years copies of these original, suppressed writings have surfaced, proving this fact. E.F. Ballenger in his circa 1950 publication, Facts about Seventh-day Adventists, proves Adventist leaders have lied in their attempt to cover-up this fact that disproves Ellen White’s visions were from God.

1850 – Ellen White predicts Jesus will come within a few months. (See Early Writings, p. 58.)

1850 - Ellen White predicts the City of Jerusalem will never be re-built. (Today it has been built up well beyond the boundaries of the city as they were in 1850.)

1853 – J.N. Andrews attempts to refute an anti-Sabbatarian paper by O.R.L. Crosier which dealt with, among other things, the biblical evidence that the Sabbath could not possibly have started in Eden and that the Early Fathers of the Church recognized this fact (J.N. Andrews, “A Review of the Remarks of O.R.L. Crosier on the Institution, Design and Abolition of the Sabbath”). Andrews addresses each anti-Sabbatarian argument Crosier presents, and Crosier presents many of the same arguments used by today’s anti-Sabbatarian Movement that have not since been discredited. It is a shocking revelation of how early the pioneer leaders of Adventism recognized that they had a “difficult sell” when it came to advancing their Sabbath-keeping requirement to the other Christians of the day.

1854 – In December H.L. Hastings publishes The Great Controversy between God and Man— Its Origin Progress and End. There is powerful evidence that Ellen White copied large portions of Hastings. The similarities of sequence, subject matter, and theological interpretation are striking. (See 1974 to learn how re-searchers later discovered her blatant plagiarism of his earlier work.)

1856 – Ellen White predicts that there will be at least one or more persons in the group to which she is speaking who will be alive when Jesus returns. There is nothing “conditional” implied in her words: “I was shown the company present at the Conference. Said the angel: ‘Some food for worms, some subject to the last plagues, some will be alive and remain upon the earth to be translated at the coming of Jesus’” (Testimonies, Vol. 1, p. 131). All these people have since died.

1858 (CIRCA) – J.N. Andrews thinks he sees great similarities between John Milton’s Paradise Lost and Ellen White’s account of a vision she “received” in March regarding the appearance of Satan in the context of the battle between good

in Adventist Currents, July 1984). Photos of this letter are available, as well as the text of the letter at: http://www.truthorfables.com/EGW_to_J.Bates_1847.htm
and evil in the Universe, Ellen denies having read Milton's book before she had the vision. Her grandson, Arthur White, explained it away like this:

He [J.N. Andrews] told her some of the things she had said were much like a book he had read. Then he asked if she had read *Paradise Lost*. She replied in the negative. He told her that he thought she would be interested in reading it.

Ellen White forgot about the conversation, but a few days later Elder Andrews came to the home with a copy of *Paradise Lost* and offered it to her. She took the book, hardly knowing just what to do with it. She did not open it, but took it into the kitchen and put it up on a high shelf, determined that if there was anything in that book like what God had shown her in vision, she would not read it until after she had written out what the Lord revealed to her. (See *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 4, cited in “Ellen White's Habit,” By Douglas Hackleman, *Free Inquiry*, Fall 1984, posted at ellenwhiteexposed.com.)

Back in the early years of Ellen White’s ministry it might have been possible to believe such an excuse, especially if critical judgment is suspended. Today, in the context of everything we know about her track record of prevarication, there is little doubt but that she told a bold-faced lie in this case.

1859 – J.N. Andrews publishes his first book on the Sabbath, *The History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week* (Battle Creek, Steam Press, 1859). (See the Wikipedia article, “J.N. Andrews.”) The earliest version we could find of this book was the one published in 1874. Therefore, it is unsafe to speculate about exactly what Andrews may have conceded about the problems with the Sabbath belief model in the original 1859 edition. However, his earlier writings about the Sabbath, such as his 1853 attempt to refute Crosier's anti-Sabbatarian paper, suggest that much of what he conceded in the 1874 edition was most likely conceded in the original 1859 edition. (See 1874.)

1859 – The Advent believers adopt a business model for the financial support of their work based on a concept called “Systematic Benevolence.” James White develops the concept, and Ellen White is “shown” that it is the model God wants for them. “Systematic Benevolence” does not work very well. If this “testimony” actually did come from God, He apparently must have been mistaken about what His little flock actually needed.

“The plan of Systematic Benevolence is pleasing to God. . . God is leading his people in the plan of Systematic Benevolence” (pp. 190, 191). “Systematic Benevolence looks to you as needless; you overlook the fact that it originated with God, whose wisdom is unerring. This plan he ordained” (*Testimonies for the Church*, p. 545, cited in *Canright, Life of Mrs. E.G. White*).

**CIRCA 1859-1863** – Ellen White predicts that England will join the South and fight against the North in the Civil War. This did not happen. There is nothing conditional in this prophecy, although Adventist apologists try to explain it away by saying that one word in the statement can have an alternative meaning that would change the prophecy into a conditional one. (See *Testimonies*, Vol.1, p.259.)

**CIRCA 1859-1863** – Ellen White states the Civil War is being fought, not to abolish slavery, but to preserve it. This is an amazing statement and contradicts all known facts of Civil War history. (See *Testimonies, Vol. 1*, pp. 254,258).

1862 - Ellen White predicts that Moses Hull, who is about to leave Adventism, would suffer a terrible catastrophe as a result. The implication is that he will die much sooner than he might expect to, but she couches her words in general terms: “If you proceed in the way you have started, misery and woe are before you. God's hand will arrest you in a manner that will not suit you. His wrath will not slumber.” (*Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. I., pp. 430, 431) Hull leaves Adventism and becomes a Spiritualist. He leads such an immoral life that even the leaders of the Spiritualist movement are anxious to distance themselves from him. He dies at a ripe old age after enjoying the pleasures of sin for many additional decades. (*The Life of Ellen White*, D.M. Canright, Chapter 15 - “Her Prophecies Fail.”)

1863 – The Seventh-day Adventist Church officially organizes. By this time it has been a while since the group of faithful Adventist believers split into two groups over the issue of the Shut Door Doctrine. The group that held on to the Shut Door Doctrine for a number of additional years was the one that organized into the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The other group, rejecting the Shut Door Doctrine almost immediately, organized into the *Church Of God Seventh-day*. Later a dissident member split away from the Church of God Seventh-day and started The Radio (later “Worldwide”) Church of God. This developmental history makes Seventh-day Adventists and The Worldwide Church of God “sister churches.” By 1863 Adventist leaders are already acquainted with most of the anti-Sabbatarian arguments D.M. Canright confronted them with in the late 1880’s, and Canright was validated in one way or another by Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in the late 1970’s.
1865 – Robert Cox, a contemporary of J.N. Andrews and Ellen G. White, publishes his massive, two-volume *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*. This set, available to theologians both then and now, furnishes the student of the Bible with a compilation of every Bible text that relates in any way to the Sabbath question and everything of significance that had ever been written about the Sabbath by Jewish rabbis, the Early Fathers, the Reformers, and all the significant biblical scholars and theologians, up through 1865. His book presents a massive number of quotes from writings on the Sabbath-Sunday question from both pro-Sabbatarian writers and anti-Sabbatarian writers, along with the author's commentary along the way. This body of research proves, if nothing else, that whether Sabbatarianism is right or wrong or not, the Sabbath conspiracy-abandonment theory of Andrews and White was incredulous.

1866 – Just three years after the Church officially organizes, two Iowa Conference leaders, Snook and Brinkerhoff, apostatize and expose a whole string of Ellen White's failed prophecies and doctrinal absurdities in their book, *The Visions of E.G. White Not of God*. At this early date these SDA leaders did not seem to know that Ellen White was a plagiarist. They document the fact that Ellen White continued to teach the Shut Door Doctrine for a lot longer than the Church would admit. These authors prove that Ellen and James White covered up the fact that they had taught the Shut Door Doctrine for several more years than they would admit, and they discuss her failed prophecies. You can access their book at: [truthorfables.com/Visons_of_%20EGW_by_Snook_&_Brinkerhoff.htm](http://truthorfables.com/Visons_of_%20EGW_by_Snook_&_Brinkerhoff.htm)

1867 – Adventist leaders plan to construct a building in Battle Creek for the new Health Reform Institute (Sanitarium) and need God's blessing on the project. They approach Ellen White, who then has a vision. Ellen says:

> “Here, I was shown, was a worthy enterprise for God’s people to engage in. Other people should have an institution of their own. Especially should those who have means to invest in this enterprise” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 1, pp. 492,494).

James White, her husband, is away at the time. When he returns to Battle Creek, he is enraged because he had not been consulted. The first story of the building is already completed. He has the building dismantled and put up again according to his design at a loss of $11,000, which in today's terms would represent the squandering of over $1,000,000. (This event, but not the financial equivalent, cited in Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*) After her husband's return, James demands another testimony to repudiate the first one. Here is that second “testimony:"

> “What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it. . . They [the officials at Battle Creek] therefore wrote to me that the influence of my testimony in regard to the institute was needed immediately to move the brethren upon the subject. Under these circumstances I yielded my judgment to that of others, and wrote what appeared in No. 11 in regard to the Health Institute. . . In this I did wrong.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 1, p. 563)

It is evident that James White, her own husband, knew that her visions were not from God, or he would not have dared to go against what he otherwise would have considered to be the revealed will of God.

1868 – James White claims that his wife's books contain many things that are not in any other books and presents this as evidence that her visions are inspired. Douglas Hackleman in his article, “Ellen White's Habit,” has the following observations about this outrageous claim:

James White, who served as his wife’s editor most of the time until his death in 1881, also made claims and denials. In his autobiographical *Life Incidents* (published by Steam Press, Battle Creek Michigan, in 1868) he argued that Ellen's writings contained “many things... which cannot be found in other books” (p. 328). In his next sentence James provides as an example “her favorite theme, God in nature.” But Mrs. White’s best-known passage on God in nature is a close paraphrase of an apologetic digression against naturalism from a sermon by nineteenth-century Anglican clergyman Henry Melville.

James White dug a deeper hole for himself and Ellen in his next paragraph:

If commentators and theological writer generally had seen these gems of thought...and had been brought out in print, all ministers in the land could have read them. These men gather thoughts from books, and as Mrs. W. has written and spoken a hundred things, as they are beautiful and harmonious, which cannot be found in the writings of others, they are new to the most intelligent readers and hearers. ... She could not have learned from books, from the fact that they do not contain such thoughts. [p. 328, 329]. *Life Sketches*, (1880 ed.), pp. 325-329. For whatever reason, when *Life Sketches* was reprinted in 1888, James White’s statement was not reprinted. (This source information is from the EGW Estate.)
The discovery in recent years by a variety of Adventist researchers that Ellen White and her editorial assistants wove the writings of scores of authors into testimonies, articles, and books published over her byline calls into question the integrity of both Ellen and James White. The White Estate recently made available for purchase on request a document comparing eighty-five pages of parallel passages between Mrs. White and Henry Melville alone.

1868 - Uriah Smith seeks to accomplish damage control for Ellen White by publishing his book, Visions of Mrs. E.G. White—Manifestations of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1868). Even at this early date there is wide-spread suspicion that the White’s are covering up the fact that in one of her earliest visions she was supposedly shown the “truth” of the Shut Door Doctrine by God. Later research by the critics of E.G. White have conclusively demonstrated that it is highly probable that the account of the Camden Vision which teaches the Shut Door Doctrine is authentic, despite the fact that the only record of this vision was made by a witness who later became one of her critics. The White Estate does not have anything written by Ellen White herself about this vision. Since Ellen White is now known to have tried to cover her tracks in regard to the Shut Door issue, it would be no surprise that she kept no record of this early vision.

1869 – Dr. William Russell examines Ellen White and determines that her visions are “the result of a diseased organization or condition of the brain or nervous system.” (See Canright, Life of Mrs. E.G. White.) Note that the White Estate has done a good job of discrediting the credentials of this doctor. However, from everything we now know about Ellen White’s behavior, it appears that whatever the case may be, Dr. Russell was able to diagnose her properly even if his medical training was received informally.

1870 - H.E. Carver publishes his book, Mrs. White’s Claim to Divine Inspiration Examined, describing among other stumbling blocks to his faith, “two instances in which she claimed to see in vision things that I had communicated to her myself.” (Source: Douglas Hackleman, “Ellen White’s Habit,” Free Inquiry, Fall, 1984.)


Now let us read what Neander, the most distinguished of church historians, says of this apostolic authority for Sunday observance:

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

(Emphasis by authors)

Note that while it is possible that this same quote is in his original 1859 edition of this book, we know for certain that Adventist leaders knew 14-15 years before the Canright Sabbath Crisis of 1887-1889 that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance hundreds of years before there was a Roman Catholic Church or a pope. It is clear that Canright was not telling them very much that they did not know.

For the complete text of the 1873 edition of Andrews’ book, go to the Wikipedia article, “J.N. Andrews,” and click on the link to the book. You must have the Djvu Reader to view it, which you can download free from the Djvu web-site if you do not already have it. Or, paste the following link in your web browser and go directly to it:

http://www.archive.org/stream/historyofsabba00andr/historyofsabba00andr_djvu.txt

1873 - The Church publishes Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day by Elder J.N. Andrews (Steam Press, Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assoc, 1873). Andrews now expands his original 1859 defense of the Sabbath with this book. As before, he discusses a wide variety of early Christian writers who documented the fact that Christians were observing Sunday very early in the history of the Early Church. By now it should be perfectly clear to Andrews that Ellen White lied about being shown by God in vision that the Roman Catholic Church “changed the day” because he has a wealth of evidence that the phenomenon of Sunday observance by Christians happened hundreds of years before there was a real Roman Catholic Church and a real pope whose authority was sufficient to spread beyond the city of Rome itself. Again, we see that Adventist leaders did not need D.M. Canright to confront them with all this evidence during the late 1880’s. Since Andrews published his first history of the Sabbath in 1859, it is apparent that the early leaders of the Advent Movement knew many of these same things more than four years before the Seventh-day Adventist Church was formally organized in 1863 and knew far more about these things by this year—1873.
1874 – Isaac Welcome publishes his *History of the Second Adventist Message*. This several volume set documents the strange fanaticism of the Whites, and their stand, later denied by them, on the Shut Door Doctrine plus the additional covering up by the Whites of a number of their earlier theologically errant statements. (A Google search will provide extensive sections of this book for your study, and it is available from Andrews University in a reproduction as well, indicated by one of the Google links.)

1876 – Ellen White predicts that Swedish publishing house manager, Charles Lee, who was very ill, would live. He died a few days later.

1876 – The “Systematic Benevolence” financial model is discarded in favor of the 10% model developed by D.M. Canright. Ellen White is “shown” in vision that this is the method God wants to support His little flock, which is growing larger. If Ellen White’s testimony were really from God, it would appear that God did not know what was best for Seventh-day Adventists, and He had to learn by experience what His people really needed. Time after time, Ellen’s claim that God has shown her things that He did not show her impinge on God’s character and power, making Him look incompetent. This is a form of White collar blasphemy that has occurred over and over up until this point and will continue to happen as long as Ellen White lives. Robert Sanders writes:


1882 – Ellen White publishes a book called *Early Writings*, which claims to be a reprint of her first writings, including the pamphlet, “A Word to the Little Flock.” The Whites had claimed that their new book contained no significant changes to the text and no deletions. (See Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*.)

1882 – SDA pastor A.C. Long, who had retained a copy of “A Word to the Little Flock” from years ago publishes a pamphlet entitled “Comparison of the Early Writings of Mrs. White with Later Publications.” In this 16-page tract, he places the original text along side of the altered new text, proving that Ellen White had deleted all the key words and phrases that would have betrayed that she taught the Shut Door Doctrine long after she claimed to have abandoned it. Again, we see a deceitful, lying prophet who claims to be directly inspired by God. (See Canright, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*.)

1882 – Ellen White is “shown” that the wrong man committed a great mistake. Here is the account from D.M. Canright’s book, *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*:

**Rebuked the Wrong Man**

About the year 1882, two Adventist ministers, E.P. Daniels and E.R. Jones, were laboring together in Michigan. In giving a health talk one of them had made some remarks quite offensive to aesthetic tastes.

Not long afterward Elder Daniels received a testimony from Mrs. White, rebuking him for the offense, which she said took place at Parma, Michigan. But, as the event turned out, she rebuked the wrong man, and the incident did not occur at Parma, but at another place.

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

“Through a misunderstanding, I happened to be the person rebuked, in the place of the one for whom the rebuke was intended, and who justly merited it. Were all the facts known, it would leave no room for even the slightest disrespect for the motives that influenced her, as she has, as she supposed, the best of reasons for believing that her informant had told her the truth. And, indeed, he had, but he made a mistake in the name of the person. All that he had said was true of another, though the incident did not occur at Parma” (Review and Herald Supplement, Aug. 14, 1883, p. 10).

1883 - Ellen White publishes a book for which she claimed divine inspiration— *Sketches from the Life of Paul*. Later it was discovered to have been lifted almost entirely from a book published earlier in England. The point is that Ellen White LIED about her source for the book. Compared to her lying, the issue of plagiarism is a much less serious evil. (See
1883 – Uriah Smith in a letter dated March 22nd, 1883 reveals that he does not believe in the visions of Ellen White. The “stunners” he is talking about refer to a situation where Ellen White, who sought a reputation as one to whom God reveals the secret sins of others, knew nothing about the fact that the denomination’s foremost evangelist was having sexual relationships with numerous women in one of the SDA churches on the East Coast. She had stayed in the home of this prominent minister and his wife when she visited his community. E.F. Ballenger tells the story in his circa 1950 book, Facts about Seventh-day Adventists:

Elder Uriah Smith was connected with the editorial staff of the RH for fifty years, most of the time as editor in chief. His works on the prophecies are still considered standard in the denomination.

In a letter written March 22, 1883, he said:

It seems to me that the Testimonies, practically, have come into that shape, that it is not of any use to try to defend the erroneous claims that are now put forth for them.... Bro. Littlejohn has preached on the subject here treating it mostly from a theoretical standpoint. But that does not touch the question at issue among us at all. I presume you noticed in the Review of March 13, Bro. Waggoner's extinguisher of the Mormon gifts. But, if the same reasoning will not apply somewhat to our own experience, I cannot see straight. The cases of F----, C----, and S--― S--― are stunners to me.

If all the brethren were willing to investigate this matter candidly and broadly, I believe some consistent common ground for all to stand upon could be found. But some, of the rule or ruin spirit, are so dogmatical and stubborn that I suppose that any effort in that direction would only lead to a rupture of the body.

Elder Smith was editor of the Review and Herald, the official periodical of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, for thirty years before he discovered that any omissions had been made from the early visions in Early Writings. We have a letter of his stating this fact.

The three people referred to above were all prominent workers in the Advent cause, associated with James White and his wife, but were very immoral in their conduct; yet Mrs. White never knew of their immorality until the women who were involved confessed their sin. The fact that she did not know of their vileness was a “stunner” to Elder Smith. It is a sad fact that Elder Smith after writing these things stultified his conscience and openly maintained his defense of the idea that Ellen White was inspired of God.

1887 – A powerful SDA leader, D.M. Canright, apostatizes from the Church and begins writing articles and papers against Adventism, including proof from historical and biblical sources that the Sabbath doctrine is impossible. By this time Canright is well aware of Ellen White's plagiarism, in addition to her failed prophecies and aberrant teachings.

1888 – Fearing that Canright was about to release an anti-Sabbatarianism, anti-Adventist book soon, Adventist leaders attempt to beat him to the draw by publishing Replies To Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists. This action turns out to have been unwise, since the following year Canright was able to refute their poorly constructed arguments and reference them by the Adventist book's page numbers.

1889 – Arch Apostate, D.M. Canright, publishes his classic Seventh-day Adventism Renounced. He presents encyclopedic evidence from reliable scholarly sources that prove Sabbatarianism is biblically and historically impossible. He refutes the SDA leadership point-by-point and page number by page number, referencing the Church's 1888 book, Replies To Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists.

1889 - The Healdsburg, California Enterprise publishes a remarkable story, March 20, 1889, exposing Ellen White's plagiarism. The article compares five passages from her writings side by side with the passages from the authors she had copied. The reporter concludes that she is, indeed, a plagiarist. This is an interesting fact, since Adventist leaders try to say that back in Ellen White's day there was no well-defined concept of what constituted plagiarism. (You can do an Internet search to read the article from the California Enterprise for yourself.)

1892 – Astronomer Bernard at Lick Observatory discovers the 5th moon of Jupiter, proving that the source of Ellen White's visions must have been from a god who didn’t remember what he or she had done when our solar system was created. (See also 1905.)
1892 – Elder J.N. Loughborough publishes *Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists*. His publishers have the audacity to change the mention of Ellen White’s words in regard to the moons of Jupiter to, “I see eight moons.” This is absolute proof that the author and his publishers knew Ellen White was a fraud. Their actions are inexcusable. If the Church were not a religious business, their false “product” claims would be illegal. (See 1905.)

1892 – In his 1892 book, *Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists*, J.N. Loughborough exalts Ellen White’s predictions about the Civil War as evidence that her visions are from God without bothering to mention the fact that she predicted that England would fight with the South against the North. Instead he tells the story of how at a certain believer’s home, she predicted that the sons of some of the people present in that room would die in battle. In a real history, Loughborough would have had no choice but to give the account of Ellen White’s disastrous prognostications in regard to England joining the South to fight against the North, as well as other Civil War predictions and comments that were incredibly inaccurate and absurd. It is no wonder that the *Wikipedia* article on Adventist Studies says that Loughborough’s book is now regarded as down-right dishonest Adventist propaganda, rather than genuine history (Roelf J. Poehler, unpublished paper on the shut-door era. Quoted in “Early Adventures in Maine”, letter to the editor by Donald E. Casebolt, *Spectrum* 18:2 (1987), p. 63). To read Loughborough’s 1892 book, you must down-load the DjVu reader from Lizard Technologies and then go to this SDA web-site: dventistarchives.org/docs/RP/RiseAndProgress/index.djvu

1893 – The General Conference exiles Ellen White to Australia. From what the 1919 Bible Conference minutes later reveal about what Adventist leaders knew about her, and from what we now know they knew about her as early as 1863 from the paper by Snook and Brinkerhoff, there is circumstantial evidence that the Church was aware of the fact that their prophetess was causing a lot of trouble for Adventism at the time. According to Arthur L. White, (Ellen G. White: *The Australian Years*, Review & Herald, 1983, p. 16), she sailed September 9, 1891. (The facts for this event, but not the interpretation of this incident, came from the paper, “When the Visions Led: an Adventist Anomaly,” by Douglas Hackleman, March 25, 2006).

1895 – The Church publishes a more complete version of *Replies to Canright*. The book’s contributors reference Canright’s 1889 book by the page number. This publication proves SDA leaders had to know that their Sabbatarian arguments were impossible. The best they are able to do is to obfuscate the issue in hopes that their readers will lose their focus on the importance of what Canright proved. They grapple poorly with the fact that the first Christian writers documented the extensive adoption of Sunday observance by Christians before the end of the First Century and attempt to use this evidence, which is highly damaging to their own position, as evidence that their preconceived notion of an “apostasy” began very early. They fail to acknowledge the fact that the angel “lied” to Ellen White about the Roman Catholic Church “changing the day,” since they were trying to explain away proof that Christians were not keeping the Sabbath hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Catholic Church. Their attempted rebuttal of Canright on Colossians 2:14-17 is proven to be equally reprehensible. It does not address Canright’s central point at all, and their quotation of Canright’s exact words from his 1889 book prove that these early Adventist leaders had been struggling, without success, to explain away this devastating-to-Sabbatarianism passage from Paul’s writings from almost the very beginning of the Advent movement.

1899 – Ellen White writes to Dr. Harvey Kellogg accusing him of erecting some buildings in Chicago with funds diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Dr. Kellogg and the Battle Creek Sanitarium represent the last road-block to the consolidation of power at the General Conference. Ellen White’s son, Willie White, conceded his mother was “shown” that the buildings were built but that, indeed, the buildings were not built. However, he tries to explain it away. See Willie White’s attempted rebuttal of this fiasco at: http://www.ellen-white.com/Ellen%20White%20Kellogg%20Chicago%20Buildings.htm

Compare that against the specific testimony of Dr. Kellogg by searching for “The Kellogg File.” You can also reference the mention of the date of 1899 for this event in the “Letter from Dr. Charles Stewart” to Ellen G. White,” dated May 8, 1907 at http://www.ex-sda.com/perplexed_stewart.htm

1899 – Astronomer Professor W. H. Pickering discovers the 9th moon of Saturn. Adventist leaders should have realized that something smelled fishy in regard to Ellen White’s claims that her visions came from God. Surely these leaders could use their brains to reason that the True God would know how many moons He created for Saturn. (See 1905.)
CHAPTER SEVEN
THE COVER-UP 1900 TO 1919

THE SABBATH CONTINUES TO BE ATTACKED
ELLEN WHITE NOW KNOWN TO BE A FRAUD

Ellen White and the General Conference prevail in their power struggle with Dr. Kellogg's Battle Creek "Empire," destroying his influence within the culture of Adventism. The General Conference moves to Washington, DC, and takes complete control of the Church. The Sanctuary Doctrine comes under fire and Adventist leaders realize that Ellen White is a fraud. However, they continue to use her, like a pawn at times, to achieve their own agenda. Her case is discussed in a top-secret meeting in 1919. No decision is reached about the fraudulent claims of Ellen White, so a cover-up plan is put into place. The Sabbath Doctrine is continuously assailed by D.M. Canright, but little permanent damage is done by his attacks. Canright dies in 1919, but questions about his teachings persist.

1902 – Dr. John Harvey Kellogg finishes preparation on the book, The Living Temple. Ellen White has a book of her own she wants to sell to the Church that teaches principles that are similar to those taught by Dr. Kellogg called Ministry of Healing. She accuses him of being a Pantheist and teaching pantheistic ideas in his book. Dr. Kellogg denies being a pantheist, but agrees not to publish the book. (Our comparison study between the books of these two authors indicated to us that both of them made statements that if stretched and taken out of context might possibly suggest a slight bent towards a hint of Pantheism. Our research could not substantiate Ellen White’s charges of Pantheism against Kellogg.) Access “The Kellogg Files” with an Internet search.

1903 – The General Conference moves its headquarters to Washington DC from Battle Creek, Michigan. The environment of the Battle Creek location has become inhospitable to Adventism, having made a bad name for itself in the treatment of Dr. J. H. Kellogg and the community's awareness of the behavior of the Church prophetess, Ellen White.

1904 – A group of key physicians associated with Dr. J. H. Kellogg at the Battle Creek Sanitarium find numerous contradictions in the testimonies of Ellen White and begin to question whether she was inspired of God or not.

1905 – A.F. Ballenger, a prominent SDA leader in England, discovers there is no biblical support for the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. Furthermore, he finds that the doctrine is squarely against what the Bible teaches about the concept of judgment and the Gospel. He writes of his concerns to Ellen White. Soon he is defrocked at a hearing held at the General Conference headquarters in Washington, DC. During his presentation he is bombarded with questions from the “jury” from the writings of Ellen White, but no one can provide Bible proof for the doctrine. He is deprived of his SDA income; he is forced to live in near poverty as he attempts to find a way to feed his family back on the farm. (See “On Trial for Heresy—The A.F. Ballenger Story,” by Dirk Anderson at Ellen White Exposed: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/egw13.htm

1905 – Continuing the deliberate deception in regard to how long Mrs. White taught the Shut Door Doctrine, J.N. Loughborough publishes The Great Second Advent Movement. In the section of his book devoted to an extensive defense of the charges that Ellen White believed in the Shut Door Doctrine for far longer than she admitted, he deliberately omits three words from a quotation from the very early Adventist publication of James and Ellen White, “A Word to the Little Flock” (1847) that proves that Ellen White’s critics are correct. On page 263 of the 1905 edition, he quotes from this early work:

“I believe the work [of Mrs. White] is of God, and is given to comfort and strengthen his scattered, torn and peeled people, since the closing up of our work . . . in October, 1844.”
Note the three little dots—ellipses—which indicate some words were left out. Here are those words from the original 1847 copy of “A Word to the Little Flock:” “since the closing up of our work FOR THE WORLD in October, 1844.”

These three words reveal the fact that Bates and the Whites did believe as late as 1847 that the door of mercy was shut to everyone but a tiny group of people who clung to the 1844 Message! By 1905, Loughborough had to have been acquainted with the 1882 work of A.C. Long, which had proved the Whites were guilty of covering up this fact to the point of over-kill! You can access the Loughborough publication by doing a Google search. In fact, it is now a Google Book. We learned of this deception from Canright's book, *Life of Mrs. E.G. White*, and verified it by going to the Loughborough book ourselves.

1905 - *Astronomer Perrine* at Lick Observatory discovers the 6th and 7th moon of Jupiter, again proving that the god who gave Ellen White the astronomy vision in 1846 was either very forgetful or was a liar who deceived her to make her look foolish later on. (See 1908.)

1905 - *Astronomer W.H. Pickering* discovers the 10th moon of Saturn, once again showing that the god who showed Ellen White the vision of the solar system had been out to lunch when the solar system was created.

1905 - *Elder Loughborough* revises his 1894 book, *Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists* and publishes it under the title of *The Great Second Advent Movement*. On page 258 of that book, there is a footnote that says, “More moons to both Jupiter and Saturn have since been discovered.” Perhaps he and his publishers thought God might have created some additional moons for these planets after Ellen White’s vision in 1846. How embarrassing! Absolute proof that SDA leaders knew her claim that her visions were from God was fraudulent! Imagine participating in a crime like this deception! (See D.M. Canright, *Life of Mrs. E.G. White* for the basic uncomplimentary information about the falsification of her visions. See the article, “J.N. Loughborough,” at The Narrow Way Ministries web-site for documentation of the renaming of the book, which Canright does not indicate. Note that The Narrow Way Ministries is strongly Pro SDA and we use this source only for the purpose of getting the name change of Loughborough’s book correct.)

1905 (MARCH) – *Ellen White* is distressed by the questioning of the Battle Creek physicians and is “shown” that she is to instruct them to write out their difficulties regarding her writings and send them to her, promising to respond to each concern. Here is her “testimony,” dated March 30, 1906:

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

*Editor's Note: This statement of Mrs. White is dated to March 30, 1906 by A.T. Jones in a letter to Ellen White dated April 26, 1909 as posted on the Web, D.M. Canright credits it to March 30, 1905. Per EGW scholar, Robert K. Sanders, Canright made a mistake by dating it to 1905, since all three primary sources, Sadler, Jones, and Stewart, refer to EGW’s 1906 date.*

1906 (APRIL) - *Dr. William S. Sadler*, in a letter dated April 26, 1906, writes to Ellen White in response to her 1905 testimony that those who are perplexed by things they find in her writings should put a list of their concerns together and send them to her for explanation. Among other things, he asks Ellen White to explain how God could have shown her that Dr. Kellogg built buildings in Chicago when, indeed, he did not. Dr. Sadler is a Battle Creek Sanitarium physician and associate of Dr. J.H. Kellogg.

1906 (APRIL) - Many days after the San Francisco Earthquake took place on April 18th, Ellen White reports that an angel had shown her a vision of great buildings falling and awful destruction in a large city and that this had happened two days before the San Francisco earthquake. She claimed that these events had been shown to her in two sessions, one the night of April 16th and one the night of April 17th. She wrote that she did not announce that these visions had taken place until many days later because it had taken her so long to write out the extensive information the angel had shown her. As D.M. Canright observes in *Life of Mrs. E.G. White*, she had learned to be cautious about naming dates and places until after the events had occurred due to her previous failures at foretelling the future. It is much safer to forecast events after the fact.

2006 (MAY) - The *Watchman* publishes an article entitled “Religious Liberty,” written years prior by Elder George E. Fifield, as an article written by Ellen G. White and presented as a revelation from God. The first page article in every issue of the WATCHMAN, a weekly magazine published by the SDA publishing house, at Nashville, Tenn. was given to Mrs. White's writings in 1906, excepting one issue which was devoted to reporting the proceedings of the Southern Union
Conference. In the issue of May 1, the section devoted to the writings of Ellen G. White was used to perpetrate this deception. (Courtesy Robert K. Sanders, www.truthorfables.com)

See http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1906 (JUNE) - In a communication dated June 3, 1906, Ellen White is “shown” that God has apparently changed His mind about whether she should try to answer all the questions raised by the Battle Creek physicians. Now, Ellen says God does not want her to answer these questions. Her “testimony,” quoted in A.T. Jones letter of 1909, is as follows:

Sabbath night, a week ago, after I had been prayerfully studying over these things, I had a vision, in which I was speaking before a large company, where many questions were asked concerning my work and writings.

I was directed by a messenger from Heaven not to take the burden of picking up and answering all the saying and doubts that are being put into many minds.

1907 – Dr. Charles E. Stewart of the Battle Creek Sanitarium publishes an 89-page pamphlet which places Ellen White’s plagiarisms of Conybeare and Howson’s book, Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul, side-by-side with the sections she copied into her book, Sketches from the Life of Paul. This pamphlet was prepared in response to Mrs. White’s request in 1905 to those who had puzzling questions about things in her writings to submit them to her for answers. Dr. Stewart’s booklet points out an extensive variety of evidence that would prove that she was not inspired by God. Ellen White never bothered to reply to Dr. Stewart’s charges. You can read his entire booklet, A Response to an Urgent Testimony from Mrs. E. G. White, at Robert K. Sander’s web-site, Truth or Fables at this Web address:

http://www.truthorfables.com/A_Response_to_Urgent_Testimony.htm#AResponse

Note that as of the writing of this book, the Ellen White propaganda web-site, www.ellenwhite.info, tries to defend her plagiarism by arguing that the Conybeare and Howson book was in the public domain and that copyright laws were different in her day. This propaganda outlet fails to disclose that the real problem with Ellen White in this instance is that she claimed to have gotten this information from God in vision, making her a liar and committing a White-collar type of blasphemy.

1907 – Adventist leaders fight dirty in regard to Dr. J. H. Kellogg. He has too much power, and the Whites want to consolidate their power at the General Conference. The Church decides Kellogg must go. Two General Conference officials, Elder George W. Amadon and Elder A. C. Bourdeau, visit Dr. J. H. Kellogg in his home on October 7th. He is disfellowshipped without being given the opportunity to defend himself in a church board meeting, as is the customary practice when a Seventh-day Adventist member contests his charges and wishes to remain in the Church. He denies being a Pantheist and explains to them how Ellen White herself had earlier read his transcript for The Living Temple and had no criticism for it. He confronts the leaders with the fact that he did not build any buildings in Chicago— a fact by this time— and questions how God could have shown Ellen something that was not true.

http://www.truthorfables.com/Statement_by_MG_Kellogg.htm

1908 – Astronomer Malotte at the Greenwich Observatory discovers the 8th moon of Jupiter, again proving Ellen’s 1846 astronomy vision to be either a product of her imagination or a diabolical spirit guide. (See 1914.)

1909 – A.T. Jones, a partner to Elder E.J. Waggoner in the 1888 “Righteousness by Faith” movement that was squelched by the Church, finds out that Ellen White had offered in March of 1906 to answer any questions people might have about things she has written. He writes Ellen that by now he has heard about the second “testimony” she was “shown” that she was not to answer the questions that her first “testimony” had told her to answer. He confronts her with the fact that Dr. Sadler and Dr. David Paulson had written to her on June 3rd, 1906 and she had not answered their questions. Furthermore, he tells her that it is impossible for her to answer their questions because there are no answers:

For if the writings were really the word of God -

a. They need no explanation.

b. If the writings to be explained were not the word of God, then I would not want any explanation of them; for I would not care anymore for them than for any other writings that were not the word of God.
Further I knew that the things that could be written, you simply could not explain; and that any explanation would be worse than no explanation. And the event has fully justified this view. (Cited in the letter Jones to White, April 26, 1909)

1909 – A.F. Ballenger publishes his classic Cast out for the Cross of Christ, which represents a very complete debunking of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment. He wrote this book after he moved to California to recover from the financial ruin that his termination from denomination employment caused and to promote the truth that he has learned about the Gospel. The book includes a presentation of the letter he wrote to Ellen White explaining, point by point, her errors placed side-by-side with the Bible statements that show that what she teaches conflicts with Scripture. (See Dirk Anderson, “On Trial for Heresy— the A. F. Ballenger Story,” at: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com

1909 – At the last General Conference Mrs. White attended, a certain minister was asked to read one of her unpublished testimonies. As he read it, he recognized that it was his own production. Since he had been taught all his life that Ellen received her testimonies from God, his faith in her was shaken. (See Canright, Life of Mrs. E. G. White.) Edward S. Ballenger, a former Adventist who published the anti-SDA/EGW paper, The Gathering Call, tells the story in the January-February 1938 issue, pp.16-23:

At the general conference of 1909, held at Washington, DC., the last conference Mrs. White attended, Elder W. A. Colcord was handed a batch of Testimonies supposedly from Mrs. White, to read at a special session of the Religious Liberty Association. In reading it over, previous to the session, he discovered an article that was quite familiar to him, and behold, the whole article was a product of his own pen, which he had sent to Mrs. White two or three years before, yet it was assigned to him to read as a revelation from God. We would be pleased to have Elder W. A. Spicer offer a satisfactory explanation of this kind of plagiarism."

See: http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1911 – The Church spends $3,000 to revise Ellen White’s book, The Great Controversy, due to anger over the fact that she had plagiarized extensively. The revisions were demanded by Church leaders because she had copied from so many sources without giving credit to the original authors while she, in general, claimed that her work was directly inspired by God. Dr. Stewart had done extensive research on Ellen’s plagiarism for his 1907 booklet, which placed her plagiarisms alongside the original sources she had not credited. Until Walter Rea discovered extensive plagiarism in the writings of Ellen White in the early 1980’s, Seventh-day Adventist leaders denied any knowledge of significant or extensive plagiarism by her as late as 1979. This deception is incredible in view of the fact that it was an official Church action, taken under extreme public pressure, to correct her blatant copying in the single most important book to Adventism, The Great Controversy. (See Canright, Life of Mrs. E.G. White.)

1912 – The Church publishes J.N. Andrews' book, Advent History of the Sabbath— a book that proves that Adventist leaders now have an exhaustive understanding of the breadth and depth of Early Church writings and understand that Sunday observance was characteristic of Christianity by around 100 AD. Andrews, in a much earlier, 1873 work, Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and the First Day, proved that the Church was well-aware of this fact. Actually Andrews knew by 1859 that Sunday observance was widespread by 100 AD. as evidenced by the content of his 1859 book, The History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week. (See also 1859.) However, Andrews' 1912 book provides a much more extensive and more scholarly approach to the Church's defense of this difficult problem. D.M. Canright quotes the 1912 edition of Andrews' book in his own 1915 book, The Lord's Day From neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism On This Subject:

The “Advent History of the Sabbath,” edition of 1912, is compelled to admit that Sunday observance was in the Christian Church at the beginning of the second century. The author says: “The results of our investigation concerning the origin of Sunday [is] that it was not introduced into the Christian Church until the beginning of the second century” (page 450).

In this same book, his research on the interpretation of a key section of Chapter 14 of the Didache is thorough and balanced. He seems to present all the facts. However, his general approach to the Didache and other such sources is to seek to demonstrate that they are invalid because they are forgeries or contain non-canonical ideas. See Appendix II for an evaluation of Andrews' work on the Didache.

1914 – D.M. Canright publishes his last revision of Seventh-day Adventism Renounced. Adventist leaders are confronted with virtually all the fundamental, fatal-to-Sabbatarian arguments that the new anti-Sabbatarian movement of today uses with the exception of the facts of Hebrew linguistics in regard to the Creation Story and the discovery in more recent years of even stronger evidence that Chapter 14 of Didache was written as early as 50 AD. Canright disproves the theory that sun worship had any possible influence on the very early adoption of Sunday observance by Christians to the
point of over-kill, and reminds his Adventist “brethren” of what they have known since 1873, when J.N. Andrews published his book on the history of the Sabbath— that Sunday observance was characteristic of Christianity by the beginning of the Second Century (100 AD.).

1914 – Astronomer Nicholson at Lick Observatory discovers the 9th moon of Jupiter. By this time there is no excuse for Adventist leaders not to repudiate the prophetic claims of Ellen White. The biblical requirement for a true prophet is to be right 100% of the time in matters for which it is claimed God is responsible for communicating. This is a major disgrace! Her false claims would appear to “embarrass” God terribly, making Him look like He couldn’t keep track of His own moons. This is why Ellen White’s false claim that her visions came from God represents “White Collar” blasphemy.

1915 – D.M. Canright publishes The Lord’s Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism on This subject. This book utilizes a wide variety of scholarly sources that not only prove that the Roman Catholic Church could not have possibly had anything to do with the early adoption of Sunday observance by Christians, but also that the idea that sun worship had any such influence is preposterous. With evidence this powerful, it is no wonder that much later, in 1977, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi essentially confirmed that Canright was right, since he conceded that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance by 140 AD., hundreds of years before there was a Catholic Church or a pope, and additionally conceded that he could not prove a link between sun worship in the Roman Empire and the virtually immediate abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by the first Christians. Read this for yourself at: truthorfables.com/The_Lord's_Canright.htm

1916 – On July 16, 1916, Ellen White died deep in debt from over-extending herself to pay for the personal care and editorial staff she retained at her mansion at Elmshaven, California. The Church was forced to borrow money to settle her estate and acquire ownership of her publications. During her life-time she made more than the equivalent of two million dollars in today's dollar value (calculated in 2005) from her ministerial salary, which was paid from tithe funds, and from the royalties she received from the publication of her books. She had advised everyone else to follow the biblical principle of shunning debt, but apparently she felt that since she was writing books for God, she was entitled to be an exception to the rule. No wonder she taught that it was wrong to use the tithe money for anything else but to pay the ministry!

1916 – D.M. Canright publishes The Complete Testimony of the Early Fathers Proving the Universal Observance of Sunday in the first Century. This booklet confronts Adventist leaders of the day with every imaginable proof that Sunday observance was universal by the early part of the second century. He uses biblical evidence, discusses the meaning of various Greek words, and observes scholarly restraint in his claims. For example, he gives 125 AD. as the accepted date for the testimony of the Didache’s documentation of Christians worshiping on the first day of the week, but adds that some authorities even date that part of this collection of the first Christian writings to 80 AD. By the 1980's, scholars, using a variety of analytical approaches, have dated the Didache to as early as 50 AD. and no later than 125 AD.. The Wikipedia article, Didache, indicates that American biblical scholars are willing to date this document to as early as 50 AD. This booklet makes very interesting reading. It can be found at: exadventist.com/Home/Sabbath/tabid/53/Default.aspx

It is in the form of a complete photocopy of the original pamphlet showing both sides of the page. Its contents should have moved Adventist leaders to abandon their apostasy theory of Sabbath abandonment and to cease their reprehensible propaganda campaign.

1916 – Still continuing to cover-up the Shut Door Doctrine lies of Ellen White and the Church, Elder G.I. Butler writes to defend her claim that she had only believed and taught the Shut Door Doctrine for a very short time by quoting the same passage and suppressing the same three words as did his predecessor in that conspiratorial crime– J.N. Loughborough. (See 1905.) See also Canright, The Life of Mrs. E. G. White.

1917 – The editor of the Youth's Instructor, in the midst of all the controversy about Ellen White's plagiarism problems, writes a scathing rebuke of the practice of plagiarism. Here is what E.F. Ballenger said:

It is quite fitting that we should reprint an editorial which appeared in the Youths' Instructor of Dec. 25, 1917:

"Thus it goes. On every hand there are similar evidences of dishonesty. It is just as wrong to appropriate to one's self credit for productions written by another as to steal a horse. One who boldly signs his name to another's article, and allows it to appear in print as his own, is a thief of the darkest hue.

"Taking another's knowledge and parading it as one's own is a despicable thing to do. The student who copies at examination time is dishonest; but plagiarism is a meaner kind of thievery, if there are degrees of dishonesty.
"Why do people do it? It is a crime punishable by law. It is as much of a disgrace, to say nothing of the sin, as to break into a neighbor's house and steal his goods.

"All who profess common decency, much less Christianity, should eschew all forms of dishonesty. Let us be true and pure in all we do, that the Lord may claim us as His own, and that we may not grieve Him again by playing a Judas part in Life."

Editor's Note: Ballenger is not claiming here, so far as we can see, that the editor of the Youth's Instructor openly labeled Ellen White as the person who was guilty of plagiarism. To have done so would likely have cost him his job. However, in the context of years of controversy about Ellen White's plagiarisms and the high cost to the General Conference of having to remedy the plagiarisms in her book, The Great Controversy, it is quite clear that he was targeting her. At the very least this Youth's Instructor article is of keen interest because it shows that contrary to the claims of those who sought to defend Ellen White by saying that plagiarism was not considered wrong in her generation, it was, indeed, considered to be a grievous wrong. It shows that whatever their claims may have been, Ellen White should have known that she was doing wrong when she credited her material to divine revelation from God rather than to the various human authors she copied.---- Kerry Wynne

See: http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Controversy_Plagiarism.htm

1919 – D.M. Canright publishes his book, Life of Mrs. E.G. White Seventh-day Adventist Prophet: Her False Claims Refuted. In this book he thoroughly treats her plagiarism. It is amazing that in the early 1980's, the secretary of the White Estate at that time, Dr. Robert Olson, stated that the charge of significant plagiarism on the part of Ellen White was unfamiliar to him. Canright's book is easy to find with an Internet search engine like Google, Yahoo, or Bing.

1919 – Top Adventist leaders meet secretly for several days at the 1919 Bible Conference to discuss their growing realization that Ellen White was a fraud. They discuss her failed prophecies, historical errors, and her plagiarism, as well as other problems. They discuss whether to tell the truth about her at the time or to cover-up the whole thing. Special concern is expressed as to how to keep the truth about Ellen White from the Church's seminary students. You can access the portion of the transcripts that specifically deal with the fraudulent claims of Ellen White at its posting at Spectrum magazine at: spectrummagazine.org/files/archive/archive06-10/10-1couperus.pdf

You can access the entire set of transcripts the the General Conference Archives at: http://www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=19&SortBy=1&ShowDateOrder=True

The stenographer's transcript of these meetings is ordered by General Conference president, A. G. Daniells, to be locked up in the vault and made inaccessible for 50 years. It will later be discovered in 1974.

1919 – Top Adventist leaders discuss the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 11 at the 1919 Bible Conference, secretly conceding that the little horn of Daniel 7 was a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes. They conclude that this fact is so dangerous to Adventism that knowledge of it should be kept from Seventh-day Adventist students.
CHAPTER EIGHT
THE COVER-UP 1920 THROUGH 1939
Damage Control Is Becoming More Effective

Conservatives are anxious to cover-up the aftermath of the 1919 Bible Conference, so a “political purge” takes place. Ellen White is established as an honorable prophet in the minds of most SDA pastors and rank-and-file members, but the Sanctuary Doctrine continues to be challenged by thinking SDA leaders. Still, SDA damage control techniques keep the problems with the Sanctuary Doctrine/Investigative Judgment issue so quiet that few Adventists ever hear about it. The White Estate manipulates the writings of Ellen White to serve the conservative, non-Gospel agenda of top SDA leaders. Questions about the Sabbath and D.M. Canright still linger, prompting the Church to publish another book to counter his teachings.

1922 – At the 1922 General Conference session, Adventist leaders Holmes and Washburn, having heard about what happened at the 1919 Bible Conference from stories leaked out from some of the participants, work behind the scenes to purge as many of the delegates as possible who were not supportive of Ellen White. Since Ellen White had few supporters at the conference, the purge was a big one. A.G. Daniells loses his position as General Conference president. (See the Wikipedia article, “1919 Bible Conference.”)

1930 – William W. Fletcher, a distinguished SDA leader and Bible professor at Avondale College in Australia, voluntarily resigns from the Church because he cannot accept the traditional SDA teaching of the Sanctuary Doctrine. (See Raymond F. Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1933 - A.G. Daniells reveals to the young LeRoy Froom the existence of thousands of Ellen White documents relating to the Gospel versus legalism debate of 1888, conceding that he had had a part in covering up the fact of the existence of these manuscripts. He tells Froom that these documents paint a completely different picture of Adventist history and explains that the Church has misused her writings, manipulating her writings as they chose to further the legalistic goals of those leaders. He charges the young Froom to set the record straight with the Church after he is gone by releasing those writings. (See 1971.)

1931 – Louis R. Conradi, a key European Division leader, voluntarily separates himself from the Adventist Church and forfeits his ministerial credentials because he could not prove the traditional SDA Sanctuary Doctrine from the Bible. (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”).

1932 – William W. Fletcher publishes his paper, “Reasons for My Faith.” Raymond F. Cottrell, who is conceded by many to be the greatest Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, stated years later that Fletcher’s arguments were superior to those of his opponents. (Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”).

1933 - In Defense of the Faith, by William H. Branson (Review and Herald, 1933, 398 pages), is published. Branson attempts to refute Canright, but his basic arguments are disproved decades later, either by the direct testimony of, or by the inadvertent “hostile witness” of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in 1977. Branson seeks to prove that the Roman Catholic Church really did “change the day,” but Dr. Bacchiocchi later proved that the adoption of Sunday observance was universal centuries before there was a Roman Catholic Church or a pope. J.N. Andrews wrote about the almost immediate adoption of Sunday observance by Christians as early as 1859. Why Branson thought he could write a successful rebuttal of Canright is simply difficult to fathom. Andrews conceded that Sabbath abandonment took place in the Second Century back in writings he published in 1859 and 1873. Canright disproved even the possibility of the sun worship/Roman Catholic Church Sabbath “apostasy” theory to the point of over-kill, and it was the writings of Canright that Branson wrote his book to refute! It helps to understand why he would attempt such an impossible task when we remember that his pay check came from the Church.

Adventist leaders knew even as early as 1933 that Ellen White did wholesale copying from other authors for her *Conflict of the Ages* series and other books. Here is a remarkable quotation from this pamphlet:

Turning to the Bible again, I read: “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets,” Hebrews 1:1; and “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” 2 Peter, 1:21.

I do not know how the S.D.A.’s interpret the above Scriptures; for, Mrs. White, the prophetess of the remnant church, is recognized, as, perhaps, one of the world’s greatest plagiarists. Let anyone compare the “The Great Controversy,” by Mrs. E.G. White, with book entitled “History of the Reformation,” by D’Aubign’er; “The History of Protestantism,” by J.A. Wylie; “History of the Waldenses,” by Wylie; “History of the Sabbath,” by Andrews; and “Sanctuary,” by Smith. Then they will soon see where her inspirations came from. Also, it would be found interesting to compare her first edition of “The Great Controversy” with the last edition, a very marked difference will be found in thought and expression. The criticism was so strong against her plagiarism that she was forced to make the alterations.

“The Patriarchs and Prophets” by Mrs. E.G. White, received some wonderful help from Adam Clarke’s Commentaries as we cannot help but notice when comparing the different paragraphs. It is now becoming a well known fact that “Steps to Christ” was written by Miss Fanny Bolton, without any dictation or assistance whatever from Mrs. White — yet it carries Mrs. White’s name. Is this in keeping with the eighth commandment? Some people think if they keep the fourth, it does not matter so much about the others.

Some of their pastors say that “all the critics of Mrs. White could not put together one chapter of “Desire of Ages” by the same author.” No, perhaps not, and it is very evident that Mrs. White was not able to produce many of them, or, in fact, any of them. “Desire of Ages” was culled from other authors on the “Life of Christ,” special mention may be made of Geikie’s ‘—Life of Christ.’ Again, it is interesting to compare her first edition of “Desire of Ages” with the latter and again notice the changes in thought and expression; and even as late as 1926, “Desire of Ages” was undergoing another revision. I trust that Mrs. White’s critics are more honest than to copy the words of another author’s pen in order to write a chapter of “Desire of Ages.”

We hear so much about her Health Reform Teachings, but they do not mention that the teachings were taken from three other doctors’ books written by Drs. Cole, Jackson, and Thrall. [Editor’s note: For more information, see the book, *Prophetess of Health*, by Ron Numbers]

In 1883 she published “Sketches from the Life of Paul,” and in the preface there was found this statement: “The writer of this book, having received special help from the Spirit of God, is able to throw light upon the teachings of Paul and the application to our own time, as no other authors are prepared to do.” This book was copied so strongly from “Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul,” by Conybeare and Howson, that Conybeare and Howson served notice upon “The Review and Herald Publishing Association,” that, unless the book was taken off the market, they would bring a suit against them for plagiarism. Mr. H.W. Kellogg who was then manager of the Publishing House informed Mrs. White that they would not undertake to publish any more copies of such, unless she would stand for the responsibilities of meeting the threatened suit. Needless to say, no more have been printed and her order for a new edition, which had just been previously booked, was withdrawn. Dr. Stewart published a booklet of eighty-nine pages in which he arranged parallel columns of quotations taken from Mrs. White’s book, “Sketches from the life of Paul,” and the book by Conybeare and Howson just mentioned, and the quotations read like this: Conybeare and Howson’s) “The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps immediately from the Agora.” (Mrs. White’s): “The judges sat in the open air, upon seats hewn out in the rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps from the valley below.”

In the preface, where it is said ............ “having received special help from the Spirit of God” ....... why did they not speak the truth and write ........ “having received special help from Conybeare and Howson”?

As this is only an introduction to some of the things which I have found out, I shall not say more here about this wicked plagiarism which is put down as the “Precious rays of light shining from the throne of God.” And I would never dare say or intimate that God was a plagiarist, would you?

This quote is astonishing in view of Dr. Robert Olson’s denial of any knowledge of charges of serious plagiarism on the part of Ellen White as late as 1979. Walter Rea only discovered by 1982 what Vowless knew in 1933 and Canright knew in 1889. Since Canright represented the single greatest enemy of Adventism, and since the Church had published so
much material to attempt to refute his arguments, it strains the imagination to think that Dr. Olson knew nothing about
Ellen White’s problem with plagiarism.

Association, revealing inexcusable lying and deceit on the part of the author. If the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes had
not been discovered in 1974, we could look back at the life and ministry of Wilcox and say he was an honest soul who
was simply deceived by the claims of Ellen White. However, Wilcox was one of most outspoken critics of Ellen White in
that secret meeting. Here is what he said in those Minutes:

I would like to ask, Brother Daniells, if it could be accepted as a sort of rule that Sister White might be mistaken in
details, but in the general policy and instruction she was an authority. . . It seems to me I would have to accept what
she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing. Either the Lord has
spoken through her or he has not spoken through her; and if it is a matter of deciding in my own judgment
whether he has or has not, then I regard her books the same as every other book published. I think it is one
thing for a man to stultify his conscience, and it is another thing to stultify his judgment. It is one thing for me to lay
aside my conscience, and it is another thing for me to change my judgment over some view that I hold.

In his book on Ellen White, Wilcox stultifies his own conscience, presents himself as a staunch believer in her prophetic
gift, and makes outrageous claims for her, like this one:

Are the writings of Mrs. White verbally inspired? Was she given the exact words in which her thoughts are
expressed? She never made any such claim. Indeed, she states very positively that such was not the case. Nor did the
pioneers in this movement ever teach verbal inspiration for the writings of the messenger of the Lord.

It is amazing how much Wilcox “forgot” during the 14 years since the 1919 Bible Conference. He lies through his teeth,
and this fact is painfully clear. Here are a couple of those statements Ellen White made that Wilcox “forgot:”

1. “When writing these precious books, if I hesitated, the very word I wanted to express the idea was given to me”
   *(Selected Messages, vol. 3, pp. 51, 52).* 1907.

2. “....yet the words I employ in describing what I have seen are my own, unless they be those spoken to me by an
   angel, which I always enclose in marks of quotation” *(Review and Herald, Oct.8,1867,quoted in
   Selected Messages, vol.1, p. 37).*

Apparently Wilcox was willing to sell his soul and stultify his conscience for the sake of Adventism, his position, and his
pay check.

1936 – A.G. Daniells, former General Conference President and one of the most vocal critics of Ellen White’s claim to be
directly inspired in the 1919 Bible Conference, publishes his defense of her inspiration, entitled *The Abiding Gift of
Prophecy*. He seems to have forgotten that he knew Ellen White was a fraud back in 1919. Perhaps he was trying to
redeem himself for the destructive role he played in the Conference. To see what he said about Ellen White in 1919,
access the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes with a Google Search. *(Cited in E. F. Ballenger, *Facts about Seventh-day
Adventists*, posted at ex.sda.com.)*

1938 - In the January 13 issue of the *Review and and Sabbath Herald*, an article based on Elder W.A. Spicer’s lectures
given at the World's Education Conference held at Blue Ridge, NC on August 19th and 20th of 1937 presents his defense of
Ellen G. White's extensive plagiarisms in her book, *The Great Controversy*. Among other excuses for her literary thefts,
Elder Spider said, “The carefulness among later writers in giving credit, did not obtain so essentially a generation or two
ago.” This deception was exposed in the anti SDA / EGW publication, *The Gathering Call*, January-February 1938, pp.16-23, published by Edward S. Ballenger. *(Courtesy Robert K. Sanders, TruthOrFables.Com)*


Ballenger adds:

This is not true. It did obtain. In 1891 T. DeWitt Talmage, in his book FROM MANGER TO THRONE, gives credit
to thirty-three authorities from which he drew his material; and Edersheim, in his LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS
THE MESSIAH, published in 1883, cites no less than 300 authorities. It was always recognized as a sin and a crime
to use other people's thoughts, without credit. Some had tried to excuse Mrs. White's plagiarisms because of her
youth and inexperience; but, when she wrote GREAT CONTROVERSY she was fifty-seven years old. She had
already been writing nearly forty years.
Did Elder Spicer Tell the Truth?

Elder Spicer saw that when Mrs. White's attention was called to the fact that she had not given credit for some material that she used, "She immediately gave instructions to her helpers to go through her books, and mark every sentence or paragraph she had taken from those historians, and insert the proper punctuation for introducing a quotation. ... She saw to it herself that this was done for the next edition of the book." Notice, he says: "She immediately gave instruction." We have the first, the third, and the ninth editions of GREAT CONTROVERSY, and several editions after that which are not numbered; and not one of them gave credit for the facts and thoughts she used from other authors. She published many editions after her attention was called to her plagiarisms before she gave credit. It must have taken her helpers a long time to search out her plagiarized portions. GREAT CONTROVERSY was first published in 1884, and proper credits were not given until the edition of 1911, a period of 27 years. You can put all the confidence you care to on Elder Spicer's "immediately."

1938 – Former SDA Edward S. Ballenger publicly identifies the primary literary sources Ellen G. White plagiarized.

The writers from whom Mrs. W. borrowed freely were as follows:

D'Aubigne, whose History of the Reformation was published between 1835 and 1853. Wylie, whose History of Protestantism was published about 1875 or 1876. Conybeare and Howson, whose Life and Epistles of St. Paul was published in various editions, 1854, 1869, etc.

See Ballenger's article, “Does Elder Spicer Play Fair With Young Educators?, The Gathering Call, January-February 1938, pp.16-23, courtesy Robert K. Sanders of TruthOrFables.Com

http://www.truthorfables.com/Great_Cntroversy_Plagiarism.htm

Contrast the open and wide-spread knowledge and controversy of Ellen White's plagiarism from 1900 to 1940 with Robert Olson's 1979 statement that he had no knowledge of any wide-spread copying on her part. Since the Ellen White plagiarism fiasco was such an important part of Adventist history, how could Olson possibly not have known anything about it? (See 1979.)
CHAPTER NINE
THE COVER-UP: 1940 — 1959
ON THE SURFACE, THINGS LOOK STABLE.
THE “GOLDEN AGE” OF ADVENTISM BEGINS.

The Sanctuary Doctrine continues to be a thorn in the side of Adventism, but most Adventists remain ignorant, as usual, of this problem. While leaders who oppose it are terminated, the Church secretly works very hard to find biblical support for it, but without success. The Golden Age of Adventism ensues. Ellen White and the Sabbath continue to reign virtually unchallenged in the thinking of almost all Adventists. This is a great time for Adventists to feel proud of their Church.

1945 – Harold E. Snide, Bible professor at Southern Junior College (now Southern Adventist University), discovers serious problems with the Church’s Sanctuary Doctrine and goes to the General Conference in Washington, DC to dialogue with Adventist leaders. He withdraws from the Church in 1945. (See Cottrell, “Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1950 – E.F. Ballenger publishes Facts about Seventh-day Adventists. This book outlines the lies and deceptions of SDA leaders from the very beginning of the Advent Movement with a special emphasis on proving that the Whites covered up the fact that they taught the Shut Door Doctrine and did not work to save lost sinners for many years beyond what they claimed. Ballenger’s book provides irrefutable evidence that after SDA leaders discovered the fact that the Whites had deceived the Church in regard to the cover-up, joined the Whites as active participants in the deception. In her suppressed very early writings, Ellen White claimed to have received the principles of the Shut Door Doctrine in vision from God. Like a number of other anti-EGW writers over the years, Ballenger discusses and documents the extensive plagiarism of Ellen White, complete with comparison studies. This book, or booklet, had to have been known to SDA leaders in the 1950’s, since Ballenger published it as part of his anti-SDA, anti-EGW circulated publication, The Gathering Call, which he published for over 28 years. The information in this book was obtained through an extensive career in Adventist leadership which spanned decades before he discovered the deceptions of the Whites and the Church. That Adventist leaders were again confronted with the facts about the cover-up of the Shut Door teachings of the Whites in 1950’s makes the White Estate’s continued denials after the 1950’s appear to be down-right “criminal.” You can access Ballenger’s Facts about Seventh-day Adventists at www.ex-sda.com. How is it possible that Dr. Robert Olson, as Secretary of the White Estate later on, had no knowledge of the existence of this book by E. F. Ballenger?

1951 – The Church publishes Frank D. Nichol’s book, Ellen G. White and Her Critics. This book represents the largest single collection of desperate attempts to explain away the failed prophecies of Ellen White and crazy things she said. Here is a classic example of Nichol’s gift for explaining away the obvious:

From Chapter 24 of Ellen G. White and Her Critics (F.D. Nichol, 1951):

Mrs. White wrote: “When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion.”—Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 259.

“England did not declare war.” “Her prophecy was a complete failure.”

Again we need the context in order to see what Mrs. White is setting forth:

England is studying whether it is best to take advantage of the present weak condition of our nation, and venture to make war upon her. She is weighing the matter, and trying to sound other nations. She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home, and that other nations would take advantage of her weakness. Other nations are making quiet yet active preparations for war, and are hoping that England will make war with our nation, for then they would improve the opportunity to be revenged on her for the advantage she has taken of them in the past, and the injustice done them. A portion of the Queen’s subjects are waiting a favorable
opportunity to break their yoke; but if England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate a moment to improve her opportunities to exercise her power, and humble our nation. When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion.”—Ibid., p. 259.

Note the conditional character of these statements: “She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home.” “But if England thinks it will pay.” Then follows the sentence: “When England does declare war….” It is evident that Mrs. White is here using the word “when” as a synonym for “if,” which is good English. In fact, if we do not thus understand the word “when” in this connection, we have an unusual situation—a series of problematical “ifs” is followed by a simple statement that England is going to declare war. Thus Mrs. White's last sentence would make pointless her preceding sentences.

A similar use of the word “when” is found on the preceding page in her work: “When our nation observes the fast which God has chosen, then will he accept their prayers as far as the war is concerned.” No one, least of all the critic, will argue that the word “when” in this connection introduces a simple statement concerning a future fact that will undebatably happen.

1955 – Raymond F. Cottrell and a special committee attempt to prepare a chapter on the Sanctuary Doctrine for the new S.D.A. Bible Commentary. The committee finds no biblical support for the doctrine and is in a quandary about how to approach the task the General Conference has given them to explain what Adventists believe with support from the Bible. (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1958 – The General Conference assigns Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell the task of revising the chapter on the Investigative Judgment (Sanctuary Doctrine) for the classic SDA book, Bible Readings. Here is Dr. Cottrell's explanation of what happened:

“In 1958 the Review and Herald Publishing Association needed new printing plates for the classic book, Bible Readings, and it was decided to revise it where necessary to agree with the Commentary. Coming again to the Book of Daniel I determined to try once more to find a way to be absolutely faithful to both Daniel and the traditional Adventist interpretation of 8:14, but again found it impossible. I then formulated six questions regarding the Hebrew text of the passage and its context, which I submitted to every college teacher versed in Hebrew and every head of the religion department in all of our North American colleges—all personal friends of mine. Without exception they replied that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14.” (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)

1959 – On May 5, 1959 a special issue of the Review & Herald showcases a beautiful painting and article designed to cover-up the fact that Ellen White taught the Shut Door Doctrine during her earliest years as a prophetess after claiming she had received such instruction in a vision from God; and that while she believed and taught this unfortunate doctrine, the Advent believers made no effort to seek and save lost souls. Ellen White taught until much later than she or the Church would like to admit, that the door of probation had closed for everyone except for their small band of Adventist believers. Deceptively, the Review & Herald painting shows Ellen White looking upward at a globe of light hovering over the Eastern U.S. and then shooting around the entire world. The article/painting falsely represents this November 1848 vision as containing instruction from God on how to reach the world with the Advent message through the publishing work. On page 39 they have recorded an explanation of this painting. Here is an extended quotation from E. S. Ballenger, Facts About Seventh-day Adventists (1950), posted at www.ex-sda.com:

Harry Anderson has sought, in this beautiful painting, to capture a scene in the early history of the Advent Movement. Mrs. E.G. White thus describes the scene she saw in her vision of the beginnings of the publishing work:

“At a meeting held in Dorchester, Mass., November, 1848, I had been given a view of the proclamation of the sealing message, and of the duty of the brethren to publish the light that was shining upon our pathway.”

“After coming out of vision, I said to my husband: ‘I have a message for you. You must begin to print a small paper and send it out to the people. Let it be small at first; but as the people read, they will send you means with which to print, and it will be a success from the first. From this small beginning it was shown to be like streams of light that went clear round the world.’ ” — Life Sketches of Ellen G. White, p. 125.

It was in July, 1849, that James White responded to this vision by starting the publication of Present Truth, which was shortly renamed Review and Herald. From this small beginning has indeed grown a world work, as Mrs. White forecast in vision.
In the background of this picture are shown James White and Joseph Bates taking notes.

We wrote to the Review & Herald Publishing House asking permission to reproduce this painting. They refused to grant our request.

THE EDITOR GUILTY

The most important portion of this description of the cover is found also on page 5 from the pen of the editor. In addition to quoting that portion referring to light going around the world, the editor also says: “James White believed that he had present truth to present to the world.” This statement is represented as being taken from one of Mrs. White's earliest visions which was given her at Dorchester, Mass., Nov. 1848. The vision from which this was taken has never appeared complete in any of Mrs. White's publications. We have a complete copy of this vision which we expect to reproduce in the next issue of the Gathering Call. The length of it prevents our using it in this issue. That portion which relates to seeing the lights going around the world is not in the Dorchester vision.

Joseph Bates wrote this vision while Mrs. White spoke it; and there is no reference whatsoever to light streaming clear around the world. It is a disgrace to any people to publish such illustrations or such statements in regard to the Dorchester vision.

MRS. WHITE WAS 58 YEARS OLD WHEN SHE FIRST SAW LIGHTS GOING AROUND THE WORLD

The first time that Mrs. White gave utterance to seeing lights encircling the globe was when she was visiting Europe, in 1885 or 1886. It was first published in the RH July 26, 1887. If Mrs. White saw this in 1848, why was it not published until 1887, nearly 40 years later? In proof of this we reproduce her first publication of her seeing lights going clear around the world. It is found on page 379 of the old edition of Gospel Workers, published in 1892.

In my very girlhood the Lord saw fit to open before me the glories of heaven. I was in vision taken to heaven, and the angel said to me, “Look!” I looked to the world as it was in dense darkness. The agony that came over me was indescribable as I saw this darkness. Again the word came, “Look ye!” And again I looked intensely over the world, and I began to see jets of light like stars dotted all through this darkness; and then I saw another and another added light, and so all through this moral darkness the star like lights were increasing.

In this Dorchester vision Mrs. White saw that they should begin printing the message but she had no idea of printing the message for the world, for in that vision she stated that they had received the “shut door,” which meant that they believed probation had closed.

Another illustration is presented in this Special on page 7. It represents James White and his wife together with other workers bowing around a stack of their first paper, the Present Truth, and asking God's blessing to go with it as they mailed it out to their friends. Present Truth was an 8-page paper which was edited by James White from July 1849 to November, 1850. The eleven issues were bound together and had a wide circulation in the early days. Mrs. White states that they bowed around very issue of this paper and asked God's blessing upon it. There was hardly a number of this paper that did not contain arguments trying to prove that probation had closed in 1844. One number is largely given to the shut door.

Mrs. White's Topsham vision given on Sabbath, March 24, 1849, contains the positive evidence that she believed and taught the “shut door.” Those who have copies of this Present Truth will find the portion relating to the shut door at the bottom of col. 1, page 22. It is this portion of the Topsham vision that is omitted from all of Mrs. White's subsequent reproductions. James White, Mrs. White, Joseph Bates, Hiram Edson and others of the pioneers wrote for the Present Truth condemning the 1st-day Adventists and other churches for trying to save sinners, because God had rejected all of the world excepting the Advent believers.

MRS. WHITE ASKING GOD'S BLESSING ON THE SHUT DOOR

The inconsistency of these pioneers including James White and his wife bowing down and asking God's blessing to attend the contents of this document which was saturated with the teachings of the “shut door,” and then a century later, trying to make all people believe that Mrs. White was shown in vision that they were called to publish and send the message clear around the world, is a shame to any people.

Quoted in E. S. Ballenger, Facts About Seventh-day Adventists (1950), posted at www.ex-sda.com
CHAPTER TEN

COVER-UP DURING THE 1960'S AND 1970'S

The Golden Age Continues Through the 1960's.

The Golden Age of Adventism continues. Canright seems forgotten. The Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Sanctuary Doctrine appear to be beyond question. However, Adventist leaders still know there is a serious problem with the Sanctuary Doctrine. The best minds in the Church are secretly trying to find biblical support for this teaching. Adventism flourishes, membership increases dramatically, and Adventist education expands. Prophetic seminars utilizing bogus dates from “history” are used to deceive hundreds of thousands of people into thinking the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the true Church of Bible prophecy for the last days and that all other churches are Babylon. Adventists do not question Colossians 2:14-17, and if they ever do, they are told that the Sabbath referred to in this passage is merely a reference to the monthly and annual ceremonial Sabbaths. No one seems to notice that the syntax of this passage forces it to target the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. The typical Adventist is ignorant of the fact that the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians was virtually immediate, making it impossible that sun worship or the Roman Catholic Church were responsible for the Christian adoption of Sunday as its day of worship. They have no clue that the Eastern Orthodox Church controlled the Western Church during the earlier centuries when Sunday observance became universal.

1961 – The General Conference president gives Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell the task of solving the Investigative Judgment problem. Cottrell sends a questionnaire out to a large number of Adventist scholars and theologians to poll their opinions. The analysis of Cottrell's survey indicates there is widespread concern that the doctrine cannot be supported from the Bible alone. The General Conference orders the formation of a top secret committee. The committee's task is to meet until it can find the biblical support the Church needs to validate the Sanctuary Doctrine/Investigative Judgment concept. The committee includes an elite group of SDA Bible scholars and theologians. (See Cottrell, "The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?").

1966-1967 (CIRCA) - Kerry Wynne, a student at Pacific Union College, interviews Dr. Robert Olson regarding Wynne's interest in studying the Seventh-day Adventist ministry. Dr. Olson is Chairman of the Religion Department at this time, prior to assuming his duties a few years later as Secretary of the White Estate. Wynne questions Dr. Olson in regard to some doubts he has about Ellen White, including charges that she is a false prophet. Dr. Olson explains that these charges stem mostly from a disgruntled apostate Seventh-day Adventist leader by the name of D.M. Canright, who left the Church because he felt his talents were not adequately appreciated by Ellen and James White. He says that Canright was a bitter man and that his charges against Ellen White were based on the desire to seek revenge. (It has been many years since this interview, and Wynne is only claiming to recall the gist of what Dr. Olson said.) He suggested that to allay his fears he should go to the Pacific Union College Library and check out the book, The Life of Mrs. E.G. White, by D.M. Canright. Wynne follows Dr. Olson's advice, checks out the book, and reads it quickly. Canright's tone seems a bit angry, and Wynne, unable to grasp the full implications of what he was reading, decides that Dr. Olson is right. Wynne concludes that Ellen White is a true prophet of God and continues in this belief until he reads the People Magazine story about the Fox Sisters. (See 1999.) Since Canright made a big deal about Ellen White’s plagiarism in the book that Dr. Olson recommended, this brief interview nearly proves that Dr. Olson knew of her plagiarism when he denied any knowledge of such charges just prior to the exposure of her extensive plagiarism by Walter Rea. (See 1979.)

1968 – The secret Sanctuary Doctrine committee disbands without reaching any conclusion. The committee studied 48 papers by competent SDA Bible scholars and theologians in vain. The total failure of the committee to find support for the doctrine is kept secret. The existence of this secret committee will not be known until Dr. Cottrell retires from the Church and can write and speak what he wants without fear of losing his employment with the Church. (See Cottrell, "The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?").

Adventism Self-Destructs in the 1970's.

The wrecking of Adventism begins. One block-buster revelation after another of the perfidy of Adventist leaders and their deceptions burst upon the scene. Damage control becomes extremely difficult. Adventist leaders are seen to have manipulated Ellen White’s writings to serve their own agenda. The foundation for the belief in the
Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Investigative Judgment is destroyed. Adventism begins the process of dividing into several “camps” of interpreting the Adventist faith. It appears that the more Adventist leaders know about the impossibilities of the Church’s key doctrines, the more financial corruption there is. Church leaders are busy in illegal conflict of interest speculation with Church and personal funds, which culminates in the disaster of the unmasking of the Davenport Scandal at the end of the decade. Similar things are happening in The Worldwide Church of God and apparently for exactly the same reasons. The WWCG events are shown in green type.

1971 – The Church publishes the epic, Movement of Destiny, by LeRoy Froom. He concedes that a massive cover-up of Ellen White’s writings related to the Gospel versus the legalism crisis of 1888 had been deliberately suppressed by the Church. This confession, made under pressure from some elements from within the Church who had heard of the existence of these writings, is astonishing. However, Froom is far from honest with his readers. He still maintains that the documents in question no longer exist when he knows they are locked away safely in the vault. (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, article “White Estate.”) According to insider Norris, Froom conspired with Arthur White to cover up what Ellen White actually said about Gospel related topics and the Investigative Judgment. In fact, as Froom lay dying he called his son to his side and ordered him to burn boxes of his research that he had utilized in the writing of Movement of Destiny. Norris says, “Scholars have long known that this large book, which claims to be the official story of 1888, is fiction.”

1972 - By 1972 it is apparent to WWCG leaders and followers that the European Union prophecies of Herbert W. Armstrong, the Church’s prophet and founder, cannot possibly come true for at least another 20 years. The Church’s leaders and followers become suspicious that Armstrong is not a prophet like he claims to be. (Wikipedia article, “Grace Communion International”) Note another interesting parallel between Adventism and Armstrongism. Absolute proof that their respective prophets were frauds surfaced about the same time—only two years apart. Also observe, as we have already pointed out, this revelation of their respective deceptions appears to have created the environment of hypocrisy on the part of church leadership that led to an explosion of financial and moral corruption within less than 10 years.

1972 – Time Magazine reports (May 15th edition) that The Worldwide Church Of God’s Herbert W. Armstrong said that Garner Ted [his son] was “in the bonds of Satan,” but observes that the elder Armstrong did not elaborate on the subject. Time speculates, however that Herbert was forced to come to grips publicly with Garner Ted’s alleged continuing problems with gambling and adultery, including his sexual escapades with Ambassador College coeds. Garner Ted Armstrong was soon relieved of his star role within the church. (Wikipedia article, “Grace Communion International”)

1974 – (Some authorities say 1975) - Dr. Stephen F. Yost receives special permission to do research in the vault at the General Conference in Washington, DC. In the very back of the vault he finds a brown package hidden under a pile of dust. He opens it up and finds the stenographer’s transcript of a secret meeting of top SDA leaders at the 1919 Bible Conference. He removes the package from the vault. In reading it he discovers that almost without exception, each key Adventist leader expresses his or her conviction that Ellen White is essentially a fraud. This amazing document will be published 5 years later (1979) in Spectrum, Volume 10, No. 1. (Spectrum is a liberal Seventh-day Adventist related independent publication that is barely tolerated by the Church.) These leaders discuss whether the Church should tell the truth about her or continue the cover-up including the pros and cons of either choice. If a cover-up plan is to be implemented, they wrestle with the problem of how they would keep the truth about her from their seminary students.

1974 – Andrews University history professor Donald R. McAdams publishes Ellen White and the Protestant Historians. His work exposes Ellen White’s extensive plagiarism of a host of Protestant writers and historians. He wrote his book, he said, because his students complain that her account of history often differs with that of accepted historical sources. In March he sends a letter to Arthur White, then director of the White Estate, detailing his findings. McAdams’ findings are disturbing:

What we find when we examine the historical portions of the Great Controversy (those events from the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. through the French Revolution) is that entire chapters at the time are simply selective abridgments of protestant historians. … In the samples I have examined there is not one historical fact in her text that is not in their text. [pp. 16, 17]

1974 – Andrews University history professor Donald R. McAdams also finds extensive evidence that Ellen White got her concept, most of her material, and her theology for her book, The Great Controversy, from a book written much earlier by an early First Day Advent writer by the name of H.L. Hastings, entitled The Great Controversy Between God and Man—Its Origin Progress and End. He notes that even her chapter titles have similar names and an almost identical order. (Cited in Douglas Hackleman’s, “Ellen White’s Habit,” referencing McAdams, Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians, 1974.)
1975 – The events prophesied to take place in Herbert W. Armstrong's book, 1975 in Prophecy, do not come to pass as foretold. Both the leaders and the membership of The Worldwide Church of God suffer severe disillusionment as perceptive individuals learn that their prophet is a fraud. (Wikipedia article, “Grace Communion International”) This event probably fostered the hypocrisy of the WWCG's leaders, which may have created conditions suitable for the growth of the corruption that broke lose in 1979.

1976 – Dr. Ronald Numbers, then a professor at the Church's medical school, Loma Linda University, publishes his blockbuster book, Prophetess of Health. He outlines conclusive evidence that proves Ellen White got her ideas about health reform from other authors who wrote about health issues and who preceded her by as much as 20 years—in particular a certain Dr. Jackson. He demonstrates that the larger problem is that she lied when she claimed that she had received this information in visions from God. The Church has no answer for his charges because the evidence is compelling.

1977 – Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi publishes his iconoclastic scholarly defense of the Sabbath, From Sabbath to Sunday. He concedes that Christians had universally adopted Sunday observance by 140 AD., proving that Ellen White lied when she claimed that God had showed her in vision that the Roman Catholic Church and the pope had “changed the day.” He concedes that the Sabbath mentioned by St. Paul in Colossians 2:14-17 is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue, flatly contradicting traditional SDA teaching on this point. The ramifications of these astonishing concessions to the anti-Sabbatarians are profound: (1) It contradicted Ellen White's claim that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross. (2) It required the necessity for Bacchiocchi to teach that the Sabbath and the other Jewish ordinances listed by Paul were not the "shadows" which Paul referred to but instead were the extra rules and regulations of the Judaizers, created by them to make the observance of this set of Jewish ordinances more rigorous. (3) Concept #2 forced Bacchiocchi to develop the theory that Paul validated all the ordinances in Paul's list of Jewish ordinances for continuance into the Christian era, rather than indicating that they were to be discarded as mere “shadows.” Concepts #2 and #3 combined forced Bacchiocchi into the unenviable position to conclude that Christians must keep the Jewish dietary laws and annual and monthly sabbath feast days if they are going to believe that Colossians 2:14-17 does not abrogate the Jewish Sabbath. This book launches the current anti-Sabbatarian movement by its colossal failure to defend the Sabbath in a believable way.

1978-1979 – Researcher Tom Norris discovers the suppressed writings of Ellen White related to the 1888 debate between the Gospel and legalism in the vaults of the newly formed General Conference Archives. These documents prove that Ellen White's son, Arthur White, had been hiding thousands of documents about this 1888 debate over righteousness by faith that tell a very different story about Ellen White from what Froom and the White Estate had been teaching about her. Furthermore, the discovery uncovers some of the actual documents from this 1888 debate that the White Estate and the Review claimed no longer existed. Here is what Norris says:

More than that, there were thousands of rare Ellen White documents from the 1888 period that were discovered hidden in the White Estate. Here was a large and stunning collection of 1888 materials that had been deliberately hidden from the church all these years. No wonder Arthur White tried to keep the White Estate off limits to any researchers or scholars. He, and Froom, and others, had been perpetrating a massive fraud on the Adventist Community. Although this historic discovery took place in 1978-79, just before Glacier View, the leaders were in no mood to admit that such a major scandal was taking place. Besides, the conservatives were in control and such a discovery would destroy their agenda to eliminate the evangelicals and promote their legalistic version of Ellen White's theology that they had so badly misunderstood.” (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, White Estate.)

1978 – Ingemar Linden publishes The Last Trump. A former Seminary Bible and homiletics teacher, his book proves Ellen White had taught the Shut Door Doctrine much later than she admitted, contrary to the denials of the Church, and supported his claim by quoting from previously unreleased portions of a letter Ellen White had written to Joseph Bates on July 13, 1847. This upset Arthur White, who was director of the White Estate at the time. Notice that SDA leaders continued to deny that Ellen White taught the Shut Door Doctrine long after Linden proved she had taught it. (See Douglas Hackleman, "Ellen White’s Habit.")

1978 – The Worldwide Church Of God disfellowships Garner Ted Armstrong, the son of Herbert W. Armstrong, a final time because of his adulterous behavior, including allegations that he frequently had sex with co-ed's at the Church's Ambassador College, and as the result of his rivalrous contentions with his father's favorite younger leader, Stanley Rader.

1979 (JANUARY) – Dr. Robert Olson, then Secretary of the White Estate, states there is nothing to the rumors that Ellen White borrowed extensively from other authors. He lies. Dr. Olson has had access to the 1919 Bible Conference
Minutes since they were discovered in 1974 or 1975. In the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes, the delegates discuss the length and breadth of Ellen White's plagiarism, including her wholesale copying of a book by two English authors and relabeling it Sketches from the Life of Paul. The delegates mention how she lifted virtually the entire book from these authors yet claimed that God had given her the information in vision. Walter Rea documents the presentation during which Dr. Olson made this deceitful statement in his book, The White Lie. Keep in mind that the 1919 Bible Conference minutes had been available to Dr. Olson since 1974 or 1975 and it would have been the single most important document he had ever seen since it proved these early SDA leaders knew Ellen White was a fraud:

At an afternoon presentation by Olson in January 1979 at Loma Linda University in California, someone in the audience asked about Mrs. White's borrowing from published sources. Olson's reply was to the effect that there was nothing to it, that all of her writings were her own. He then volunteered that there was some minister in Southern California making waves with allegations about borrowed material for her key book, The Desire of Ages, but that there was nothing to these rumors.

To say that I was in a state of shock after the meeting is to put it mildly. My file at that very time already held several letters from that same Olson encouraging me to keep sending him my comparisons of Ellen with her contemporaries. Furthermore, he had personally talked with me when he was in California only a short time before and had sought my promise that I would not publish any report on my work until he and the White Estate staff had been given additional time to survey the material.

I had agreed to his request, and the fact of the agreement had been recorded in the in-house memo that he wrote afterward and that I held in my files. (The White Lie, Introduction)

1979 (APRIL) – The Worldwide Church Of God's corruption problems break loose as Mike Wallace of the CBS program 60 Minutes interviews the Church's legal and financial adviser, Stanley Rader, before a national audience. Wallace presents documentary evidence of lavish secret expenditures, conflict of interest insider deals, posh homes and lifestyles of Church officials, and the heavy involvement of Stanley Rader himself in financial manipulation. Rader abruptly terminates the interview. This interview was aired April 15, 1979. Garner Ted Armstrong had blamed Stanley Rader for his two-time ousting from his father's church. Garner Ted and other former and discontented members of the Worldwide Church of God prompted the State of California to investigate charges of malfeasance by Rader and others who were connected with WWCG’s Ambassador International Cultural Foundation (AICF) which had been founded in 1975 as a tax-exempt world-wide charitable organization. In this year California Attorney General George Deukmejian brought civil charges against the Church, and the Church was placed into an investigative financial receivership for one year. Note these interesting facts: (1) As we have reviewed, this financial corruption broke out about the same time and apparently for many of the same reasons that caused financial corruption to break out in the Seventh-day Adventist Church at this time, including the increasing hypocrisy that developed as the top leaders in both churches came to realize that their respective prophets were frauds. (2) Both churches started tax-exempt, world-wide charities that got into serious legal trouble. The problems with the Adventist Development and Relief Agency in later years were virtually identical. A tax-free charitable organization appears to give religious organizations a blank check to take government money and other funds and cause the money to disappear without doing anything to help the people for whom it is intended. It makes for a lot of good-paying jobs and expense accounts.

1979 (MAY) – Spectrum Magazine publishes the 1919 Bible Conference Minutes in its May issue. This event provided absolute proof that Adventist leaders had known for certain that Ellen White was a fraud for a very long time. The Church admits nothing and continues to present her as a true prophet.


The point of this entry is to demonstrate that after 1979 there is absolutely no excuse for the SDA Church to continue to promote Ellen White as a true prophetess, to continue to deny that she was guilty of plagiarism on a massive scale, and to evade the issue that whether she plagiarized or not, the lied about the sources of her material. Your authors do not have access to this document, nor do they know, at this point, whether Dr. Olson had access to the Minutes between its theft from the vault in 1974 and its subsequent publication by Spectrum in May of 1979.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE IMPOSSIBILITIES OF THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL SDA DOCTRINES GET AIRED

The factual basis for the three key doctrines of Adventism is destroyed. Bacchiocchi's “New Sabbatarianism” blasts any hope of ever returning the Sabbath doctrine to respectability. The Church is unable to defend the Sanctuary Doctrine and General Conference President, Neal C. Wilson, lies about what happened at Glacier View. The Church is forced to acknowledge that Ellen White lied about her prophetic gifts and borrowed about everything she ever wrote, setting the stage for the astonishing public acknowledgment of this fact in 1990. The attention drawn to the impossibilities of the Sabbath motivates thinking Adventist theologians to take a closer look at the prophetic dates used to prove that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the remnant church of Bible prophecy. The discovery is made that Adventist leaders should have known that most of these dates were unsubstantiated as prophetic indicators. Adventism is in shambles by the end of the 1980's, but the majority of Adventist believers are still not aware of the existence of these fatal-to-Adventism developments.

1980 – Skip Baker, then General Conference Photographer, convinces vault officials to grant him access to the 1847 letter Ellen White wrote to Joseph Bates. Baker is shocked by its release to him. He makes numerous photographs of the letter. He notes the letter clearly proves that Ellen White believed in and taught the Shut Door Doctrine as late as 1847—a fact that Adventist leaders had vehemently denied for well over 100 years. He discovers that much of the letter had been intentionally mutilated to keep the contents beyond page 3 from being legible. However, there is enough damaging evidence on the first page to prove that she taught the Shut Door at the time. To see a photograph of this letter, access it at: www.truthorfables.com/EGW_to_J.Bates_1847.htm

1980 – Dr. Desmond Ford, guest professor of religion at Pacific Union College and on loan at the time from Avondale College in Australia, is put on trial at Glacier View Ranch near Denver, Colorado, for his views on the Sanctuary Doctrine. He had disclosed in a forum lecture at Pacific Union College that he cannot find biblical support for this doctrine and that its teachings appear to be fundamentally anti-Gospel. About 40 top SDA theologians and biblical scholars are present at the trial. They vote unanimously in favor of six of his eight points. Ford is defrocked and forced to earn a living outside of Church employment. Neal C. Wilson, then General Conference president, flies back to General Conference headquarters in Washington, DC and announces that the Glacier View Committee unanimously agreed that Dr. Ford's views are wrong and that he should be defrocked. (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”).

1980 – News that an Adventist pastor, Dr. Walter Rea, had found evidence of plagiarism in the writings of the Church's prophetess, Ellen G. White, reaches the ears of John Dart, the religion editor of the Los Angeles Times. Dart interviewed Dr. Rea in his home, and very quickly publishes a story with banner headlines that read, "Plagiarism Found in Prophet Books," (October 20, 1980). The story is syndicated to 1,000 newspapers and reported on worldwide radio and TV. Dr. Rea is fired from the Church in November. (See Walter Rea, Pirates of Privilege, p.76 in the spiral-bound edition available from Dr. Desmond Ford's, Good News Unlimited organization in Australia.)

1980 – The Church forms a committee in Glendale, California to study the evidence they already have that Ellen White borrowed extensively from the writings of other authors without giving credit to her sources. Eighteen key scholars from across the country met to examine the evidence. They receive orders to work with Dr. Rea in their study. The committee concludes that the evidence is alarming and that further study is needed. Unfortunately, the committee acts without the consent of the Church's high administrative council, PREXAD. PREXAD blocks any further activity by the Glendale committee and announces its own plan to deal with the issues. (See Rea, Pirates of Privilege, p.75 of the spiral bound edition from Good News Unlimited.)

1981 – Circa 1981 – A group of about 40 SDA biblical scholars and theologians sign a statement which came to be known as the “Atlanta Affirmation.” This document, sent to General Conference President, Neal C. Wilson, rebukes him for lying about what happened at Glacier View and for the way he treated Dr. Ford both before and after the Glacier View trial. (See Cottrell, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?”)
1981 – Robert D. Brinsmead, a highly controversial independent Seventh-day Adventist theologian with a large following in the United States in earlier years, publishes his classic paper, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined.” Brinsmead’s paper, the writing of which is evidently prompted by his keen perception that Dr. Bacchiocchi’s 1977 book came closer to destroying the case for Sabbatarianism than to defending it, refutes Bacchiocchi’s fanciful Sabbath theology and painfully exposes the impossibilities of Sabbatarianism. A brilliant writer, Brinsmead disproves the entire Sabbath concept with the most up-to-date scholarly research and lock-step logic.

1981 – The Church's Davenport Scandal breaks loose with the bankruptcy of SDA physician and real estate developer, Dr. Donald J. Davenport. This scandal exposes Adventist corruption on an unimaginable scale, including bribery, kickbacks, illegal conflicts of interest, and cover-up. Many Church entities are shown to have been involved—state and regional conferences, Adventist institutions like Pacific Union College, and a wide variety of Adventist leaders, including the General Conference president and six union conference presidents. The Davenport Scandal shows Adventist leaders behaving as if they do not believe in Heaven or Hell, much less than in the unique SDA doctrines of the Investigative Judgment, the inspiration of Ellen White, and the Sabbath.

1981 – Dale Ratzlaff, who is later to be described by SDA Bible professor Judd Lake as the “fountain head of all [SDA] critics,” leaves the Church because he cannot find biblical support for the Church’s Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment (Sanctuary Doctrine). He continues to keep the Sabbath for a while and later writes his devastating critique of the Investigative Judgment entitled Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists. Later, he will publish a comprehensive anti-Sabbatarian book entitled Sabbath in Crisis, which is now renamed Sabbath in Christ. (See also 1990.) His book on the Sabbath will later become one of two documents written by former SDA authors that influence The Worldwide Church of God to turn its back on the Sabbatarian heritage it had shared with Seventh-day Adventists from the very beginning. (See also 1995.)

1981 - The General Conference presents the Ramik Report— the findings of a Roman Catholic lawyer hired by the Church to investigate the claim that Ellen White was a plagiarist. Attorney Ramik finds that Ellen White is not guilty of plagiarism and that her borrowing of the ideas of others was not extensive and exact enough to constitute plagiarism. The Ramik Report fails to address the real question, "Is Ellen White a liar?" Ramik apparently did not research carefully enough to read where Ellen White repeatedly claimed that God had showed her something in vision that she had copied from a human writer. The Church fails to address the real problem, and that is that true prophets of God do not lie.

1982 – Robert D. Brinsmead publishes another block-buster paper on the Sabbath, “A Digest of the Sabbath Question.” This paper provides additional scholarly proof for the points he made in his 1981 paper and is written in his usual brilliant style. These two papers confront SDA leaders with biblical and historical evidence that prove that Sabbatarianism is impossible— not merely questionable.

1982 - Dr. Walter Rea publishes his block-buster anti-Ellen White classic, The White Lie. This phenomenal book explains the extent of her plagiarism with many specific examples, and it details the cover-up of the Ellen White problem by Adventist leaders. Rea’s book effectively destroys the Ellen White myth, and Adventist leaders should have raised the “White” flag of surrender and repudiated the Church’s claim that she was a prophet of God. Rea eloquently demonstrates that the biggest problem with Ellen White was not simply her plagiarism, but that she repeatedly lied every time she made the blasphemous claim that God Himself gave her the information she copied.

1982 – The Church commissions Dr. Fred Veltman, then head of the religion department at Pacific Union College, to study the charges of Walter Rea that Ellen White had plagiarized most of the material she put into her book, The Desires of Ages. Dr. Veltman launches an eight-year study focused on this one book.

1982 - D.A. Carson (editor) publishes From Sabbath to Lord's Day, a collection of scholarly papers written by his team of biblical scholars to answer Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's book, From Sabbath to Sunday. This project, which took his team many years to complete, stumbled on the discovery that Moses clearly worded Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 in such a way as to indicate that the Sabbath Ordinance was not instituted at Creation; that it was given to the followers of God for the first time with the giving of the manna at the time of the Exodus, and that the newly given Sabbath Commandment was merely modeled after Creation Week. The Carson scholars also added greatly to our understanding of why Christians abandoned Sabbath-keeping in favor of Sunday observance. Their findings provided additional evidence that any variation of the apostasy-conspiracy approach—whether it be Ellen White's Roman Catholic Church theory, Samuele Bacchiocchi's Jewish Persecution Theory, or Strands Out Of Easter Theory, does not fit the facts. (Note that Dr. Bacchiocchi never addressed the Hebrew linguistics problem in any of his subsequent books on the Sabbath. Note also that the Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholars who attempted to develop more respectable theories to replace Dr. Bacchiocchi's "New Sabbatarianism" failed to even mention it, much less try to refute it.)
1983 – The Church fires Dr. Ron Graybill, a research assistant for 13 years and the Associate Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, after his Johns Hopkins University doctoral dissertation, “The Power of Prophecy: Ellen G. White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century,” was leaked out. Without his consent or knowledge, copies of the dissertation, which he had placed on a five-year embargo, are circulated to Adventist leaders throughout the world. He had taken the liberty to use material that the White Estate had placed in a top secret category. It is highly significant to observe that someone who had unlimited access to Ellen White’s entire collection of writings for over 13 years eventually determined that she was a fraud. His paper was skeptical of her prophetic gifts, her character and integrity, and he provided evidence that suggested that she produced her visions whenever necessary to maintain her authority. (See Walter Rea’s book, Pirates of Privilege, p. 72-73, spiral bound edition available from Dr. Desmond Ford’s Australian organization, Good News Unlimited. This book is also available at various web-sites, including SCRIB-D.)

1984 – Walter Rea’s 1984 book, Pirates of Privilege, is not published. Earlier, Rea had been fired in November of 1980 for uncovering the fact that Ellen White plagiarized the writings of other authors while claiming that she got that information in visions from God. He was 60 years old at the time the Church fired him, and had served the Denomination faithfully for many decades. Adventist leaders attempted to deny him his retirement benefits as well. Dr. Rea took the Church to court and won back his retirement benefits. However, he was forced to agree not to publish Pirates of Privilege to have his retirement benefits reinstated. Thus, every cent paid by the Church to Walter Rea after his firing represents, in a real sense of the word, out-right bribery in the form of “hush money.”

Read Pirates of Privilege at: www.truthorfables.com

1986 – Adventist seminary student, Bruce Weaver, discovers a newspaper account of a wild meeting at Israel Dammon’s home and a transcript of the court record. It shows that Ellen White lied about her participation in the same fanaticism that she condemned later. (See Bruce Weaver's story at Ellen White Exposed, taken from Adventist Currents, Vol. 3, Number 1, 1988.) See also 1874. His article can be found at the following link: http://www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/israel.htm

1987 – The White Estate publishes a shoddy, disorganized, and difficult-to-read release of hundreds of Ellen White’s writings related to the Gospel versus legalism debate of 1888. There is no acknowledgment that the very fact that these documents actually exist represents a huge scandal. The released document is so shoddy that it suggests that the Church deliberately made it so difficult to study that few people would have the courage to struggle through it. Tom Norris, the Adventist researcher who, earlier, had been given unlimited access to these documents, says this regarding this event:

“The late publication of this large collection of 1888 materials from the White Estate proves that they were hiding and suppressing Ellen White's writings, and acting in bad faith all during the Righteousness by Faith debates of the 1970's and even during Glacier View, and beyond. Arthur White was indeed guilty of misleading and deceiving generations of SDA's, including the scholars and the critics about Ellen Whites Gospel theology and her role in 1888. And thus the SDA leaders have been caught perpetrating a massive fraud about Ellen White and the fundamentals of Adventist theology. Here is the largest scandal that the denomination has ever faced, and yet few today are even aware that such a scandal exits because it has never been acknowledged, much less confessed or explained. And thus this massive fraud is still ongoing in nature even though the White Estate managed to publish the hidden documents some time ago.” (Search for Norris, All Experts, Seventh-day Adventists, White Estate.)
CHAPTER TWELVE

Section II – The Long War Against Truth – Chapters 4,5,6,7,8,9,10

THE COVER-UP: 1990 — PRESENT

The New Anti-Sabbatarian Movement Takes Its Toll.

The new anti-Sabbatarian movement gets under way as many thinking Adventists come to understand that there is no factual basis for the three pillars of Adventist doctrine. At first, these problems are communicated to the Adventist family through what you might call the “Adventist Underground” via books and copies of articles by Brinsmead and others. Dale Ratzlaff becomes the chief architect of the anti-Sabbatarian, anti-Adventist movement, and his books on the Sabbath and the Investigative Judgment attain wide circulation and influence. The Worldwide Church of God renounces Sabbatarianism, providing a huge insult to its Adventist “sister church.”

The Internet comes into wide-spread use, and anti-SDA web-sites spring up as the TRUTH about the lies of Adventism is made available to millions of Internet users. Dirk Anderson sets up a pro-Ellen White web-site and begins gathering material to support the prophetic claims of Ellen White. The more he learns about Ellen White, the more convinced he becomes that she is a fraud. His web-site flips and becomes an anti-Ellen G. White web-site. Soon Anderson’s new web-site is a devastating witness against the prophetic claims of Ellen White.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church is now losing up to 300,000 members a year, and it is believed that many of these losses are caused by the influence of the new anti-Sabbatarian movement. The Church continues to be plagued with almost continuous financial scandals, which your authors believe result from hypocrisy of its leaders, who, by now, know there is no biblical or historical basis for any of Adventism’s distinctive teachings. To them, the Church is a “cash cow” to support their denominational employees. Some Adventist workers, of course, in their ignorance, remain sincere believers in what has, for a long time, been referred to as “The Truth.”

More researchers study the prophetic dates used by Adventists to prove the Church is the only true church for the end-times, and they demonstrate successfully that many of these dates are not useful for any known prophetic purpose. These researchers later post their work on the anti-SDA web-sites that have sprung up since the late 1990’s and 2000’s.

1990 – Dr. Fred Veltman completes his study of the Desire of Ages. He concludes that Ellen White had plagiarized the vast majority of her material from other writers, including writers of religious fiction, and that there is hardly a single idea that is unique to Ellen White in the Desire of Ages. His findings are published in the December, 1990, issue of Ministry (pp. 11-14). Amazingly, Dr. Veltman concedes that he has no explanation for her lying about receiving direct, divine inspiration for things that she copied from the writings of others. (You can find the entire Veltman Report by accessing: http://www.truthorfables.com/Desire_of_Ages_Veltman.htm.)

1990 – Dale Ratzlaff publishes his anti-Sabbatarian book, Sabbath in Crisis. As you may recall, Ratzlaff had left Adventism in 1980 because he could not find biblical support for the Sanctuary Doctrine. He remained a Sabbath-keeper for several years after his apostasy from the Church. Eventually he began to look into other Adventist doctrines, including the Sabbath. Among the sources he studied were the Brinsmead papers. As a result of this study, he rejected Sabbatarianism and began to work on Sabbath in Crisis. This book has now been re-named Sabbath in Christ. Ratzlaff’s book appears to be one of the most complete treatises on the impossibilities of Sabbatarianism available today. Together with the Brinsmead papers, Sabbath in Crisis/ Sabbath in Christ has lead the way in forging the current anti-Sabbatarian movement that is threatening the very existence of Adventism, particularly in North America.

1995 – The Worldwide Church of God renounces Sabbatarianism after studying the writings of former Adventists, Robert D. Brinsmead and Dale Ratzlaff. This repudiation of Sabbatarianism represents one of the most significant events in the history of modern Christianity. Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church and The Worldwide Church of God ultimately
developed out of one group of Advent believers immediately after the Great Disappointment of 1844, the implications of this astonishing development are devastating to Seventh-day Adventists.

1997 – Dirk Anderson switches his web-site devoted to defending Ellen White to exposing her as a fraud after Dale Ratzlaff challenged him to read D.M. Canright’s 1919 book, Life of Mrs. E.G. White, Seventh-day Adventist Prophet—Her False Claims Refuted. Since 1997 Brother Anderson’s anti-EGW web-site has become the repository of one of the largest collections of original documents as well as research papers written by Dirk Anderson and others, exposing the fraudulent claims of Ellen White and the Church’s cover-up of its knowledge that she was a fraud.

You can read Dirk Anderson’s story at: http://www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/archive/testimony.htm. His research is so devastating to Adventism that the Seventh-day Adventist Church successfully brought legal action against him that forced him to give up his original internet domain name. This tactic made it more difficult for Internet users to find his web-site.

1997 – Robert K. Sanders, who left Adventism some years prior to 1997 after discovering problems with Ellen G. White and the Sanctuary Doctrine, launches his anti-SDA, anti-Ellen White, and anti-Sabbatarian web-site, Truth or Fables. Since 1997 Truth or Fables has provided a substantial collection of anti-SDA documents not available anywhere else, including top quality, well-researched biblical studies by Sanders and others who exhaustively deal with the problematic teachings of Adventism. Sanders’s web-site also features a collection of documents that deal with the extensive corruption which has plagued the Seventh-day Adventist Church since the 1970’s. His ministry includes a small panel of experts who dialogue directly with individuals who have specific questions about Sabbatarianism, Ellen White, and other SDA issues. His ministry helps many people throw off the deceptions of Adventism and embrace the Gospel of Jesus as outlined by Paul in his writings. Go to TRUTH OR FABLES and read his testimony at: http://www.truthorfables.com/My_Testimony.htm

1998 – Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi publishes Sabbath under Crossfire in response to the tremendous growing threat of the new anti-Sabbatarian movement that he inadvertently started in the first place by his catastrophic embarrassment of Sabbatarianism represented by his book, From Sabbath to Sunday, back in 1977. Bacchiocchi ignores the newer key arguments of the anti-Sabbatarians, such as the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story, the improved understanding by scholars of the diversity in the Early Church, and the link between circumcision and the Sabbath. More importantly, as you will recall, he brought further embarrassment to Adventists by enlarging on the requirement that Christians must keep the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbath feast days, and monthly sabbath feast days, in addition to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue.

1998 – Revelation of disgusting financial corruption at the tax-exempt Adventist Relief and Development Agency comes to light, thanks to General Conference whistle-blower and chief financial officer, David Dennis, who uncovered the scandal. Millions of dollars of government funding and private donations fail to make it to their intended recipients. This organization created a lot of nice job for Adventists and provided more than generous expense accounts to pay them well for mismanaging the funds. Note the parallel, here, with the financial scandal that corrupted The Worldwide Church Of God’s charitable and cultural organization, which surfaced in 1979.

1999 – People Magazine publishes an article about the Fox Sisters, who started the Spiritualist Movement in the mid-1800’s. This information proves Ellen White lied about being shown in vision that the “rappings” were not the result of “human trickery.” The article tells the story about how these sisters confessed, decades later, that they made up the story about the rappings at their farm house and that they deceived people during their seances by tying a string to their toes which activated a rock placed against the wall. After touring the country for decades giving lectures and seances, they toured the country lecturing about how they had managed to deceive everyone. The author of the article uses exactly the same words as Ellen White, just turned around, stating that the Fox Sisters confessed that their spirit manifestations WERE THE RESULT OF HUMAN TRICKERY. This People Magazine article brings to mind the fact that Ellen White said in the Great Controversy that Spiritualism would soon pervade all the main-line churches and that it would be considered a sin to talk against the spirit manifestations within these churches. Here we have another clear example of a total failure of Ellen White as a prophet. Nothing of the sort has happened.

See this link for the story of the Fox Sisters: www.ellenwhiteexposed.com/egw54.htm

2002 – Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell, widely acknowledged to be the greatest Seventh-day Adventist theologian of all time, presents his paper, “The Sanctuary Doctrine: asset or liability?” at the San Diego Forum on February ninth. His presentation exposes not only the impossibilities of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment, but the perfidy of Adventist leaders spanning over many decades of Church history. Wisely, Dr. Cottrell waited until his retirement from the Church to present this paper. There is no question but that he would have been fired if he had presented his views while being actively employed by the Church. It is possible that we would never have known about this scandalous cover-up if it had not been for his willingness to reveal what happened after his retirement.
2004 – An “Independent” SDA-related ministry, satellite broadcaster 3ABN opens the floodgates to a huge scandal when its governing board dismisses the board’s president’s wife, Linda Shelton, alleging sexual misconduct. This event led to scrutiny of financial and other irregularities, which would later come to nearly threaten the existence of this very large pro-SDA broadcasting network.

2007 – Plans to merge two huge SDA “independent” ministries, Amazing Facts and 3ABN are scrapped by the Church due to the growing scandal at 3ABN.

2007 – The Church publishes its first “scholarly” attempt to defend its Sabbath doctrine for 30 years, almost certainly timed to commemorate the 30-year anniversary of the publication of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi’s 1977 book, From Sabbath to Sunday. The author is Dr. Skip MacCarty, Associate Pastor of the Pioneer Memorial Church at Andrews University where the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary is located. This author takes his readers on a theological wild goose chase to bring them around and around to accept, hook, line, and sinker, the convoluted theological gymnastics of his predecessor, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi. MacCarty ignores the impossibilities of the arguments against Sabbatarianism from the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story and the biblical prerequisite of circumcision for Sabbath-keeping, and slicks over the impossibilities of Colossians 2:14-17 in the same manner as Bacchiocchi. However, MacCarty fails to spell out to his readers that what he and Dr. Bacchiocchi teach about Colossians 2:14-17 absolutely requires Adventists and Sabbatarians to keep all the Jewish ordinances mentioned by Paul, including the Jewish dietary laws and annual and monthly sabbath feast days. He states that a discussion of Early Church history is beyond the scope of his book, and for good reason. The facts of the history of the Early Church demonstrate that he thinks he knows more about the Sabbath than the first Christians did.

2008 - The Andrews University Press publishes a book by SDA scholar, Dr. Ron du Preez, entitled Judging the Sabbath: Discovering What Can’t Be Found In Colossians 2:16, which refutes Dr. Bacchiocchi’s and Dr. MacCarty's conclusion that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-16 is a reference to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. Du Preez looks at Old Testament texts that list sets of Jewish holy day classifications and concludes that St. Paul is merely teaching against the animal sacrifices that are associated with this list of holy days. He confines his discussion only to Colossians 2:14-17, ignoring the problems associated with the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis and Exodus which rule out the possibility of a Sabbath commandment at Creation and that Sabbath observance is dependent on the ordinance of circumcision, which was officially put to rest at the Council Of Jerusalem. Du Preez' pivotal argument is questioned and invalidated by Evangelical scholars. He ignores the extreme difficulty with the concept that St. Paul would be teaching the first Christians not to judge each other on the basis of whether or not they were offering animal sacrifices on Jewish holy days.

2009 – The Church has beefed up its propaganda campaign to defend Ellen White, but it is unable to defend the Sabbath doctrine in any kind of meaningful way. The only defense for the Sabbath “left” to Adventists is that it supposedly was given to the entire world at Creation— an argument invalidated by the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation story in Genesis, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, as well as the exegetical context of the Creation account itself. The propaganda effort to defend Ellen White seems to be focused on technicalities and ignores the problem that she told a falsehood when she claimed direct, divine inspiration from God for the things she copied! A visit to www.ellenwhite.info will give you an excellent sampling of this propaganda. Here are some highlights:

Her nearly total plagiarism of Conybeare and Howson’s book on the life of the Apostle Paul, which Ellen White called Sketches from the Life of Paul, is defended with the excuse that copyright laws were different in her day and that the Conybeare and Howson book was in the public domain. There is no mention of the fact that she said in her introduction to the book that God had revealed the information she put in the book to her in vision.

Her accusation of plagiarism of multiple sources for the Desire of Ages is defended with a few short comparison clips and the explanation that her critics make too much out of the similarities they noticed. This fanciful defense is in total denial of the Seventh-day Adventist Church’s official eight-year study of plagiarism in this book by Dr. Fred Veltman, who, after eight years of exhaustive study at Church expense, said these things:

In practical terms, this conclusion declares that one is not able to recognize in Ellen White’s writings on the life of Christ any general category of content or catalog of ideas that is unique to her. We found source parallels for theological, devotional, narrative, descriptive, and spiritual materials, whether in reference to biblical or extra-biblical content.
QUESTION - “How do you harmonize Ellen White's use of sources with her statements to the contrary? Do you think the introductory statement to The Great Controversy constitutes an adequate admission of literary dependence?”

ANSWER - I must admit at the start that in my judgment this is the most serious problem to be faced in connection with Ellen White's literary dependency. It strikes at the heart of her honesty, her integrity, and therefore her trustworthiness. . . . As of now I do not have - nor, to my knowledge, does anyone else have - a satisfactory answer to this important question. The statement from The Great Controversy comes rather late in her writing career and is too limited in its reference to historians and reformers. Similar admissions do not appear as prefaces to all her writings in which sources are involved, and there is no indication that this particular statement applies to her writings in general.

Therefore, www.ellenwhite.info, fails to disclose that the real problem with Ellen White's wholesale copying of Conybeare and Howson's book, Sketches from the Life of Paul, is that she lied when she claimed that God directly revealed this information to her when she actually copied it from a human source.

2010 - The arrest of former 3ABN president Tommy Shelton is announced by Fairfax County, Virginia Police on March 16, 2010, following a two-year investigation of allegations that he molested children while pastoring churches previous to 2004. Subsequently, Tommy Shelton pleads guilty to child molestation on July 19, 2010. However, we note that the molestations did not take place in Seventh-day Adventist Churches.

After reviewing the extent of deception of the Church from the very beginning of the Advent Movement, it is difficult to comprehend why “truth” needs so many lies to protect and defend it. We now know that, not only did Adventist leaders cover-up the truth about the impossibilities of the Sabbath Doctrine, the fraudulent claims of Ellen White, and the absurdities of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment, but they also misused the writings of their own prophetess to force the Church into submission regarding legalism. It should not come as any surprise then, that the Adventist leaders, since the unprecedented events of 1995 in regard to The Worldwide Church of God, have shown no interest whatsoever in fundamental doctrinal reform.

While there seems to be corruption of one degree or another in Christian churches, the degree of it in Adventism and Armstrongism is way out of proportion to their relatively small sizes. This phenomenon of Adventism and Armstrongism is consistent with our view that when church leaders have to live a life of hypocrisy on a day-to-day basis—knowing that almost nothing they teach is the truth—an environment favorable to the development of moral and financial corruption is created.
BOOK THREE

Doctors Bacchiocchi, MacCarty, and du Preez
Wreak Havoc with the Sabbath & SDA Theology –

Chapter 13 – Doctors Bacchiocchi and du Preez
Wreak Havoc

Chapter 14 – Doctor Skip MacCarty
Wreaks Havoc
CHAPTER 13

Doctors Bacchiocchi and du Preez
Wreak Havoc

ABSTRACT: This first chapter of Book III reviews the profound deficiencies of Dr. Bacchiocchi's research methods and conclusions in detail. We begin with an analysis of Bacchiocchi's chief SDA critic, Dr. Ronald du Preez, who unsuccessfully attempts to refute Bacchiocchi on a key point regarding Colossians 2:14-17. This critic is anxious to refute him, because if Bacchiocchi is correct, Ellen White is demonstrably a false prophet. Then we disassemble Dr. Bacchiocchi's interpretations of the writings of St. Paul with a special emphasis on Colossians 2:14-17 to prove to the point of over-kill that he clearly taught that the Sabbath was an obsolete shadow that the new Gentile Christians coming into the church were not to be required to keep. We demonstrate that Bacchiocchi ignored a variety of scholarly research that was available to him during the years when he was working on his dissertation at the Vatican that a reputable scholar would be responsible to review and address in a book that purports to be a serious apology for Sabbatarianism. We show that had he recognized the significance of the research that he was responsible to have known, he could not have written *From Sabbath to Sunday* or *Sabbath Under Crossfire*.

We now turn to a detailed study of two Adventist theologians who have spent countless futile hours trying to turn the impossibilities of the Sabbath doctrine into a plausible reality. To the "faithful," their efforts have been as successful as the fairy godmother that turned a pumpkin into a royal carriage for Cinderella. However, to the informed, their work is no more effective than the use of a sieve to hold water.

**DR. RONALD DU PREEZ CHALLENGES BACCHIOCCHI**

Dr. Du Preez attempts to refute Dr. Bacchiocchi's New Sabbatarianism by re-establishing credibility for the traditional SDA defense of the passage— that the Sabbath reference in Colossians 2:14-17 is to annual sabbath feast days and has nothing to do with the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. However he approaches the problem from a novel and extremely risky point of view. In fact it appears like he has not bothered to think through the logical consequences of his theory. He suggests that Paul is discussing the practice of offering animal sacrifices on Jewish holy days— these representing obsolete shadows— and teaching that the first Christians not to judge each other on whether they were or were not observing this practice. Du Preez exchanges these high cost problems for what he had hoped would be at least a small gain for the Sabbatarian reading of Colossians 2:14-17:

*Du Preez' animal sacrifices connection with Colossians 2:16-18 means that Gentile Christians would have been performing animal sacrifices according to the law— something technically impossible for the Colossians to do, seeing as this could only be done at the temple in Jerusalem.*

The one incident recorded where a Christian, St. Paul, may have offered an animal sacrifice was in connection with a Nazarene purification ceremony that was not connected with any offering for sin tied to any annual sabbath. There are commentaries pro and con regarding whether or not Paul used bad judgment in this situation. The Bible tells things the way they were, and even the authors of their own books seem to tell about their own mistakes.

What then of Jesus' sacrifice? Isn't this idea contrary to what the author of Hebrews wrote about the completeness of Christ's sacrifice on the cross as sufficient for all?

2. If Paul was merely instructing the first Christians not to judge each other in regard to offering animal sacrifices on Jewish feast days, he would not have been condemning the practice of animal sacrifices. He would be, in reality, condoning the practice itself.
If St. Paul is in harmony with the continuance of animal sacrifices into the Christian dispensation, indicted (if du Preez were to be correct) by not condemning the practice and again by teaching the first Christians not to judge each other in regard to whether or not they practice animal sacrifices on Jewish holy days or no, then Adventists are right back where they started with the New Sabbatarianism of Bacchiocchi, only worse:

If du Preez' conclusions concerning Colossians 2 were correct regarding the weekly sabbath not being addressed, then this further implies that SDA and other Sabbatarian theologians and scholars besides Dr. Bacchiocchi were “right” also, but all for the wrong reasons. This all begs the logical conclusion that we are dealing with a belief that went shopping for Scriptural support when in fact there is none. It is an obvious attempt to continue the justification for keeping the sabbath, seeing as all other explanations used by SDA theologians and scholars have failed in regards to Colossians chapter 2. When this explanation fails, Dr. du Preez or another scholar will step forward with yet another explanation, no matter how implausible.

Ellen G. White becomes a false prophet because, supposedly unlike Paul, she teaches that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross.

Adventists must now begin teaching that its membership may begin keeping Jewish holy days and performing animal sacrifices on those days.

Du Preez has not derailed the New Sabbatarianism of Dr. Bacchiocchi. Instead he has made it a thousand times more repugnant, and anti-Gospel, and made Adventism look extremely bad in the eyes of other Christians.

Du Preez, therefore, appears to be willing to sacrifice the principles of the Gospel in favor of the privilege of continuing to believe that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath. The cost of continuing to believe in the principles of Sabbatarianism has now reached a price that no Christian can afford to pay.

Du Preez' Methodology

**Du Preez’ Evidence From Classifications of Jewish Holy Days and Leviticus 23**

Du Preez theorizes that St. Paul modeled his list of classifications of Jewish holy days after that of a similar list found in Hosea 2:11. He presents a language comparison study, inherently flawed in our opinion, that suggests the possibility that the Hebrew word translated “sabbaths” in the third position of holy day classifications in the Hosea text refers to the “ceremonial” sabbaths rather than to the sacred seventh day Sabbath of the Decalogue. He seems to base this opinion primarily on the premise that there are four items in the Hosea list but only three in the one in Colossians 2:14-17.

Du Preez further theorizes that there is evidence that God made a distinction between two major classifications of Jewish holy days when He outlined a list of them in Leviticus 23. He thinks God used one term to refer to the ceremonial holy days and another term to refer to the sacred weekly Sabbaths. Du Preez explains that there is an equivalent word in Greek for the word that God used to refer to the ceremonial Sabbaths and that Paul chose this equivalent Greek word to refer to the classification of Jewish holy days that falls in the third position in Paul’s list in Colossians 2:14-17.

**Du Preez’ Greek word, Sabbaton, Argument—An Old SDA Defense In New Clothes**

In addition to arguing that the third position of holy days in Paul’s statement reflects a usage pattern that indicates the yearly classification of holy days types, he resurrects the traditional SDA defense that the Greek word, Sabbaton, used in this third position, is the plural form of the word and must, therefore, refer to one of the ceremonial types of sabbath holy days. In doing so, he asks us to strain our trust in his methodology beyond the point of reason.

The word Sabbaton, a Greek word in the plural form, is used in the New Testament to refer to either a 7-day week or to the weekly Sabbath. In each case where New Testament writers use this word, the context of the sentence easily determines how the word must be translated—either to “week” or to the “sacred” Sabbath of the Decalogue. In other words, in each case the same word is used, but it would be virtually impossible to translate the word the other way because the statement would not make any sense. Thus we have a wide understanding of the model of Greek usage Paul had in his mind when he wrote Colossians 2:14-17.
According to Bob Pickle, a conservative SDA author and pro-SDA web-host, Sabbaton occurs in the NT 68 times. It is singular 41 times and plural 25 times, with the last two times being singular in the Critical Text [the Greek text of B.F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort first published in 1881] and plural in the Received Text [the manuscript from which the King James Version of the Bible was translated] (e-mail Bob Pickle to Kerry Wynne, October 31, 2010). Therefore we have almost 70 occasions to see how New Testament writers used this Greek word, and these writers are extremely consistent from two contrasting perspectives that nearly demand that Paul used this word in Colossians 2:14-17 to refer to the weekly Sabbath. Du Preez is asking us to believe that Paul cast aside his excellent command of Greek usage and used this word in a manner unlike that of any other New Testament writer.

Clearly, du Preez struggles to demonstrate that Bacchiocchi, Brinsmead, Ratzlaff, and others are wrong in their conclusion that the weekly Sabbath is included in St. Paul's list in Colossians 2:14-17. Here is an anonymous blog posted at theologyweb.com, which comes up with a Google search for du Preez and Colossians 2:16. It is posted by contributor, Thief On the Cross, May 2nd, 2007 at: http://www.theologyweb.com/campus/showthread.php?t=130606

Colossians 2:16 mentions the Greek word Sabbaton (Strong's # G4521) which by definition only means 7th day Sabbath and the common word "week?" (You can look this up to verify.) To support this fact, I have listed all the scriptures in the New Testament where this word is used. (Every place speaking of the 7th day Sabbath in the New Testament uses this word.) And note that it only means either the 7th day Sabbath or the common word "week"; thus confirming the definition of this word when you look up its meaning. Here are all the scriptures that use this word:

Matthew 12:1, Matthew 12:2, used twice as 7th day Sabbath in Matthew 12:5, Matthew 12:8, Matthew 12:10, Matthew 12:11, Matthew 12:12, Matthew 24:20, used twice (first as 7th day sabbath and second as the common word "week") in Matthew 28:1...

Mark 1:21, Mark 2:23, Mark 2:24, used twice for the 7th day sabbath in Mark 2:27, Mark 2:28, Mark 3:2, Mark 3:4, Mark 6:2, Mark 16:1, Used as the common word "week" in Mark 16:2, Also appears as the common word "week" in Mark 16:9...


John 5:9, John 5:10, John 5:16, John 5:18, John 7:22, John 9:14, John 9:16, Used twice as 7th day sabbath in John 19:31, Used as the common word "week" in John 20:1, Used as the common word "week" in John 20:19...


How ironic that the very last scripture that uses this word tells us that it was a shadow of things to come! After this, it is mentioned no more! Also all Sabbatarian New Testament proof-texts that mention the Sabbath are in this above list. How ironic!

I would like to use simple logic here. We know that fish does not come from serpents, neither do they gather grapes from bramble bushes. Even so, God would never misuse a word, as even the use of words has rules. Now it is a fact that the word Sabbaton used in all these Scriptures that I've just listed above only means 7th day Sabbath and the common word, “week.” Just like “yes” means “yes” and “no” means no. God would never put the word “no” where He means "yes"; and if the 7th day Sabbath did not belong in Colossians 2:16, He would have never used the Greek word Sabbaton (which is translated in the KJV as “Sabbath days,” just as it is translated in all those other verses of scripture meaning the same thing consistently all the way to Col 2:16 where it is last used).

If anyone seems to be contentious over this, consider the consistency of how this word is used all over the New Testament until Col 2:16 where it is last used. There can be no exceptions to the rule; if the word sabbaton can mean anything other than what it means, then I can use the word “yes” to mean “no.” If this does not agree with your doctrine, it's not what I said that's the problem. You need to count your doctrine to be at a loss and come to terms with the truth. Remember, we can do nothing against the truth. We can only do for it.
The Ezekiel 47:17 Similarity Problem: Typical Lists of Jewish Holy Days

Du Preez also finds himself in the uncomfortable position of having to demonstrate that the list of Jewish holy day classifications in Ezekiel 47:17 is significantly dissimilar to that of the one in Hosea. Why? Because du Preez, like most other biblical scholars, sees one of those classifications as a reference to the weekly Sabbath.

Here are the texts so you can see their similarities and differences.

HOSEA 2:11
I will also put an end to all her gaiety,
Her feasts, her new moons, her sabbaths
And all her festal assemblies.

EZEKIEL 45:17
"It shall be the prince's part to provide the burnt offerings, the grain offerings and the drink offerings, at the feasts, on the new moons and on the sabbaths, at all the appointed feasts of the house of Israel; he shall provide the sin offering, the grain offering, the burnt offering and the peace offerings, to make atonement for the house of Israel."

I am indebted to the work of the following scholars for this presentation:

Jason C. Meyer of Bethlehem College and Seminary (Minneapolis)-- his review of the du Preez’ book in Volume 35, Issue 1 (April 2010) of Themelios:


Hugo Mendez, M. A., Religion, University of Georgia, from his essay, “What Is The “Sabbath” of Hos. 2:11 and Col. 2:16? A Response To du Preez.” You can read his complete essay at the following link:

www.catholicadventist.com/Papers/Q_Sabbath_Col2duPreez.pdf

Jason C. Meyer makes these observations:

Though this book is a vigorous defense of the Sabbatarian reading, the present reviewer would classify it as a vigorous defense of a very weak position. There is simply too much stacked against this reading to make a successful defense of it. The author acknowledges the challenge of ascribing a ceremonial meaning to sabbâton in Col 2:16 (pp. 41–42). His proposed reading is rare to say the least; it is the only alleged example of this meaning out of sixty-nine occurrences.

Furthermore, the reader sometimes will sense that the author is guilty of special pleading or elaborate exegetical gymnastics in order to defend his reading. For example, large segments of the book tackle the issue of identifying the Old Testament parallels behind Col 2:16. His chapter on the use of the Old Testament in Paul claims that Hosea is the obvious candidate because Paul quotes Hosea three times and alludes to it once, while he only alludes to Ezekiel three times and never utilizes Nehemiah or Chronicles (pp. 100–101). The present reviewer questions the minimalistic nature of these statistics and this overall methodology.

The author engages in these comparisons because he sets his sights on dismissing the traditional “yearly, monthly, weekly” interpretive scheme for the phrase “festival or a new moon or a Sabbath” (Col 2:16 ESV). He observes that eighty-eight of the ninety-two commentaries he surveys (from 1861 to 2005) defend the yearly-monthly-weekly sequential reading of Colossians 2:16 (p. 56). The traditional reading frequently appeals to Old Testament precedents for this sequence in eight passages (Num 28–29; 1 Chr. 23:29–31; 2 Chr. 2:4; 8:12–13; 31:3; Neh 10:33; Ezek. 45:17; Hos. 2:11). The author dismisses the first seven passages as true parallels because they have four or five items in the sequence instead of three (p. 59, 63). Chapter 11 argues that only Hos 2:11 is a real parallel for Col 2:16 because it consists of three items in the same sequence and has similar semantic markers (see his six reasons on p. 106).

This analysis is problematic for three reasons. First, the author does not sufficiently take Lev. 23:2 into account. Here the Hebrew term for “appointed times” (moed) serves as an inclusive term for the wider Jewish system, which includes the Seventh-Day Sabbath (Lev 23:3). Second, the inclusive nature of “all her appointed times” (moed) in
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Hos 2:11 could show that God will put an end to the wider Jewish system of Lev 23, which includes the Seventh-Day Sabbath. Third, it is questionable to assume that Paul could not have multiple parallels in mind in Col 2:16. Why does an additional item in the sequence eliminate similar texts from consideration?

Hugo Mendez argues that the minor differences between the lists of holy day types in these texts are not particularly significant, and he states, “Denotation rarely hinges on number or case, even less so when the linguistic similarity between these two texts is so profound.” Beyond this, he sees a much stronger similarity between Ezekiel 44:17 and Colossians 2:14-17 than between Hosea 2:11:

Col. 2:16 can be distinguished from Hos. 2:11 insofar as it lacks pronominal indications, as well as the absence of the closing construction “all her appointed times” makes the link between Hos.2:11 and Ezek. 44:17 that much stronger than that existing between Hos.2:11 and Col. 2:16.

ANNUAL-MONTHLY-WEEKLY CHART

1 Chronicles 23:31 (New International Version)

and whenever burnt offerings were presented to the LORD on Sabbaths and at New Moon festivals and at appointed feasts. They were to serve before the LORD regularly in the proper number and in the way prescribed for them.

2 Chronicles 2:4 (New International Version)

Now I am about to build a temple for the Name of the LORD my God and to dedicate it to him for burning fragrant incense before him, for setting out the consecrated bread regularly, and for making burnt offerings every morning and evening and on Sabbaths and New Moons and at the appointed feasts of the LORD our God. This is a lasting ordinance for Israel.

Chronicles 8:13 (New International Version)

according to the daily requirement for offerings commanded by Moses for Sabbaths, New Moons and the three annual feasts—the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles.

Nehemiah 10:33 (New International Version)

for the bread set out on the table; for the regular grain offerings and burnt offerings; for the offerings on the Sabbaths, New Moon festivals and appointed feasts; for the holy offerings; for sin offerings to make atonement for Israel; and for all the duties of the house of our God.

Isaiah 1:13-14 (New International Version)

Stop bringing meaningless offerings! Your incense is detestable to me. New Moons, Sabbaths and convocations—I cannot bear your evil assemblies. Your New Moon festivals and your appointed feasts my soul hates. They have become a burden to me; I am weary of bearing them.

45:17 (New International Version)

It will be the duty of the prince to provide the burnt offerings, grain offerings and drink offerings at the festivals, the New Moons and the Sabbaths—at all the appointed feasts of the house of Israel. He will provide
the sin offerings, grain offerings, burnt offerings and fellowship offerings to make atonement for the house of Israel.

Ezekiel 46:1-11 (New International Version)

"This is what the Sovereign LORD says: The gate of the inner court facing east is to be shut on the six working days, but on the Sabbath day and on the day of the New Moon it is to be opened. The prince is to enter from the outside through the portico of the gateway and stand by the gatepost. The priests are to sacrifice his burnt offering and his fellowship offerings. [a] He is to worship at the threshold of the gateway and then go out, but the gate will not be shut until evening. On the Sabbaths and New Moons the people of the land are to worship in the presence of the LORD at the entrance to that gateway. The burnt offering the prince brings to the LORD on the Sabbath day is to be six male lambs and a ram, all without defect. The grain offering given with the ram is to be an ephah, [b] and the grain offering with the lambs is to be as much as he pleases, along with a hin [c] of oil for each ephah. On the day of the New Moon he is to offer a young bull, six lambs and a ram, all without defect. He is to provide as a grain offering one ephah with the bull, one ephah with the ram, and with the lambs as much as he wants to give, along with a hin of oil with each ephah. When the prince enters, he is to go in through the portico of the gateway, and he is to come out the same way.

9 " When the people of the land come before the LORD at the appointed feasts, whoever enters by the north gate to worship is to go out the south gate; and whoever enters by the south gate is to go out the north gate. No one is to return through the gate by which he entered, but each is to go out the opposite gate. 10 The prince is to be among them, going in when they go in and going out when they go out.

11 " At the festivals and the appointed feasts, the grain offering is to be an ephah with a bull, an ephah with a ram, and with the lambs as much as one pleases, along with a hin of oil for each ephah.

Hosea 2:11 (New International Version)

I will stop all her celebrations:
her yearly festivals, her New Moons,
her Sabbath days—all her appointed feasts.

Galatians 4:10 (New International Version)

You are observing special days and months and seasons and years

Colossians 2:16 (New International Version)

Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day.

Note that whether the writer begins his list from the weekly end or the annual end, the list goes in the order of smallest to largest or largest to smallest, even if the number of classifications included is different. The "appointed feasts" refer to annual sabbaths. Meyer makes the following observation:

This analysis is problematic for three reasons. First, the author does not sufficiently take Lev. 23:2 into account. Here the Hebrew term for “appointed times” (moed) serves as an inclusive term for the wider Jewish system, which includes the Seventh-Day Sabbath (Lev. 23:3). Second, the inclusive nature of “all her appointed times” (moed) in Hos 2:11 could show that God will put an end to the wider Jewish system of Lev. 23, which includes the Seventh-Day Sabbath. Third, it is questionable to assume that Paul could not have multiple parallels in mind in Col 2:16. Why does an additional item in the sequence eliminate similar texts from consideration?
Du Preez' Additional "Mine" Versus "Your" Theory

Du Preez also thinks he has noticed that when God is talking about the holy weekly Sabbath, He refers to them as "My Sabbaths," but when He is talking about the ceremonial sabbaths, He refers to them as "Your Sabbaths." Bill Hohmann researched this theory and concluded that, to the contrary, a consistent pattern is that God referred to them as "My sabbaths" when His people were spiritually close to Him and to them as "Your sabbaths" when His people were spiritually distant from Him.

Bill Hohmann provides the following texts to support this observation:

As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because it did not rest in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it. – Leviticus 26:35

And I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation; and I will bring up sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head; and I will make it as the mourning of an only son, and the end thereof as a bitter day. – Amos 8:10

Jerusalem remembered in the days of her affliction and of her miseries all her pleasant things that she had in the days of old, when her people fell into the hand of the enemy, and none did help her: the adversaries saw her, and did mock at her sabbaths. – Lamentations 1:7

I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts. – Hosea 2:11

And the LORD said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: – Exodus 32:7

Say ye unto your brethren, Ammi; and to your sisters, Ruhamah. Plead with your mother, plead: for she is not my wife, neither am I her husband: let her therefore put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts; Lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born, and make her as a wilderness, and set her like a dry land, and slay her with thirst. And I will not have mercy upon her children; for they be the children of whoredoms. For their mother hath played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. Therefore, behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths. And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; and she shall seek them, but shall not find them: then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband; for then was it better with me than now. For she did not know that I gave her corn, and wine, and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, which they prepared for Baal. Therefore will I return, and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof, and will recover my wool and my flax given to cover her nakedness. And now will I discover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers, and none shall deliver her out of mine hand. I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts. And I will destroy her vines and her fig trees, whereof she hath said, These are my rewards that my lovers have given me: and I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall eat them. And I will visit upon her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them, and she decked herself with her earrings and her jewels, and she went after her lovers, and forgot me, saith the LORD. – Hosea 2:1-13

The word of the LORD that came unto Hosea, the son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel. The beginning of the word of the LORD by Hosea. And the LORD said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the LORD. So he went and took Gomer the daughter of
Diblaim; which conceived, and bare him a son. And the LORD said unto him, Call his name Jezreel; for yet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel. And it shall come to pass at that day, that I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel. And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And God said unto him, Call her name Loruhmah: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away. But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the LORD their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses, nor by horsemen. ¶Now when she had weaned Loruhmah, she conceived, and bare a son. Then said God, Call his name Loammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God. — Hosea 1:1-9

Thus saith the LORD, Where is the bill of your mother’s divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away. — Isaiah 50:1

To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the LORD: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. — Isaiah 1:11-15

**Du Preez Leviticus 23 and Colossians 2:14-17 Defense:**

"Sabbaths" Versus "Feasts" Of The Lord

Du Preez believes he finds additional evidence that Paul could not have been referring to the weekly Sabbath in Colossians 2:14-17 in the form of a supposed word usage pattern he finds in Leviticus 23—a chapter in which God explains the various kinds of holy days He has given Israel. He sees two supposed distinctions of importance: (1) between “sabbaths of the LORD” and “feasts of the LORD.” (2) Between the feasts that involved the sacrifices where the Jews would sit down to eat (the “chags”) and all other feast days that didn’t involve eating or which refer to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue (the “moeds”).

The supposed “evidence” he finds is that the Hebrew word, “moeds,” has an equivalent word in Greek, “heorte,” and Paul chose to use the word “heorte” in Colossians 2:14-17 in reference to the feast days he mentioned. Our same blogger-theologian outlines a remarkable logical pathway to prove that the argument du Preez uses supports the anti-Sabbatarian view instead (the view that the Sabbath Paul referenced was none other than to the weekly Sabbath.) This argument is a complicated one to follow, but a patient reading and re-reading of his outline of the problem is well-worth one’s time. A lot is at stake here. If du Preez theory is correct, Paul actually validated the concept that it is OK for Christians to sacrifice animals on Jewish holy days:

The argument against the Sabbath days in Colossians 2:16 meaning the 7th day Sabbath using Leviticus chapter 23 is also of no avail when you consider the original Hebrew text, God’s conversation with Moses, how He distinguishes the feasts from the 7th day Sabbath twice in the text, and how Moses responds in verse 44.

God introduces the feast days in verse 4 as one who uses a colon before making a list. Then He begins to specifically give out the details and commandments concerning these appointed times. He mentions the "sabbath of the LORD" in verse 3; then in verse 4 He says, “These are the "feasts of the LORD", even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons.” This is the first distinction between the "sabbath of the LORD" and the "feasts of the LORD." I will get to the second distinction in a moment.

I would like to mention how a certain SDA tried to read in a distinction that just did not exist within the text because of the distinction God made twice in the chapter. He tried to make a categorical distinction between the Hebrew words "chag" (Strong's # H2282) and "mo'ed" (Strong's # H4150) used in the text. The “chags” were the feasts that involved the sacrifices where the Jews would sit down to eat. The “mo'eds” were all the rest that did not involve...
eating, meaning "appointed times" and was also used to summarize all those days besides the “sabbaths of the LORD" in verse 38. This is the second distinction, by the way.

The reason that this SDA's observations of differences between these two Hebrew terms were irrelevant to the debate was because of how God used the term "mo'ed" to summarize all those days that were not classified as “the sabbaths of the LORD”. I will explain the problem.

When God finished speaking to Moses, Moses does exactly what God commanded him in verse 44 which says, "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts (mo'ed- Strong's # H4150) of the LORD.” Notice the word "chag” is not used in this verse. Also notice that the "sabbath of the LORD" was already given to them prior to this chapter, so Moses gave them all these thing[s] that were "besides the sabbaths of the LORD,” using the term "mo'ed" to summarize all these things.

This is interesting because the Hebrew word "mo'ed" (Strong's # H4150) has a Greek equivalent in the New Testament– the term "heorte" (Strong's # G1859) used in Colossians 2:16 as "feast" in most English translations just before the New Moon is mentioned. Everything that was besides the sabbaths of the LORD in Leviticus 23 is covered in the term "heorte" ("feast" in English) in Col 2:16; just like all those things are covered in the Hebrew term "mo'ed" ("feast" in English) in Lev. 23:44 when "Moses declared to the children of Israel the "mo'ed" (feasts) of the LORD.”

We read the Bible in English, so the word for us is feast or feasts. The definition of this term according to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary is:

1.) an elaborate and usually abundant meal often accompanied by a ceremony or entertainment: Banquet
b (1) : something that gives unusual or abundant enjoyment <a visual feast> (2) : Abundance, Profusion <an unprecedented feast of corruption, gargantuan in scale-Neil Sheehan>

2.) a periodic religious observance commemorating an event or honoring a deity, person, or thing.

According to this last definition, we can see that the word "feast” also means "appointed times" and was the correct English term to adequately depict the Hebrew word "mo'ed" in our English text of the Bible, as it also means "appointed times". So, verse 44 which says, "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the "feasts" of the LORD", is right on the money.

When you truly go through Leviticus 23 with a fine tooth comb, it clearly shows that there is nothing else left for the English term "sabbath days" in Col 2:16 to mean anything other than the 7th day sabbath– even all the times when you see the word “sabbath” in the text of Leviticus 23. For example, when God gives Moses the "Feast of Weeks" or what is now known as "Pentecost", the word “sabbath” is used multiple times. The average SDA would see that and conclude that all these times the word “sabbath” is mentioned here proves that the "sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16 is talking about yearly (annual) feast days.

But... when you read the text closely, the very first time you see the word "sabbath" after verse 4 is in verse 11. Starting from here, let's identify all those usages of the term "sabbath”. The word “sabbath” in this verse is the 7th day Sabbath. The priests waved the sheaf offering on the 8th day. Leviticus 23:15 does a count starting from the morrow after the Sabbath, which is Sunday (the day the priests waved the sheaf offering), from there to count 7 sabbaths (seven 7th day Sabbaths).

Verse 16 finishes the thought saying, "Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the LORD." Now note: the Hebrew term used in the text for “sabbath” mentioned since verse 4 to this point is shabbath (Strong's # H7676). I say this because the next use of the English word "sabbath" will not use the same Hebrew term (7676), but the term shabbathon (Strong's # H7677), which has a different meaning than shabbath (Strong's # H7676).

Shabbathon means- a sabbatism or special holiday-sabbath.(H7677)

shabbath means- intermission, that is, (specifically) the Sabbath:- (+every) sabbath. (H7676)

The next term for "sabbath" is used in verse 24 as shabbathon, referring to the memorial of blowing of trumpets.
The only day that uses the Hebrew term (H7676) other than the 7th day Sabbath in this chapter is the Day of Atonement in verse 32 where it is used twice, which only occurred once a year. This is the only day other than the 7th day Sabbath that "no work" was to be done "at all". All the other feast days commanded that no "servile work" be done. This meant they could not go to do their trade that day, but could do other things as long as the work was not servile.

This couldn't be used to mean the "sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16 because it is already mentioned in the Greek word "heorte" ("feast" in English) in the same verse covering it just like how it is covered in Leviticus 23:44 in the Hebrew word "mo'ed" ("feast" in English). When verse 44 says, "And Moses declared to the children of Israel the feasts (mo'ed) of the LORD", period, it showed Moses being obedient to God right away giving the children of Israel "everything" that God gave him that was "besides the sabbaths of the LORD" in Leviticus chapter 23, the Day of Atonement being included here.

Next, "Besides the sabbaths (H7676) of the LORD" is mentioned in verse 38. After this H7677 is used twice in verse 39 where they are translated "sabbath" in English, verse 39 being the last verse to mention "sabbath."

Our anonymous theologian blogger summarizes the problems with du Preez' work succinctly as follows:

In conclusion, I would like to summarize my position. I have many scriptural witnesses (over 50) attesting that the "sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16 is indeed the 7th day Sabbath. I covered the definition of the Greek term, sabbaton, and how it is used consistently for every instance of the mentioning of the 7th day sabbath in the New Testament- every scripture using this term used it only to speak of the 7th day Sabbath and or the common word week. All the scriptures using this term are unanimous all the way to Colossians 2:16 where the term is last used.

I examined every argument against this fact; including the argument using Leviticus chapter 23 as a proof text against this, when in fact it actually proves that the Sabbath days in Col 2:16 is in fact the 7th day Sabbath.

If for no other reason, there is just nothing else left that it could mean since everything else is covered by the Greek term "heorte" used as "feast" and "holyday" in the English translations; just like they are all covered in Leviticus 23 by the Hebrew term "mo'ed" used as "feasts" in the English translations. The only thing not given in debut by Moses in Leviticus 23:44 is the "sabbaths of the LORD". Everything else besides the sabbaths of the LORD in Leviticus chapter 23 is given in verse 44 definitively; thus giving us infallible proof that the 7th day Sabbath is in fact the Sabbath days mentioned in Colossians 2:16.

These comments were posted by contributor, Thief On the Cross, May 2nd, 2007 at:

www.theologyweb.com/campus/showthread.php?t=130606

EARL L. HENN'S “PEER GROUP PRESSURE” THEORY

Earl L. Henn (1934-1997), in his paper, "Are the Sabbath and Holy Days Done Away?" posted at BibleTools.Com, a ministry of the Sabbatarian Church, Church of the Great God (Charlotte, NC), theorizes that the pagan community at Colossae was highly “religious” and corporately tended to believe that perfection could be attained through self-denial; therefore, Paul is saying, in Colossians 2:14-17, something like, “Don't let the pagans in the community upset you by their criticisms of how you observe your dietary laws and holy days.” Since his theory is well-articulated and plausible, it is worthy of treatment in our discussion. If Henn is correct, we anti-Sabbatarians cannot use Colossians 2:14-17 to show that the Sabbath was abrogated by this passage. Please consider his theory in his own words:

For centuries, people have tried to use Colossians 2:16-17 to say that Christians are not required to observe the Sabbath and holy days. This distortion stems partly from a misunderstanding of Colossians 2:14, which many claim says that the law was abolished and nailed to the cross, and partly from having a carnal mind, which is enmity against God and His law (Romans 8:7). They reason that Paul is saying in verse 16, "Therefore [since the law is done away] don't let anyone condemn you for eating unclean meats or not observing the Sabbath or holy days." Consequently, they interpret verse 17 to mean that Paul dismises the Sabbath and holy days as unimportant symbols of future events, while emphasizing that the only truly substantive Christian need is belief in Christ. From this, they conclude that we should not concern ourselves about these days because, since Christ died, their observance is not required. This is not true.

The Colossians had been significantly influenced by pagan philosophies that taught that perfection could be achieved through self-denial and abstinence from pleasure. As a result, Colossae tended to be an ascetic community.
which adhered to a religion of severity, and its citizens thought anyone who was religious should behave as they did. Many of the people who had come into the Christian church in Colossae had brought their pagan philosophies with them, and they soon began to have an adverse influence on the entire congregation at Colossae. Paul corrects the people in the church who were doing this in Colossians 2:20-23. It appears some of the people had begun thinking that this self-imposed asceticism could somehow contribute to their salvation and had begun turning away from trusting in Christ. They had more faith in their unchristian works. Paul warns them about this in Colossians 2:8.

God had called the people in the church at Colossae out of their pagan, ascetic way of life, and they had begun to learn how to enjoy life in a balanced manner as God intended. This included eating meat, drinking wine, and enjoying food and fellowship when observing God's Sabbath and festivals.

Because the converted Colossians were learning how to enjoy life as God intended, the people in the ascetic community began to look down on them and condemn them. In addressing these problems, Paul reminds the Colossians that they are complete in Jesus Christ; they have no need for the pagan philosophies of this world (Colossians 2:9-10).

Paul explains in verse 16 why they need not be bothered by the attitude of the Colossian society toward their practices and way of life in the church. To paraphrase, "Do not worry about what the people in the community think about your enjoyment of eating good food, drinking wine, and joyously celebrating the Sabbath and the festivals. Christ has conquered the world and all of its rulers, so we do not need to be concerned about what the world thinks about us."

In verse 17, Paul mentions that the Sabbath and holy days are "shadows," symbols or types, of future events in the plan of God. The Sabbath is a type of the Millennium when Jesus Christ and the saints will rule the world for a thousand years. The holy days symbolize various steps in the plan of God and remind us annually of God's great purpose in creating mankind.

A literal translation of the last few words of Colossians 2:17 reads, "but the body of Christ." What is the body of Christ? I Corinthians 12:27 shows that the body of Christ is the church! The exact same Greek expression that is translated "body of Christ" in I Corinthians 12:27 (soma Christou) is used in Colossians 2:17. Paul tells the Colossians that they should not let any man judge them or call them into question about these things but rather let the church make those judgments. He is pointing the members to the example of the spiritual leaders of the church who set the tone and pattern of worship on the Sabbath and holy days, exhorting them not to worry about what anyone in the community thinks about them. A similar exhortation is given in Colossians 2:18-19.

Far from doing away with the observance of the Sabbath and holy days, Colossians 2:16-17 is one of the strongest proofs that the early church kept these days and that Paul taught the Gentiles to keep them.

Earl L. Henn (1934-1997) “Are the Sabbath and Holy Days Done Away?”

Analysis of Henn's Theory

It seems unlikely that the Gentile converts would be at all concerned with what their pagan neighbors thought about what they ate, what holy days they observed, or how they observed those days. These are such minor issues compared to the profound differences between the morality of the pagans and the Christians. Their pagan neighbors would have been far more likely to make fun of the new moral values of their newly-become-Christian friends, such as the radical concept that heterosexual relationships were only for a life-time committed marriage and homosexual practices were never acceptable under any circumstances. If the Colossian Christians were afraid of being ridiculed for their new faith, it just seems unlikely that Paul would have to be giving them a pep talk so they could face criticism over their dietary and holy day observances.

A study of Colossians Chapter One suggests that Paul's view of the Colossian Christians was that they were basically well-grounded in the faith. Paul's ministry seems to have been focused on the Gospel of Christ and protecting it against the attacks of the Judaizers. A theme that we will see, as our study unfolds, is that Paul understood that the ideas of the Judaizers (but not of Judaism itself) was similar to that of the pagan acetic teachings in that both influences had in common a human, rather than divine, source, and that both sets of teachings promoted the idea that humans can save themselves by their works. Judaism was always about Righteousness by Faith, but the Judaizers had turned their version of Judaism into a works-oriented religion. The God of Judaism was the same, loving God of Christianity; so the Source of inspiration for both the Old Covenant (Judaism) and the New Covenant (Christianity) was the same.
Henn's attempt to evade the fact that Paul classifies the Jewish dietary laws, annual and monthly sabbaths, and the Weekly Sabbath as "shadows" that were fulfilled when Christ came to this Earth is unconvincing. The idea that the Sabbath is a symbol of the 1,000 year period of time when the saints with rule the Earth is pure speculation and is based on the interpretation of one text found in the Book of Revelation. His assertion that the word properly translated "body of Christ" means that Paul is telling the Colossians to let God's People, or the Church, determine what is proper in the way of dietary practices and the observance of holy days stretches the accepted principles of literary interpretation way beyond the limits of propriety. Henn is also negligent to explain why the sabbath being a shadow, and how Jesus is what has a body of substance a shadow does not have, is not a valid understanding of the passage.

We observe that not even Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi stooped to use this argument. Instead, as we shall see, he theorizes that Paul is talking about the ideas of the Judaizers and that he spends his scholarly efforts trying to get around the anti-Sabbatarian implications of Colossians 2:14-17 in an entirely different way. We have already touched on Dr. Bacchiocchi's approach to this passage. Now let us examine his teachings in detail.

\section*{AN EXHAUSTIVE STUDY OF BACCHIOCCHI'S METHODS AND CONCLUSIONS}

Our review of du Preez' work on Colossians 2:14-17 demonstrates the extreme difficulties Dr. Bacchiocchi had when he sought to reconcile this text with the necessity of writing a book to prove that even though D.M. Canright was right about the reference to the weekly Sabbath, his conclusions about what that facts meant were wrong. At this point we should be ready to launch into an exhaustive analysis of Colossians 2:14-17 and see that the facts prohibit the traditional defense of Adventism, du Preez' animal sacrifice theory, and the New Sabbatarianism of Bacchiocchi. Since we have touched on some of these things before, it may be easier, now, for our readers to follow our arguments.

Because Dr. Bacchiocchi had some changes in his thinking between the publication of From Sabbath To Sunday (1977) and the time he wrote Sabbath under Crossfire (1998), an analysis of the latter work is a fairer treatment of his ideas. All the elements of Dr. Bacchiocchi's teachings which we discuss in this section are articulated in the chapter entitled "Paul and the Sabbath" from his 1998 book, Sabbath under Crossfire. The entries in blue print and all capital letters represent summaries of his key ideas, rather than quotations from his text. In some cases Dr. Bacchiocchi may have taken several pages to develop a concept, which we have summarized in a few sentences, and in other cases he may have presented an idea in not many more words than we have used, and the wording may be relatively similar. This chapter of his book is fairly short and is accessible to all Internet users by going to Dr. Bacchiocchi's own web-site. There are no page numbers provided on the Internet version of this chapter, so a page reference for each idea is not possible. At the time this section of this manuscript is being prepared, it appears that Dr. Bacchiocchi's family is maintaining his web-site. He passed away in December of 2008. \url{http://www.biblicalperspectives.com}

In October of 2006 Kerry Wynne sent a rough draft of the following section of this paper to Dr. Bacchiocchi. Wynne asked only that he seek to determine whether or not Wynne had represented his ideas accurately. He replied only that he had skimmed the paper and that it was evident that Wynne did not understand the principles of literary research. There was no hint that he felt Wynne had misrepresented his teachings. While there have been changes to the wording of his rebuttals to his ideas since he read the rough draft, there have been no significant changes to Wynne's summaries of his teachings.

Before beginning our study, a structural analysis will give us a better idea of just what a Sabbatarian is up against when trying to render the passage in a favorable light.

These items are not to be enforced on Christians:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{JEWISH DIETARY LAWS}
  \item \textbf{ANNUAL FEAST DAYS}
  \item \textbf{MONTHLY FEAST DAYS}
  \item \textbf{WEEKLY SABBATHS}
\end{itemize}

These items were shadows of things to come and found their fulfillment in Christ:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{JEWISH DIETARY LAWS}
  \item \textbf{ANNUAL FEAST DAYS}
  \item \textbf{MONTHLY FEAST DAYS}
  \item \textbf{WEEKLY SABBATHS}
\end{itemize}
If you try to make the “Sabbath Day” of Colossians 2:14-17 into a monthly or annual Sabbath, Paul’s sentence becomes nonsense. In this case, Paul’s sentence would read something like this, if the meaning were ‘monthly’:

“in regard to an annual, monthly, or monthly celebration.”

If the meaning of Sabbath were changed from weekly to annual, it would read something like this:

“in regard to an annual, monthly, or annual celebration.”

A reason would have to be given to Paul’s target audience for no longer requiring the observance of a list of things that had been sacred to the Jews for over a thousand years. What reason did Paul give, as his rationale, for the change? Some kind of set of rules and regulations had gone out of effect when Jesus died on the Cross.

According to Bacchiocchi’s alternate and highly creative interpretation, what was nailed to the cross was not a list of rules and regulations, but rather a list of the sinner’s transgressions of those rules and regulations. He needs this premise to avoid the fact— fatal to Sabbatarianism— that the list of Jewish ordinances listed in the passage are the Old Covenant ordinances which became “shadows” because of something that happened at the cross. Even if we could not determine exactly what was nailed to the cross, Paul has actually told us all that we need to know when it comes to the Sabbath question. These ordinances are no longer enforceable. Let us see if Dr. Bacchiocchi can provide a convincing case for his idea of what was nailed to the cross. We will summarize each point from Sabbath under Crossfire (1998) and evaluate it according to biblical facts, concepts, and principles for the integrity of his logic:

**DR. B: THE SABBATH IS NOT MENTIONED IN THE CONTEXT OF A DIRECT DISCUSSION OF OLD COVENANT LAW. IT IS MENTIONED IN THE CONTEXT OF PAUL’S INSTRUCTIONS TO AVOID THE ASCETIC PRACTICES THAT WERE THE FOCUS OF THE FALSE TEACHERS (JUDAIZERS) — SYNCRETISTIC BELIEFS AND PRACTICES WHICH INCLUDED ELEMENTS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT. THEREFORE, WE MUST CONCLUDE THAT IT WAS NOT A SET OF LAWS, WHETHER THEY BE MORAL OR CEREMONIAL, THAT WAS NAILED TO THE CROSS.**

While it is true that Paul addressed more than one area of the false teachings of the Judaizers, the Sabbath was unquestionably mentioned in the list. From a standpoint of logic, the inclusion of other items has no power to negate the significance of the importance of any other element in the group. Furthermore, logic dictates that if he condemned all the things in this specific group without differentiating any level of condemnation for the items, all the items in the set must be approximately as wrong as any of the other items in the set. Thus, Paul is indicating that the observance of obsolete Jewish ordinances is just as bad as the practice of other syncretistic practices, including the worship of angels— hardly a flattering commentary on the value of Sabbath-keeping. It is interesting to note that Dr. Bacchiocchi acknowledges the fact that Paul included a condemnation of something that included elements from the Old Testament. Just what were these elements of the Old Testament?

A careful study of Colossians 2 clearly reveals that Paul was warning the Church of two dangers:

1. Greek philosophy.
2. Jewish traditions that would undermine the gospel.

In Colossians 2:8, he warns the Church about the dangers of heeding human traditions:

(NIV) “See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.”

But when it comes to which “elements” of the Old Testament Paul lumps with Greek philosophy and Jewish traditions, he is very specific. The “written code” has been canceled:

Colossians 2:13-15 (NIV): When you were dead in your sins and in the uncircumcision of your sinful nature, God made you alive with Christ. He forgave us all our sins, having canceled the written code, with its regulations, that was against us and that stood opposed to us; he took it away, nailing it to the cross. And having disarmed the powers and authorities, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross.”
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Paul continues, in Colossians 2:16-17, to explain what impact the cancellation of the Mosaic Law would have on the Church:

Colossians 2:16-17 (NIV) Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ.”

The Mosaic Law is the law set that requires the keeping of the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbath feast days, monthly sabbath feast days, and the weekly Sabbath.

The writer’s language is very clear in regard to the fact that there is no judgment in regard to the keeping or not keeping of these Jewish ordinances—so clear that even if we could not figure out why this was true, we would still understand that we were commanded not to judge in regard to the observance of these things. What other kind of a code has regulations? It sounds like a good description of the Torah, which had 613 of them. It is difficult how one could avoid the conclusion that Paul meant that the Torah was nailed to the cross. This most likely explanation makes sense when we understand the Hebrew way of thinking about Noachian Law versus Torah Law. The end of Torah law did not mean the end of all law to a Jew. Dr. Bacchiocchi does not seem to acknowledge any understanding of this concept, but it is difficult to imagine that he knew nothing about it.

At the highest level of interpretation, the Gospel of Jesus, as articulated by St. Paul, compels us to interpret this passage to mean that in so far as the process of determining the question of our salvation, all law sets of all kinds are nailed to the cross. If a Christian’s compliance with either Noachian or Torah law were to be used to determine our eligibility for salvation, not one of us would be saved. We have all violated not only the letter of the law, but the spirit of the law. Our motives are rotten, even if our outward actions appear to be compliant.

Paul made it very clear that the freedom from the fear that the LAW will be used to determine our salvation cannot be used to justify sinful living, and he even went so far as to list a group of sins that will keep a person out of Heaven. The Holy Spirit is the new LAW for the Christian, and the Holy Spirit would never lead a person into sin. The charge of Seventh-day Adventists that the concept that the entire LAW was nailed to the cross opens the flood-gate to sinful living is no more than a sensational claim. Surely the Christian does not refrain from sin merely because there is a written law against it. The Holy Spirit works on the heart to lead the Christian because of his or her love for both God and other people. This love “fulfills” the law; a concept hard to grasp for those ensconced in the letter of the law.

DR. B: WHAT WAS NAILED TO THE CROSS WAS NOT THE LAW ITSELF, BUT WAS THE WRITTEN RECORD OF OUR SINS AGAINST THAT LAW. THIS MAKES SENSE BECAUSE THE GREATER CONTEXT OF COLOSSIANS 2:14-17 IS GOD’S FORGIVENESS. PAUL DOES NOT USE THE GREEK WORD FOR LAW (NOMOS) ANYWHERE IN THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS, AND THE WORD PAUL USES IN THIS PASSAGE IS CHEIROGRAPHON, WHICH MEANS A WRITTEN DOCUMENT. IN APOCALYPTIC AND RABBINICAL LITERATURE, THE WORD CHEIROGRAPHON IS USED TO DENOTE THE "RECORD BOOK OF SINS" OR A "CERTIFICATE OF SIN INDEBTEDNESS."

1. Bacchiocchi admits that if the Greek word cheirographon does actually refer to the Mosaic laws, there is at least a possibility that this passage could include the weekly Sabbath as one of the ordinances that was nailed to the Cross. The problem for Bacchiocchi’s idea that the document nailed to the Cross was merely a record of our sins, rather than the law itself, is that in non-biblical Greek, this word has a number of meanings and may refer to (1) a labor contract, (2) a document giving authority to act, or even (3) to business agreements. It is misleading to say, then, that this word, as used in this passage, simply means the document itself upon which the debt is recorded. It would only make sense that the context in which this word is found would determine what kind of written document it is. This particular cheirographon is made up of “ordinances” and “decrees;” an interpretation demanded by Paul’s use of the Greek word, dogmasin, which is the word immediately following the word cheirographon and which modifies this word. An English equivalent example of a word with a modifier in this order would be “the color blue.” There are a number of colors. Which color is it? Blue! What kind of a written document is it? Decrees and laws! Who makes decrees and laws? The King! Who signed the law decree? God Himself! Notice that the same word, dogmasin, appears in a discussion of the Mosaic Law in Ephesians 2:15, indicating both texts deal with similar issues. (Credit for the information about Greek linguistics goes to Robert D. Brinsmead, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined.”)
It is highly significant to note that Paul's audience was a mixture of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Paul uses this language devoid of Hebraics, using *cheirographon*, knowing that both Jew and Gentile will understand what he is writing about. Dr. Bacchiocchi conveniently ignores Paul's audience.

Paul uses similar language in another passage, giving strength to the concept that Paul really did mean that the Law of Moses was nailed to the cross:

Ephesians 2:15 (NIV); “by abolishing in His flesh the law with its commandments and regulations.”

The context of this passage in Ephesians is to show that the TORAH was a major barrier between the Jews and the Gentiles and that it was God's purpose to destroy this barrier with the advent of the Messiah. Another link with this concept is Romans 7:8-13, which further establishes the idea that Paul is discussing the Law of Moses. Now look at Ephesians 2:15 and 16:

by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. (NIV)

Additionally, Paul was not writing for a rabbinical or apocalyptic audience. With the Epistle to the Colossians, he was addressing a general audience. Paul was a highly skilled and brilliant author. One would think he would have the sense to write for his target audience.

The Bible teaches that it is the Law of Moses that is “against us.” How can Dr. Bacchiocchi conclude that the Law of Moses is not against us when the Bible says it is?

Deut. 31:26 (NIV) - “Take this Book of the Law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God. There it will remain as a witness against you.

Removing the barrier between us and God created by the witness against us of the Old Covenant “Book of the Law” does not mean that some moral void has taken its place. There is the New Covenant of the Spirit, where the believer is led now by the Spirit of God in them. The spirit of the Law is therefore not lawlessness as implied by those who hold to the Old Covenant letter of the law. Faith and love are the criteria for fulfilling the Law as contrasted to the Old Covenant kept in the letter, where faith and love were absent.


When you go to court, you are being tried for breaking the law itself— not for breaking the written record of that transgression against that law. It is the accusing witness that stands in the middle of the court, and it is the law that accuses and condemns the defendant. If it is the law that accuses and if it is the law which “stands in the middle,” it would seem that it is the law itself that would be removed. When a judge hands down a pardon— an event very comparable to what happens when a human being is eternally saved— the “law” has to be removed, or “suspended” for that moment. Recall that Paul places the Greek word, *dogmasin*, which means “regulations” or “ordinances,” adjacent to the word, *cheirographon*, as a modifier, What type of written document is it? A list of regulations and ordinances! A piece of paper that documents a person’s transgression of a law is not the law itself. Dr. Bacchiocchi is unsuccessful in his attempt to exploit the court metaphor for his Sabbatarian bias. The commitment Dr. Bacchiocchi demonstrates to avoid the idea that the Torah was nailed to the cross appears to be the result of his need to read this passage in a way that will not conflict with his presupposition that Sabbatarianism is true.

DR. B: ADDITIONAL PROOF THAT PAUL IS SAYING THAT WHAT WAS NAILED TO THE CROSS WAS MERELY THE WRITTEN RECORD OF OUR SINS– NOT THE LEGAL GROUND (LAW) FOR OUR ENTANGLEMENT INTO SIN– IS THAT IN COLOSSIANS 2:15, THIS ACT OF FORGIVENESS DISARMS THE PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS. BECAUSE THESE EVIL POWERS CANNOT ACCUSE THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN FORGIVEN, YOU DON’T NEED THE HELP OF A SECONDARY MEDIATOR. THIS INTERPRETATION SEEMS TO SQUARE WITH, AGAIN, THE IMMEDIATE ARGUMENT OF COLOSSIANS 2:14-17, WHICH IS THE FULLNESS OF GOD’S FORGIVENESS.
Only a strong Sabbatarian bias could prompt a claim such as this. There can be no such thing as additional “proof” as Dr. Bacchiocchi would like to provide since his concept about Paul’s intended use of the Greek word *cheirographon* has been shown to be invalid. The immediate argument of this passage is clearly not the fullness of God’s forgiveness. The fact that forgiveness is one of the components of his statement does not identify it as the focus of the passage. The key theme, here, is that the death of Christ on the cross caused a whole set of Jewish ordinances to become obsolete because they were nailed to the cross with Him. The Judaizers and all other parties who attempt to establish unnecessary and obsolete barriers between God and His people, who are now made up of both Jews and Gentiles, are unwittingly teaching a false gospel and are in league with the “principalities and powers who are evil, and who wield this *cheirographon* for their own benefit.” William Hohmann comments:

> Jesus, as the God of the Old Testament, died on the cross, thus ending that covenant even as all such covenants end upon the death of either party to a covenant. Paul uses the marriage covenant in Romans 7 to explain this obvious fact regarding such covenants. Principalities and powers are those people in position of power and authority who wield their control through the Law and the administration of the Law. If they administer the law of the Old Testament to their own advantage, which they did, then the rug is pulled out from under them by removing the Law they use to control and rule unjustly over others. Even the devil could no longer bring accusation against one freed from that Law. – Wm. Hohmann

Paul indicates these things were accomplished by the death of Christ:

1. Our sins were forgiven.
2. A set of Jewish ordinances that were shadows of Him was set aside.
3. A great victory was won over principalities and powers, including Satan and his evil angels.

Of these three items, Paul gives additional explanation for the second item— the set of Jewish ordinances. He explains that this set of Jewish ordinances has become obsolete because they were merely shadows of things that were to come and that the Reality shadowed by these things is Christ Himself.

To his credit, Dr. Bacchiocchi does not stoop to use the poorly conceived Sabbatarian argument that “things to come” is a reference to events that were still future in relationship to the time Paul was writing his letters to the Churches. The time reference for “things to come” would have to be the time the Mosaic Law was given, since these ordinances were instituted at that time.

**DR. B: THE WEEKLY SABBATH IS NOT THE TARGET OF COLOSSIANS 2:14-17 BECAUSE PAUL IS NOT CONDEMNING THE TEACHINGS OF MOSES REGARDING JEWISH DIETARY LAWS, CEREMONIAL ANNUAL AND MONTHLY SABBATHS, AND THE WEEKLY SABBATH. INSTEAD, HE IS MERELY CONDEMNING THE EXTRA MAN-MADE REGULATIONS IMPOSED ON THE KEEPING OF JEWISH DIETARY LAWS, ANNUAL SABBATHS, MONTHLY SABBATHS, AND THE WEEKLY SABBATH ITSELF BY THE FALSE TEACHERS. “A PRECEPT IS NOT NULLIFIED BY THE CONDEMNATION OF ITS PERVERSION.”**

Whatever Paul was “targeting,” that “thing” got nailed to the cross. As you may recall from an earlier discussion, Bacchiocchi teaches that it was the written record of our sins that got nailed to the cross— at least plausible, but not the case as is so eloquently established by Robert D. Brinsmead in “Sabbatarianism Re-examined.” The very structure of Paul’s statement and the facts of Greek linguistics forbid any pathway of logic leading to Bacchiocchi’s explanation. Let us review the possible candidates for what might have gotten nailed to the cross that might come to mind:

The extra rules and regulations supposedly invented by the Judaizers – As we have noted already, Dr. Bacchiocchi does not even suggest this candidate himself. It wouldn’t make sense that an Act of God would be needed to do away with human traditions. He teaches that it was a written record of our sins that was nailed to the cross— a metaphor that is forbidden by the logistical constraints of the text itself.

The body of laws God gave to all the world at the very beginning, which are not formally codified by Moses in his writings, but which clearly exist because of numerous references to such laws throughout the Book of Genesis – This is not likely, since this would make no more sense than turning off all the traffic signals in New York City at rush hour. Dr. Bacchiocchi himself does not mention this possibility. If he were to do so, the implications would be self-incriminating. It would explain how Paul could talk about the TORAH being nailed to the cross without giving people the freedom to violate “natural” law. Since the mentioned but non-codified laws discussed in the Book of Genesis are, for the most part, simply “scientific” statements of cause and effect, not particularly different than, let’s say, the laws of gravity, they could not be nailed to the cross any more easily than the events of the cross could have stopped the Earth from spinning.
The “ceremonial” part of the TORAH, and not the “moral” part, was nailed to the cross. – Dr. Bacchiocchi does not suggest this himself. It is one of the traditional SDA arguments, which he knows is not even possible, in view of how the Jews thought about the TORAH as a fully integrated and inseparable unit. Furthermore, it would destroy the only possibility of demonstrating that the Sabbath is validated by Colossians 2:14-17, rather than set aside by it —made necessary since there is no way around the fact that the Sabbath of Colossians 2:14-17 is a reference to the Weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue.

A written record of our sins as taught by Dr. Bacchiocchi – We have seen that the structure of Paul’s statement in Colossians 2:14-17 places modifiers by the words in the passage that identify the written document as rules and regulations (dogmasin). Rules and regulations are far different from a record of a person’s transgressions of those rules and regulations. Review the in-depth study of this “candidate” presented earlier. This is Bacchiocchi’s choice, but it is a virtually impossible one that is inconsistent with a wide variety of other factors. There is no written record of our sins available to be nailed to the cross – at least not in this passage.

The TORAH: a special set of laws for Jews only, designed to govern Israel from the Exodus to the Cross – We are consistent with the content and context of the text, as well as the major themes and concepts of the Bible, in concluding that what was nailed to the cross was the TORAH— a special group of laws designed to reign in the rebellious nature of the Jews and keep them headed in the right direction between the Exodus and the cross. It is also a simple explanation that even a child can understand by just reading the passage itself. The TORAH contained the laws requiring the Jewish ordinances of the dietary laws and Sabbath systems, including the weekly Sabbath. These ordinances, and especially the Sabbath rest, pointed forward to Christ as symbols of Him. Once He died on the cross, symbol met Reality. Now that the Real Thing has arrived, the shadowy symbols were no longer necessary, just like you can snuff out the candles when the flood lights are turned on.

There is no reason to accept Dr. Bacchiocchi’s evasive solution to this problem and every reason to stand with the straightforward reading of the passage. The “shadows” were the Jewish ordinances and they were nailed to the cross in the sense that the temporary law set that required their observance was nailed to the cross. Paul was “targeting” the TORAH with its Jewish ordinances. A set of humanly authored rules and regulations does not even qualify as a candidate for something that requires the death of Christ on the cross to be made of no effect.

DR. B: THE JEWISH ORDINANCES LISTED BY PAUL ARE NOT LABELED BY PAUL AS THINGS THAT ARE SHADOWS OF CHRIST AND WHICH POINTED FORWARD TO HIS COMING. THE “SHADOWS.” INSTEAD, ARE THE MAN-MADE RULES AND REGULATIONS CREATED BY THE JUDAIZERS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING THESE JEWISH ORDINANCES EVEN MORE RIGOROUS TO OBSERVE THAN THE MOSAIC REQUIREMENTS THEMSELVES. THE PRONOUN “THESE” IN “THESE THINGS” REFERS BACK FURTHER TO THE ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS IMPOSED BY THE FALSE TEACHERS– NOT TO JEWISH ORDINANCES THEMSELVES. DR. EDWARD LOHSE, AN IMPORTANT NON-SABBATARIAN EVANGELICAL BIBLE SCHOLAR, SUPPORTS MY [BACCHIOCCHI SPEAKING OF HIS] VIEW ON THIS PARTICULAR POINT.

If judged by conventional principles of literary evaluation, a pronoun must be viewed as referring to something in the sentence or paragraph immediately before it unless such a reading clearly cannot be accommodated within any sense of propriety. In view of the fact that there is no compelling reason to reject the standard literary expectation in this situation, other than Dr. Bacchiocchi’s a priori bias toward Sabbatarianism, any disinterested party of biblical scholars would likely agree that the items in Paul’s list are, indeed, shadows of things that pointed forward to Christ and were nailed to the Cross. In particular, the weekly Sabbath, as we mentioned earlier, was spoken of by the Jews as a symbol of the rest for God’s people, both in the (incorrectly) anticipated earthly Messianic kingdom and in the Paradise beyond the grave.

Dr. Bacchiocchi has resorted to a logical fallacy commonly called “an appeal to authority.” Dr. Lohse, as a highly respected theologian, is a valuable resource, but he is still subject to errors of interpretation and understanding. That Dr. Lohse would agree with Dr. Bacchiocchi then, by itself, is no more definitive than taking Dr. Bacchiocchi’s own opinion. Neither author provides the proper evidence to support this position.

Dr. Lohse appears not to have thought the whole issue through to its logical conclusion. Perhaps he stands in awe of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s tremendous stature as the acknowledged world authority on the seventh day Sabbath and has allowed himself to be taken in by one of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s occasional lapses of scholarly excellence. Perhaps he simply cannot comprehend the gripping, overwhelming fixation that compels a dyed-in-the-wool Sabbatarian to protect this belief at all costs. If Dr. Bacchiocchi’s reading of this passage is correct, and if his primary way of defending Colossians 2:14-17 in general is correct, Dr. Lohse needs to lead the world of Evangelical Christianity to Judaization. Evangelical Churches would have to open their doors on Sabbath morning, no pork could be served at potlucks, and Church members would be observing all of the sabbath feast days. Perhaps we would find the Evangelical Churches camping out annually to celebrate the Feast of the Tabernacles in Jerusalem, performing the required sacrifices. One way to evaluate the TRUTH of a teaching is to follow it to the end of its logical conclusion.
The Judaization of Christianity cannot be the TRUTH because it clearly opposes everything Paul stood for as God’s personally chosen spokesperson for interpreting Christianity to the Gentiles. Paul warned his readers that his Gospel of Grace was the only true gospel and that they were to reject anyone who taught a “different gospel.” Clearly, a gospel of grace plus the requirement to keep a set of obsolete Jewish ordinances as a requirement for salvation is a “different gospel.” Because the teaching purports to achieve a higher level of righteousness than the Gospel of Paul, a teacher of such a theory might be suspect as a wolf in sheep’s clothing. In I Timothy 1:5-7, Paul says that those who turn away from a faith-based gospel to teaching the law do not know what they are talking about.

The term “shadow” is used two other times in a figurative sense in the book of Hebrews (Heb. 8:5 and 10:1), and in both cases it is in association with the Law of Moses.

We have seen that it is impossible to get around the fact that the weekly Sabbath is classified, by Paul, with a group of things that are now obsolete because they were mere shadows of “things to come.” The weekly Sabbath, as a Jewish institution, looked both backward to Creation and forward to Christ. The Reality has already come in the person of Christ.

Paul teaches that something that happened when Jesus died on the Cross caused the Jewish ordinances in this list to become of no importance to both Jews and Gentiles. The Gentiles were “grafted” into Israel. The Christian Jew and the Christian Gentile are now one body in Christ. The “barrier” that stood between them, the TORAH, was ripped down by God Himself when Jesus died on the cross.

A study of a literal Greek translation (available at http://www.olivetree.com of Colossians 2:14-17 demonstrates that there is no need to question what kind of written document is indicated or which things are shadows. It appears straightforward that what is against us is found in the handwriting composed of decrees. How can you possibly get a list of sins committed by a certain individual out of the term decrees? See Deut. 31:26 (NIV)

> “Take this Book of the Law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God. There it will remain as a witness against you.”

Also, there is nothing else that “which” could refer to as a shadow other than the things listed. What kind of scholarship is represented by an effort to prove that it refers to something that isn’t even hinted at in the original language?

> 14. {HAVING BLOTTED OUT} {THE} {AGAINST} {US} ceiograpon {HANDWRITING} {IN} {THE} dogmasin {DECREES,}
> 15. {HAVING STRIPPED} {THE} {PRINCIPALITIES} {AND} {THE} {AUTHORITIES,} {HE MADE A SHOW [OF THEM]}
> 16. {NOT} {THEREFORE} {ANYONE} {YOU} {LET JUDGE} {IN} {MEAT} {OR} {DRINK,} {OR} {IN} {RESPECT} {OF FEAST,
> 17. {WHICH} {ARE} {A SHADOW} {OF THINGS} {TO COME;} {BUT} {THE} {BODY [IS]} {OF THE} {CHRIST.}

When we add up all of these considerations, we see that the extra man-made rules and regulations for observing the Jewish dietary laws and all the sabbaths cannot possibly be what was nailed to the cross. If this were to be the case we would appear to need an act of God to make of no effect laws written by human beings. Man-made rules are not used in Scripture to represent large spiritual events or truths; so equating these humanly devised regulations with “shadows” violates a key concept of biblical principles. Jesus cannot be symbolized (shadowed) by man-made rules and regulations.
(NIV) Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing judgment on disputable matters. One man’s faith allows him to eat everything, but another man, whose faith is weak, eats only vegetables. The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him. Who are you to judge someone else’s servant? To his own master he stands or falls. And he will stand, for the Lord is able to make him stand. One man considers one day more sacred than another; another man considers every day alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind. He who regards one day as special does so to the Lord. He who eats meat eats to the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who abstains, does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God. For none of us lives to himself alone and none of us dies to himself alone. If we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die to the Lord. So, whether we live or die, we belong to the Lord.

DR. B: ANY ATTEMPT TO SEE THE SABBATH AS ONE OF THE DAYS REFERRED TO IN THIS PASSAGE IS NOT POSSIBLE SINCE THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE WEAK AND THE STRONG OVER DIET AND DAYS CAN NOT BE TRACED BACK TO THE MOSAIC LAW. THE WHOLE DISCUSSION HERE IS NOT ABOUT THE OBLIGATION TO KEEP THE LAW VERSUS FREEDOM FROM ITS OBSERVANCE, BUT RATHER CONCERNS UNNECESSARY SCRUPLES OF CONSCIENCE CAUSED BY HUMAN CONVENTIONS AND SUPERSTITIONS.

Bacchiocchi is correct that the conflict between the weak and the strong can’t be traced back to the Mosaic Law. Whether you are weak or strong, you keep the covenant rules, or you die. If you pick up sticks or carry a burden on the Sabbath, you are put to death. A mention of this fact does nothing to further the examination of the Sabbath question.

Since there is no TORAH observance without circumcision, and since the Gentile converts do not have to be circumcised and therefore cannot keep the Laws of Moses, the discussion is, indeed, about the obligation to keep the Law versus freedom from its observance. Christians are free from its observance. Paul says not to be concerned about disputable matters. The fact that the Sabbath can be disputed is a clear indication that it is not something about which to judge someone. We are in the process of disputing the Sabbath by the very act of writing this book. By contrast, we could not possibly write a credible paper to convince people that they could kill, steal, or commit adultery. In fact, were we to discover tomorrow that there was no God—no Heaven to win or Hell to shun—we would not write a paper like that. Even without an eternal judgment to face, just the natural consequences of these behaviors would create a hell on Earth for us, were we to be so foolish, right in the here and now.

The question raised by this passage of Scripture actually is, “An adherence or lack of adherence to what set of dietary laws and sacred days determines whether a Christian is to be considered weak or strong?” Let us apply a little logic to this question and work at it by the process of elimination:

1. Dr. Bacchiocchi wishes us to believe that these unnecessary scruples of conscience are merely in regard to the traditional man-made rules and regulations for keeping the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbaths, monthly sabbaths, and the weekly Sabbath. However, as has been demonstrated earlier, the Jewish ordinances themselves are targeted in Paul’s list of practices that are obsolete because they are “shadows.” In Paul’s mind, the Christian is weak or strong, depending on his or her willingness to reject all unnecessary and irrelevant practices, whether they are man-made or part of a divinely instituted covenant which God Himself has declared obsolete. This statement of Paul’s is consistent with other things he has said about day sacredness throughout his writings. There is every reason to reject Dr. Bacchiocchi’s reading of this passage and no reason to accept it.

2. It is similarly impossible to think that Paul was discussing how a Christian could be judged to be weak or strong on the basis of his or her rejection of pagan dietary laws and pagan sacred days in this particular passage. Did the pagans have any dietary laws at all? The only pagan dietary law we know of is you can eat anything you want. Would a Christian be judged to be strong or weak on the basis of his or her attachment to pagan sacred days? It would seem that any interest in observing pagan sacred days would be considered a weakness on the part of a Christian.

There is only one reasonable answer left. Since the Torah was fulfilled in Christ, its requirements exist no more. Adherence to its requirements brought a real sense of security to the Israelites under the terms of the Mosaic Covenant, but under the terms of the New Covenant, any degree of reliance on obsolete ordinances for a sense of spiritual security would be considered a sign of weakness on the part of a Christian. Instead, it is a sign of strength to be able to find
security in Christ and His Grace, rather than in the observance of arbitrary ordinances. The very idea that any day of the year has any sacredness in-and-of-itself is superstition, whether those days are sacred to pagans or Jews.

Since all days are now alike, there is nothing wrong with keeping any one of those days if the motivation for keeping such a day is not to win God’s favor but to honor Him. Thus, Paul is teaching the Roman community of Christians that the Gentile Christians should not condemn the Jewish Christians for keeping the Sabbath and the Jewish Christians should not condemn their Gentile brothers and sisters for not keeping the Sabbath.

DR. B: PAUL, IN THIS PASSAGE, APPLIES THE BASIC PRINCIPLE “OBSERVE IT IN HONOR OF THE LORD” ONLY TO THE CASE OF THE PERSON “WHO OBSERVES THE DAY.” IN THIS MATTER, PAUL MAKES A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DIET ISSUE AND THE “DAYS” ISSUE. HE DOES NOT SAY THAT THE PERSON WHO REGARDS ALL THE DAYS ALIKE DOES SO TO THE LORD. THEREFORE, PAUL DOES NOT GIVE HIS STAMP OF APPROVAL TO THOSE WHO THINK IN TERMS OF ALL DAYS BEING ALIKE.

This is one of the most remarkable statements Dr. Bacchiocchi has ever made. As Jesus’ specially chosen interpreter of New Covenant Christianity to the Gentiles, it was Paul’s responsibility to point out any real spiritual problem. Paul even rebuked Peter for slitting his Gentile brothers, and he was not known for remaining silent when confronted with error. Knowing Paul, he would have rebuked any Christian who might think in terms of all days being alike if this view was wrong. Since the Sabbath was a particular day, and since Dr. Bacchiocchi thinks that Paul did not teach that Christians don’t have to keep the Jewish Sabbath, would not Dr. Bacchiocchi expect a pointed rebuke to all those who were so “misguided” as to regard every day alike? If Sabbatarianism were true (which it clearly isn’t), those who regarded every day as alike would be wicked violators of an eternal, moral principle. The logic of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s argument is absent. In some cases, actively doing something honors God. In other cases, refraining from doing something honors God. We honor God by giving our offerings with a willing heart. At the same time I honor him by not swearing by His name. Paul puts both concerns for ceremonial dietary laws and the ceremonial superstition about the special qualities of any day in the same basket as non-essentials. Since days have no intrinsic sacredness, what difference does it matter if you observe a day or if you don’t? The answer is that it doesn’t.

DR. B: IF PAUL HAD SET ASIDE THE SABBATH, THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS WOULD HAVE ATTACKED PAUL VICIOUSLY, LIKE THEY DID OVER HIS EFFORTS TO SET ASIDE CIRCUMCISION. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF SUCH A CONTROVERSY ANYWHERE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, INDICATING THAT PAUL NEVER DISCOURAGED SABBATH KEEPING OR ENCOURAGED SUNDAY KEEPING INSTEAD.

The Jewish Christians, and especially the Judaizers, vehemently opposed the exemption from circumcision for the Gentiles because they knew that this automatically exempted them from Sabbath-keeping as well. Can Dr. Bacchiocchi really be as theologically uninformed as not to understand exactly why there was such a huge fight over circumcision? As we have learned earlier, the Sabbath and circumcision cannot be separated. We have seen that neither Jew nor Gentile could keep the Sabbath without the circumcision requirements being met. Therefore, when the Council of Jerusalem decided not to impose the rite of circumcision on the Gentiles, the Sabbath perished forever with it. This is why the New Testament does not mention a requirement for Christians to keep the Sabbath thereafter. Nearly everything Jewish about Christianity was destroyed at the Council of Jerusalem. The gateway to Sabbath observance within the Jewish community had always been closed to anyone who was unwilling to be circumcised, whether Jew or Gentile. Without circumcision for the new Gentile converts, there could be no Sabbath-keeping for them. Perhaps a review of this matter is in order.

The Bible teaches that the Gentile/alien must go through the same process of becoming a Jew by circumcision if he wanted to participate in the Jewish religion. In fact a Jew was a Gentile till he was circumcised.

Exodus 12:48-49 (New International Version)

“An alien living among you who wants to celebrate the LORD’s Passover must have all the males in his household circumcised; then he may take part like one born in the land. No uncircumcised male may eat of it. The same law applies to the native-born and to the alien living among you.”

Exodus 12:43-45 (New International Version)

Passover Restrictions

The LORD said to Moses and Aaron, “These are the regulations for the Passover: “No foreigner is to eat of it. Any slave you have bought may eat of it after you have circumcised him, but a temporary resident and a hired worker may not eat of it.”
Leviticus 24:22 (New International Version)

You are to have the same law for the alien and the native-born. I am the LORD your God.’"

Jewish scholars from the very beginning of Jewish history have understood that the TORAH was given only to the Hebrews. By the time of Jesus, the typical Jew may not have been aware of the fact that they, as a people, had never believed that the Gentiles would be lost by not keeping the TORAH. Instead, Jewish thought has always held the belief that the Gentiles would be saved if they kept the Noachian laws. In fact, Jewish traditional law called for the stoning of a Gentile who kept the Sabbath without first being circumcised. (This applied to the Gentile who had chosen to become a part of the Jewish community. The Sabbath commandment itself provided that temporary guests—travelers, for example—were to keep the Sabbath with their Jewish hosts.)

Paul, in his letter to the Romans, had to use a different approach than in his letter to the Colossians. With a large number of Jewish Christians living in Rome at the time, Paul was careful to show that the Jewish Christians were free to continue to keep the Sabbath. The idea that Sabbath-keeping became intrinsically wrong after the Cross is not part of Paul's teachings.

Dr. Bacchiocchi presents the fact that Paul never encouraged Sunday observance as evidence that Paul never taught that the Gentiles did not have to keep the Sabbath. If the Pauline theory of Sabbath abandonment is true, this fact would be no surprise. Of course Paul never encouraged Sunday keeping because there is no intrinsic sacredness or "holy magic" about Sunday. Sunday was chosen by Christians for a variety of reasons. Meeting together on the Sabbath was not practical. Every New Testament reference to the Apostles being in the synagogues on Sabbaths mentions the fact that they were there to witness to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah. Additionally, Jesus stated that His followers would be cast out of the synagogues for following Him. Also, understanding the teachings of Paul that Sabbath observance was now optional, they may have had communal worship on Sundays so as to distance themselves from the Jews and Judaism, as well as allow those Jewish Christians to rest on the Sabbath. During this period of time, the Jews were highly disliked within the Roman Empire for their frequent uprisings against the government. Jesus rose from the grave on Sunday. Any other day of the week would have been appropriate, but Sunday had special significance to the believers. The fact that Christians chose Sunday as the day to meet with each other was not merely an accident, but neither was it a choice governed by the concept of day sacredness.

Finally, it is difficult to imagine that Paul would write to the Christians in Rome, counsel them about how they should relate to the observance of sacred days, and fail to give them any instructions about how they should relate to the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. Circumcision was included in Paul's comments, and circumcision was excluded from things to be required of the Gentile converts. Since keeping the Sabbath was not provided for within a Jewish community without circumcision, the Sabbath issue was dead.

With a large number of Jewish Christians in its membership, Paul would need to take a somewhat softer approach in conveying the truth about the Sabbath and other Jewish sacred days than he did when writing to the predominantly Gentile Colossian Church. The diversity in the make-up of the Church at Rome prompted Paul to be concerned about them arguing about things that are not essential to the Gospel. He talks about how the LAW is fulfilled by genuine love. A review of Romans 13 is a good way to help understand the context of Paul’s statement in the next chapter. Back in Romans 2, he talked about the principles of the Law being in the hearts of the Gentiles through their consciences. Thanks to our understanding of the Jewish differentiation between Noachian and Torah law, it is likely that Paul was thinking in terms of Noachian law when he wrote this passage:

ROMANS 2:12-16 (NIV) - All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not those who hear the law who are righteous in God’s sight, but it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous. (Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law, since they show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts now accusing, now even defending them.) This will take place on the day when God will judge men’s secrets through Jesus Christ, as my gospel declares.
The Gospel of Grace as taught by Paul teaches that there is no salvation earned by Gentiles who follow their consciences or Jews who follow the TORAH. Both the Gentile and the Jew are equally condemned for their failure to measure up to a perfect Godly standard. Paul’s statement in Romans 2:12-16 seems to teach that at least some Gentiles will do well on Judgment Day. It is difficult to comprehend how Dr. Bacchiocchi could possibly conclude that keeping a set of Jewish ordinances could suddenly become essential for Gentiles in the Christian era.

Bacchiocchi argues that the New Testament writers are totally silent about Sunday observance for Christians and that this fact proves Sabbatarianism. This argument is not valid, since the New Testament writers discuss the obsolescence of Sabbath-keeping: (1) Circumcision is a required entrance sign for observing the Sabbath, and Paul clearly taught that the Early Church made the decision at the Council of Jerusalem that circumcision was not to be required of the Gentiles coming into the Church. (2) Colossians 2:14-17 is a direct command against requiring the observance of the weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. (3) The Law of Moses must include the Sabbath of the Decalogue simply cause to claim the Decalogue was not part of the Law of Moses means that the Jewish members pushing for circumcision and the Law of Moses were claiming Gentiles had to keep the ceremonial laws in order to be saved, but not the Decalogue.

At the same time he argues that the apostles kept the Sabbath because they went to the Jewish synagogues on the Sabbath day, supposedly setting the example for Christians to follow. This logic is also flawed. The apostles went into the Jewish synagogues on the Sabbath day to witness to them that Christ was, indeed, the Messiah. They went as missionaries. Also, every recorded time when Christians met together themselves, they met on the first day of the week—not on the Jewish Sabbath.

DR. BACCHIOCCHI ON GALATIANS 4:9-11

Please study Galatians chapter 4 for the complete context:

GALATIANS 4:8-11 (NIV) - Formerly, when you did not know God, you were slaves to those who by nature are not gods. But now that you know God—or rather are known by God—how is it that you are turning back to those weak and miserable principles? Do you wish to be enslaved by them all over again? You are observing special days and months and seasons and years! I fear for you, that somehow I have wasted my efforts on you.

DR. B: THE DAYS OF THIS PASSAGE IN GALATIANS ARE NOT A REFERENCE TO THE JEWISH CALENDAR OF SPECIAL DAYS, BUT A REFERENCE TO THE SPECIAL DAYS OF THE PAGAN CALENDAR. THEREFORE, THIS PASSAGE IS NOT DIRECTED AT THE JEWISH FEAST DAYS OR WEEKLY SABBATH.

The root of the problem with Dr. Bacchiocchi’s Sabbatarian interpretation of Galatians 4:10-11 is his singular failure to recognize a massive theme that runs from one end of the Bible to the other, in that the jurisdiction of the TORAH was to be temporary. As we have seen, earlier, the Bible clearly teaches that God did not make the TORAH Covenant with His people prior to Mt. Sinai. Amazingly, in Galatians 3, just one chapter before this passage, Paul is talking about the TORAH having a certain beginning and a certain end. The beginning was at the Exodus, it being added to the Abrahamic Covenant, and it was to end when the Messiah arrived. Please examine Galatians 3:15-19:

Brothers, let me take an example from everyday life. Just as no one can set aside or add to a human covenant that has been duly established, so it is in this case. The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. The Scripture does not say “and to seeds,” meaning many people, but “and to your seed,” meaning one person, who is Christ. What I mean is this: The law, introduced 430 years later, does not set aside the covenant previously established by God and thus do away with the promise. For if the inheritance depends on the law, then it no longer depends on a promise; but God in his grace gave it to Abraham through a promise. What, then, was the purpose of the law? It was added because of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise referred has come.

Dr. Bacchiocchi turns to Dr. Troy Martin for support for his idea that this passage in Galatians is a reference to their return to the observation of the sacred days of the pagan calendar, rather than those of the Jewish calendar. Dr. Martin, Professor of Religious Studies at Xavier University in Chicago, published two articles in New Testament Studies and the Journal of Biblical Literature. He cites Martin as saying that the days of Colossians 2:14-17 are definitely Jewish but that the days of Galatians 4:10 seem to be characteristic of the pagan calendar. Bacchiocchi states that Martin reaches this
conclusion on the “time structure” of pagan calendars, as well as the immediate context of Paul’s statement, which appears to be “pagan” as evidenced by their “renewed pre-conversion reckoning of time.”

In regard to their analysis of what Paul meant in this passage, what both scholars fail to realize is that a COMPARISON between two similar ideas does not perform the function of setting context. This is an error of logic, because it simply does not follow. The thrust of Galatians is directed against the influence of Judaizers— not “paganizers.”

Paul chides the Galatians for trading their former slavery to the observance of the days of the pagan calendar for the slavery of their unfortunately adopted observance of the days of the Jewish calendar. He is saying that observing either set of holy days is a violation of the principles of the freedom that the Gospel brings. No day has any holiness in and of itself, and the need to observe either set of holy days represents a superstition of one kind or another.

The context of Chapter Four of Galatians is a focus on fighting the Judaizers from Jerusalem. By the time we get to verse 17, Paul calls the reader’s attention back to the previous and over-all context of his remarks:

(NIV) 17 Those people are zealous to win you over, but for no good. What they want is to alienate you from us, so that you may be zealous for them. It is fine to be zealous, provided the purpose is good, and to be so always and not just when I am with you.

If Dr. Bacchiocchi and Dr. Martin had read just a little further in this chapter, they would have noted that by this statement, Paul dispelled any possible confusion about whether he was talking about a return to pagan principles or to the slavery of the Law of Moses. Look at verse 21:

(NIV) 21 Tell me, you who want to be under the law, are you not aware of what the law says?

“Those people” refers to Judaizers— not to paganizers. There is no suggestion here that Paul was addressing a problem of pagans trying to win back the new Gentile converts to heathenism. He states plainly that the concern is over their desire to be under the LAW, again-clearly a reference to the TORAH. There is simply no license in this statement of Paul’s to use one’s theological imagination to force this passage to read in a manner favorable to Sabbatarianism. Martin, who is not a Sabbatarian, seems oblivious to the overwhelming compulsion of Dr. Bacchiocchi to force everything Paul wrote into a light that is favorable to Sabbatarianism. Since the context of this passage is unquestionably one of Jewish things, common sense tells us that we must acknowledge that this is a linguistic question of comparison— not context. This comparison is between the slavery to the days of the pagan calendar to the slavery to the days of the Jewish calendar. The idea that any day on any calendar has intrinsic sacredness and must be honored is superstitious, whether it is a pagan superstition or a Jewish superstition.

In this text, Paul recognizes that the Galatians know God. Logic tells us that if Paul says these people have basically a good relationship with God, he is not likely to mean that he is afraid that these Gentile believers are being tempted to return to pagan practices. Rather, they are just in danger of thinking that they have to observe obsolete Jewish ordinances to keep His favor or enhance their Christianity. In the Book of Hebrews, the author is addressing the problem that the Jewish Christians are being tempted to go back to Judaism and to the inferior things there. If the Jew could be tempted to return to Judaism, it is certainly possible that the Gentile could be tempted to return to heathenism. But Paul clearly indicates in the context in which this passage is found that he is concerned that the Galatians seem to want to return to the LAW, which is exclusive to Judaism; so, again, we are biblically justified in rejecting Bacchiocchi’s attempt to make us believe that the Sabbath cannot be one of the “days” included in this passage.

DR. B: THE “DAYS” OF GALATIANS 4:10-11 COULD NOT REFER TO THE JEWISH CALENDAR REGARDING SPECIAL DAYS BECAUSE THE PHRASE “ELEMENTAL SPIRITS OF THE UNIVERSE” IS TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH FROM THE GREEK WORDS STOIKEIA TOU KOSMOU, WHICH MOST SCHOLARS INTERPRET AS THE BASIC ELEMENTS WHICH THE PAGANS THOUGHT THE WORLD WAS MADE OF- EARTH, WATER, AIR, FIRE, OR PAGAN GODS WHO CONTROLLED HUMAN EVENTS.

We have reviewed the chapter’s context and have found that Paul gives us all the clarification of context that any reasonable reader would expect. Galatians 4:1-7 is a discussion about sacred law. Verse 17 makes it clear that he is discussing the worrisome influence of the Judaizers, and verse 21 clearly identifies the LAW as the subject under discussion. Therefore, there is no compelling reason to believe Paul was expressing concern in this passage that his beloved Galatians were beginning to observe their former pagan sacred days. The translators of the NIV chose to translate the words stoikeia tou kosmou as “principles.” From the Greek-Interlinear Bible http://www.olivetree.com, we find these possible meanings for this word [stoikeia] in the Greek language:
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After discussing the enslavement of the Galatians as represented by their return to the keeping of special days, months, seasons, and years, Paul moves on in Galatians 4:21-31 to explain the two covenants. The first covenant – the Sinaitic Covenant – is represented as a body of arbitrary requirements to which the Jews were slaves. The second covenant is represented not only as freedom from the requirements of the Sinaitic Covenant, but the new freedom to be found in Christ under Grace with the motive of following Christ as a result of the transformation of the heart.

It is strange that when Paul himself uses the term “slavery” to describe the bondage of the Jews to the Law which required them to observe a large calendar of holy days, Dr. Bacchiocchi would presume to declare that Paul is referring to the calendar of pagan holy days. It is clear that Paul is referring to Jewish sacred days because the Book of Galatians is devoted almost entirely to combating the influence of the Judaizers, and the Judaizers were advocating that the Galatians embrace the observance of Jewish, not pagan, holy days. Notice Paul's words in Galatians 5:1:

Gal 5:1 (NIV) It is for freedom that Christ has set us free. Stand firm, then, and do not let yourselves be burdened again by a yoke of slavery.

Paul is clearly concerned that his beloved Galatians are being wrongly influenced by the Judaizers to think that their salvation is dependent on, or enhanced by, observing the sacred days of the Jewish calendar.

Dr. Martin may believe these “days” are pagan, but another well-respected scholar, disagrees. The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament says that the “days” of Galatians 4:10 “are in the first instance Sabbaths, though they include other days too, e.g., the Day of Atonement (Eduard Lohse, The Sabbath In The New Testament, 7:30, footnote 232, quoted in Robert D. Brinsmead, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined.”) This assessment is in keeping with the sentence structure, as noted earlier, that Hebrew writers used when talking about the Law of Moses.

Also consider that Paul knew how to use the Greek language very well. It could be that no one has ever done such a good job of putting the most profound spiritual truths into language that, in general, can be understood by most readers. Because of his good command of language, it is almost inconceivable that Paul would not add a “disclaimer” to this passage if the weekly Sabbath were still required of Christians. He would add something like, “I don’t mean you shouldn’t keep the 7th Day Sabbath.” Since Paul was a highly articulate writer under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, he knew what affect his words would have on his immediate target audience. There can be no doubt that Paul’s words were inspired by the Holy Spirit in view of how this passage would be understood by readers down through time.

In the next chapter, Galatians 5, we find Paul talking about the LAW again. He teaches that those who attempt to keep the law have fallen from grace.

Gal 5:2–4 (NIV) - Mark my words! I, Paul, tell you that if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no value to you at all. Again I declare to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obligated to obey the whole law. You who are trying to be justified by law have been alienated from Christ; you have fallen away from grace.
In keeping with the theme of the Book of Galatians, Paul continues with a discussion of the LAW, which continues his explanation that the TORAH has been replaced with non-arbitrary laws that are written on the heart through the Holy Spirit. This is in line with the concept that moral laws are simply statements of cause and effect. In the first chapter of the book of John, John writes that everyone who is born into the world is influenced by the Spirit of God. There is a basic understanding of right and wrong in all cultures and all societies. For example, if you steal something from someone and that person wants his or her property back badly enough to fight you for it, one or both of you may die in that fight. A Gentile growing up in the darkest recesses of Africa can see these self-evident truths, and the Holy Spirit is there to convict through the conscience. However, that same heathen person will never come to the self-evident conclusion that he must not do any work on one of the days of the week, much less be able to figure out, as a self-evident principle, that he should not work on the 7th day of the week. His “week” might have 10 days, or 17 days, or he may have no concept of a week at all. If a law is self-evident and based on natural cause and effect, it is a moral law with eternal implications. If a law is not based on a self-evident principle of natural cause and effect, it is not a moral law and must be classified as ceremonial and temporary. Paul teaches that after the cross the new covenant Christians are led by the law of the Spirit and not the Law of Moses. Christians know what real sin is without having to look at a codified set of laws. Furthermore, Paul says that the Mosaic Law was made for the lawbreakers– those that commit gross sins; those who have a lifestyle of sin. There is never an excuse for breaking a moral law. This cannot possibly be said of the Sabbath law! It is the Sabbatarian who, by fiat, declares the Sabbath to be a moral law. A few examples of when the Sabbath law could be broken include the following examples:

The work of circumcising a child on the 8th day if the 8th day fell on the Sabbath

Rescuing an ox from a ditch.

The example of when the Israelites marched around the City of Jericho for seven days in a row.

15 Joshua 6:5 (NIV) - On the seventh day, they got up at daybreak and marched around the city seven times in the same manner, except that on that day they circled the city seven times.

The army of Israel was even commanded by God to fight and kill on the Sabbath as in the following example:

1 Kings 20:29 – 30 (NIV) - For seven days they camped opposite each other, and on the seventh day the battle was joined. The Israelites inflicted a hundred thousand casualties on the Aramean foot soldiers in one day. The rest of them escaped to the city of Aphek, where the wall collapsed on twenty-seven thousand of them. And Ben-Hadad fled to the city and hid in an inner room.

The Bible teaches that the LAW is not designed for the righteous:

9 1 Tim. 1:9–11 (NIV) - We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers-and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

It is impossible to keep the Mosaic Law. Again we see that Christians that are led by the “Law of the Spirit” which has set them free. Christians do not need a written code to tell them what is immoral.

1 Romans 8:1 – 4 (NIV) - Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN

DR. MACCARTY WREAKS HAVOC

Chapter Fourteen, The second chapter of Book III, demonstrates that SDA theologian and Sabbath scholar, Dr. Skip MacCarty, exhibits a definite unwillingness to disclose the terms of the belief system he is “loaning out” to his Seventh-day Adventist flock. By the Year 2007, the knowledge that the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20, is much better known within the circle of biblical scholars. We explain that it is ethically irresponsible to publish a book that purports to be a serious scholarly work when it fails to address, much less attempt to refute, this fatal argument against the Sabbatarian myth. We call attention that he fails to disclose the full truth about what he knows about the impossibilities of the myth that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath by stating that this topic is beyond the scope of his subject-- an “out” that is very dishonest because the Early Church rejected Sabbath-keeping on biblical grounds.

Dr. Skip MacCarty, a theologian on the staff of the Pioneer Memorial Church at Andrews University, which hosts the Church’s theological seminary, published a 30-year “tribute” to Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi’s 1977 book, From Sabbath to Sunday, exhibiting an approach to defending Sabbatarianism that is essentially the same as that of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s. However, some of his comments deserve recognition and special treatment in this paper. Dr. MacCarty has given additional thought to addressing the problem of the many passages in the writings of St. Paul which seem to support anti-Sabbatarianism. Furthermore, he has taken more time to provide scholarly opinion from some well-known biblical scholars to support his Sabbatarian interpretation than Dr. Bacchiocchi. The fact that his 2007 book, In Granite or Ingrained?, is an official denominational publication, printed by the Andrews University Press, which is affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary, gives it the weight of official Church dogma. By contrast, Dr. Bacchiocchi’s books were published independently.

Despite some refinements, however, MacCarty’s views are fundamentally the same as those of Dr. Bacchiocchi, only deceptively wrapped in more attractive packaging.

IN GRANITE OR INGRAINED? - CHAPTER 9 – CIRCUMCISION

MacCarty does a wonderful job of showing the deeply spiritual symbolic aspects of circumcision. Later in the chapter, however, he attempts to refute the anti-Sabbatarian argument that circumcision is a requirement for Sabbath-keeping. Let us examine his arguments one at a time. In most cases, we will summarize his arguments, rather than quote them. Verification of his arguments is as simple as reading the appropriate parts of his book.

DR. MACCARTY – THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT DEPEND ON THE OBSERVANCE OF CIRCUMCISION. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE IN SCRIPTURE THAT EVEN HINTS AT SUCH A CONNECTION BETWEEN CIRCUMCISION AND THE SABBATH. “If any teaching in the Old Testament needed to be overwritten in the New Testament era, it would be made unmistakably clear, as it was in the case of circumcision (p. 186).”

Either Dr. MacCarty did not do his homework before writing In Granite or Ingrained? or he deliberately choose to ignore the mountain of evidence from biblical and rabbinical sources that clearly demonstrate that the Jews had always understood that circumcision was a prerequisite for Sabbath-keeping for both the Jews and proselyte Gentiles. The Jewish Encyclopedia, available to Adventists since no later than 1906 (Wikipedia article, “Jewish Encyclopedia”), is striking in its position that the Sabbath was given for the first time to Israel at the Exodus and that it was given to no other nation on Earth.

Acts chapter 15 provides us with Scriptural evidence beyond merely a “hint” when the Christian Pharisees made their claim that the Gentile converts needed to undergo circumcision and the attendant observance and adherence to the law of Moses. Is Sabbath observance a commanded requirement in the law of Moses? Perhaps Dr. MacCarty believes, as some Sabbatarians teach, that the “law of Moses” is a separate law from the Ten Commandments, and that the Ten are a
relationships—not its location or association. The Gentiles were not required to keep any of the Law of Moses. The fact to stand next to a monarch, but doing so does not make us kings. A moral law is Sabbath to be a moral law based solely upon its proximity to other laws that are moral does not make it moral. We can the law; any of it, and that to teach them otherwise was a subversion of their souls. That Dr. MacCarty declares the Judaism was about the Sabbath. The Council of Jerusalem made it abundantly clear Gentiles were not required to keep above everything else, Jewish Sabbath. The Judaizers were not primarily concerned about getting the Gentiles to keep basic moral laws. They that the Council of Jerusalem placed its official blessing on the elimination of the requirement that Christians keep the study of the writings of the rabbis, that neither a proselyte nor a Jew can keep the Sabbath without the head of the could be a ceremonial regulation, and thus be subject to being utilized for a specific period of time to meet a specific need. Moral laws are simply statements of natural cause and effect relationships and are, therefore, virtually self-evident to any thoughtful observer of human experience. The Sabbath does not meet the simplest requirements to qualify as a moral law. The breaking of a moral law can never be justified. The Sabbath is not so, there are many examples of the Sabbath being set aside for more important matters, including circumcision on the 8th day after the birth of a Jewish child and Israel going out to war on the Sabbath. His assertion here is simply speculative, and designed to draw one's attention away from the real purpose and function of the Sabbath in relation to the Israelites; the sign of that covenant between them and God, and how it serves as a reminder to the people who their God is, and what He has done for them. MacCarty provides no evidence of any kind for his claim that the Sabbath requirement was instituted at Creation. As we have demonstrated in Lying for God, the very first SDA biblical scholar, J.N. Andrews, was thoroughly acquainted with the lack of biblical evidence for the Sabbath at Creation concept. It is almost unthinkable that MacCarty would write a book like In Granite or Ingrained? without a thorough study of the work of the D.A. Carson research team, which had been available to him for nearly thirty years. MacCarty chooses to ignore, once again, the fact that the Jews themselves recognized that all the people of the world were given laws against killing, stealing, adultery, murdering, and so on, at the very beginning, but that the Sabbath law was not introduced to Israel until the Exodus. We have discussed the difference between the Noachian Laws, as the Jews referred to them, and the TORAH— the Laws of Moses— previously. The Sabbath and circumcision are cultic "signs" rather than intrinsic moral laws. MacCarty seems to want to try to detract his readers from following this train of thought by appealing, once more, to the flawed concept that the Sabbath was instituted at the time of Creation and cannot be considered anything but a moral law just like the other 9 of the Ten Commandments. If a law is not introduced at the beginning of the world, and all the people of the Earth lived without that rule for something like 2,000 years before it was introduced to a small country with provisions tailored to that particular part of the world, it has to be a ceremonial regulation, and thus be subject to being utilized for a specific period of time to meet a specific need. Moral laws are simply statements of natural cause and effect relationships and are, therefore, virtually self-evident to any thoughtful observer of human experience. The Sabbath does not meet the simplest requirements to qualify as a moral law. The breaking of a moral law can never be justified. The Sabbath is not so, there are many examples of the Sabbath being set aside for more important matters, including circumcision on the 8th day after the birth of a Jewish child and Israel going out to war on the Sabbath. His assertion here is simply speculative, and designed to draw one's attention away from the real purpose and function of the Sabbath in relation to the Israelites; the sign of that covenant between them and God, and how it serves as a reminder to the people who their God is, and what He has done for them. It has been a well-known fact of biblical studies for decades that in the historical era in which God gave the Israelites the 10 Commandments, treaties were almost always written up with a ceremonial provision placed near the middle of the list of the terms, as we explained earlier. Most treaties of this era were between a conquering nation and a conquered nation. This ceremony, to be performed on a ritual basis by the nation in a subjective relationship to the treaty, was a way to keep the requirements of the tribute and services due the superior country ever before the minds of the subjugated people and their rulers. This fact is widely known in the realm of biblical scholarship and was available to Dr. MacCarty for decades before he wrote his new book. MacCarty chooses to ignore, once again, the fact that the Jews themselves recognized that all the people of the world were given laws against killing, stealing, adultery, murdering, and so on, at the very beginning, but that the Sabbath law was not introduced to Israel until the Exodus. We have discussed the difference between the Noachian Laws, as the Jews referred to them, and the TORAH— the Laws of Moses— previously. The Sabbath and circumcision are cultic "signs" rather than intrinsic moral laws. MacCarty seems to want to try to detract his readers from following this train of thought by appealing, once more, to the flawed concept that the Sabbath was instituted at the time of Creation and cannot be considered anything but a moral law just like the other 9 of the Ten Commandments. MacCarty chooses to ignore, once again, the fact that the Jews themselves recognized that all the people of the world were given laws against killing, stealing, adultery, murdering, and so on, at the very beginning, but that the Sabbath law was not introduced to Israel until the Exodus. We have discussed the difference between the Noachian Laws, as the Jews referred to them, and the TORAH— the Laws of Moses— previously. The Sabbath and circumcision are cultic "signs" rather than intrinsic moral laws. MacCarty seems to want to try to detract his readers from following this train of thought by appealing, once more, to the flawed concept that the Sabbath was instituted at the time of Creation and cannot be considered anything but a moral law just like the other 9 of the Ten Commandments.
that some Gentiles thought their freedom from the Law meant they could indulge the flesh in regards to fornication demonstrates this. Paul had to correct those Gentiles in this regard, but did not have to address Gentiles who would have had no problem with not keeping the Sabbath. Christianity is a movement away from the letter of the law to the spirit of the law. Not all grasped this perfectly then, and those today who focus on the Old Covenant letter of the law, such as the Sabbath, do not grasp this perfectly either.

The apostolic Church understood that the Sabbath, along with virtually everything else Jewish, would perish along with circumcision. There is abundant evidence both from Scripture and Jewish writings of the inseparable relationship between the Sabbath and circumcision. This principle explains why there is not one word in the New Testament about the requirement for keeping the Sabbath and how to keep it. It is difficult to imagine that the Gentiles coming into the apostolic church would not need any instructions regarding how to keep the Sabbath in relation to New Covenant theology if it were required. As we mentioned before, when Paul instructs his readers not to use their freedom from the Law to do wrong, he outlines a list of approximately 23 sins that a person who is lead of the Spirit will not be found doing. Sabbath-keeping is not mentioned in that list. If Sabbath keeping were a Creation ordinance, and if it were a moral law, how could Paul not have included it in these sin lists?

**DR. MACCARTY - “BECAUSE THE 10 COMMANDMENTS WERE TAKEN FOR GRANTED AS UNIVERSALLY APPLICABLE, THE COUNCIL HAD NO NEED TO SPECIFICALLY INSTRUCT GENTILE CONVERTS NOT TO MURDER OR STEAL, TO BE RESPECTFULLY OBEIDENT TO PARENTS, OR TO OBSERVE THE SABBATH (WHICH IN THE LAW WAS ITSELF ENJOINED UPON “THE ALIEN [HEBREW, GER] WITHIN YOUR GATES,” EXOD. 20:10; CF. ISA.. 56:3-7).**

As we have discussed before, the Jews did not view the 10 Commandments as being universally applicable. Only Sabbatarians view them as being universally applicable. Dr. MacCarty is working from the SDA paradigm where this is just assumed to be true, and assumptions lead to errors. Again, this concept is directly opposed to the facts about the way the Jews thought about the concept of LAW. They recognized the difference between the “Laws of Noah” (Noachian), which were for all the people of the world, and the TORAH, which was for the Jews only. The Sabbath was only a part of the TORAH. It is a huge oversimplification to throw the Sabbath into the mix with a set of laws, which, unlike the Sabbath, are rooted in “natural law”— that is, requirements based on observable cause and effect.

A short-stay visitor to a Jewish community was to refrain from work on the Sabbath while staying with his Israelite host. However, were an alien to decide to remain with the Israelite community, the head of household was required to be circumcised before the family could observe any of the Torah’s ordinances. The Law of Moses indicated a difference between the need for a Gentile on short-term stay with Jewish hosts and a Gentile who wished to become a part of the Jewish community. In the first case, the Gentile avoids offending his Jewish hosts by not performing labor. In the second case, the Gentile “keeps” the Sabbath as a religious practice, but not until he has been circumcised.

As we mentioned in the previous section, the Gentiles coming into the apostolic Church would have had little knowledge of the requirements of Sabbath-keeping unless they had been attending a Jewish synagogue. If the apostles believed Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath, it is reasonable to expect that there would have been some discussion of it in their writings. Look at the controversies over Sabbath-keeping that confronted Jesus on so many occasions! How to keep the Sabbath seems to have been a continual source of debate among the Jews. Jewish Christians, as well as Gentile Christians, would have needed some clarification on Sabbath-keeping.

MacCarty also misapplies the law while attempting to uphold the law of the Sabbath. It was those Gentiles “within thy gates” of Jewish settlements that were to refrain from work on the Sabbath. The situation with the Gentile Christians in the New Testament era is the reverse of what is found in the law, and what MacCarty attempts to slip by unnoticed. We are discussing Jews living among Gentiles, and it is not reasonable to conclude the Gentiles had to conform to Jewish expectations within their own countries. It is the Jew who is within the gates of the Gentiles.

**MACCARTY – THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM DID NOT HAVE TO LIST THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE GENTILE CONVERTS KEEP THE SABBATH AND THE OTHER 10 COMMANDMENT LAWS BECAUSE THE COUNCIL SPECIFICALLY INDICATED THAT IT EXPECTED THE GENTILES TO GET THEIR COMPLETE MORAL TRAINING BY ATTENDING THE JEWISH SYNAGOGUE WITH THE OTHER CHRISTIANS ON SABBATH. Proof of this fact is that immediately following their official pronouncement of the four requirements that were to be imposed on the Gentile converts, the Council adds, “For Moses has been preached in every city from the earliest times and is read in the synagogues on every Sabbath (Acts 15:21).**

Before attempting to read this aspect of the Council of Jerusalem in a manner favorable to Sabbatarianism, we must fit it into its total context. Please consider the following facts, mentioned in the previous two sections:
The only record of Christians attending synagogues on the Sabbath was when they went there as “missionaries” to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.

Every New Testament reference to Christians meeting together took place on Sunday—not Sabbath.

As presented elsewhere in this paper, the apostolic Christians were likely gathering on Sundays in significant numbers by 50-70 AD., and probably less than 10 years after Paul wrote Colossians 2:14-17. As you will recall the Early Church documents that recorded an almost immediate abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by the Church. Why would Paul see a need to have the Gentiles receive education about Sabbath keeping, whether it is in a synagogue or a meeting of Christians, when he had instructed the Church not to enforce Sabbath keeping on them?

Christians were driven out of the synagogues for their belief in Christ. The Gentiles would not be able to get their instructions for Sabbath-keeping in the synagogue, even if the first Christians had believed that keeping the Jewish Sabbath was required.

“Moses” consisted of the TORAH, all 613 rules and regulations, most of which were ceremonial. Adventists themselves believe that the vast majority of what the delegates to the Council of Jerusalem referred to as “Moses” was nailed to the cross. If MacCarty is correct in his reading of Acts 15:21, the Gentiles are being expected to get extensive training in the very thing that the Council freed them from. Furthermore, the TORAH was nailed to the cross. Why would the Gentiles need any education in these obsolete matters?

A more consistent interpretation of the Council of Jerusalem’s statement would be something like this:

Because many of the Gentile converts will be constantly hearing about the requirements of the TORAH when they visit the synagogue with their Jewish friends, or when they go to the synagogue with other Christians to help convince the Jews that Jesus is the Messiah and that the Sabbath met its fulfillment in Him, there is a danger that they will become confused and “Judaized” by the continual harping of the Jews that the 613 rules and regulations of the TORAH must still be observed by Christians. We, the Council of Jerusalem, must strongly convey to our new Gentile converts that they can be confident that this is not so.

Moses and what Moses wrote and taught is what was taught in the synagogues. Most all of the Gentile converts to Christianity then came from those same synagogues, and heard the law read, and learned of Jewish culture and sensitivities as a result. When you consider this in relation to the prohibitions listed in the previous verse, it becomes plain the issue is also about avoiding offenses in their relationship to the Jewish Christians who, regardless of whether they follow the law or not, still have those sensitivities in regards to their culture. If we are to conclude that the Gentile Christians received important instructions regarding their conduct as Christians by following Moses, then what Paul wrote in II Corinthians chapter 3 would be most strange in regards to having a veil before their eyes should they live by, and continue in, the teachings of Moses; the Old Covenant.

DR. MACCARTY – THE BOOKS OF REVELATION AND ISAIAH PROVE THE ETERNAL NATURE OF THE SABBATH.

“The book of Revelation is permeated with direct and indirect allusions to the Ten Commandments, showing their enduring nature.”

Dr. MacCarty cites Revelation’s frequent references to a number of the 10 Commandments as evidence that the 10 Commandments are permanent. This would not be surprising, since most of the other 10 Commandments represent natural laws of cause and effect, many of which were covered in the Noachian laws. As proof that the Sabbath was included, he cites Revelation’s reference to “The Lord’s Day” in Revelation 1:10. Biblical scholars came to the understanding in the last century that the term, “Lord’s Day,” is never used in reference to the Sabbath. In all early Church writings, beginning in 70 AD. with such a reference in the Didache, the Lord’s Day is always a reference to Sunday, the first day of the week. According to the article on The Book of Revelation in Wikipedia, this book was written somewhere between AD. 68-96. Therefore, John’s use of the term, The Lord’s Day, is consistent with early Church writers around 70 AD. and thereafter.

Dr. MacCarty cites, as proof that the Sabbath endures in Heaven, the imagery of John the Revelator in describing the presence of the Ark of the Covenant in the Most Holy Place in Heaven, since the Sabbath commandment is written on the stone tablets that are in the Ark. The Ark also contains the Laws of Moses, which Moses wrote under the direct dictation of God Himself. Here is the biblical basis for what is found in the Ark courtesy of Robert K. Sanders:
Ex 25:21 - 22 (NIV) - 21 Place the cover on top of the ark and put in the ark the Testimony, which I will give you. 22 There, above the cover between the two cherubim that are over the ark of the Testimony, I will meet with you and give you all my commands for the Israelites.

Deut. 10:5 (NIV) - 5 Then I came back down the mountain and put the tablets in the ark I had made, as the LORD commanded me, and they are there now.

1 Kings 8:9 (NIV) - 9 There was nothing in the ark except the two stone tablets that Moses had placed in it at Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the Israelites after they came out of Egypt.

Heb 9:3 - 5 (NIV) - 3 Behind the second curtain was a room called the Most Holy Place, which had the golden altar of incense and the gold- covered ark of the covenant. This ark contained the gold jar of manna, Aaron’s staff that had budded, and the stone tablets of the covenant. 5 Above the ark were the cherubim of the Glory, overshadowing the atonement cover.

The Law of Moses contains 613 separate laws, the vast majority of which Seventh-day Adventists believe were nailed to the cross. By this kind of logic, the saved will be keeping all 613 rules and regulations of the TORAH, both ceremonial and moral, for eternity. This is contrary to the traditional SDA concept that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross. More importantly, it is contrary to the teachings of Ellen White, because she stated that God showed her that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross. In this book we have explored a number of cases where the theology of Bacchiocchi and MacCarty contradicts Ellen White.

He also cites what he believes is Isaiah’s portrayal of the Sabbath in Heaven found in Chapter 66 and notes that The Book of Revelation, in its discussion of the New Earth, appears to reference Isaiah Chapter 66. The study we presented earlier refutes the premise for his argument and demonstrates the danger of proof-texting to support a belief that has already been assumed to be true.

DR. MCCARTY – “IT IS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS BOOK TO DISCUSS ALL THE BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND HISTORICAL ISSUES INVOLVED IN THAT ON-GOING DISCUSSION [THE SABBATH DEBATE], EXCEPT AS THEY RELATE TO THE OLD AND NEW COVENANTS.” (P. 182)

Dr. MacCarty has wisely chosen to avoid any discussion of the historical issues, in particular. We now have conclusive evidence from early Christian writings that the adoption of Sunday observance was almost immediate. As you recall, the Didache is thought, particularly by American biblical scholars, to have been written as early as 50 AD. with somewhere between 50 and 70 AD. as highly probable. The Didache documents Christians worshiping on the first day of the week. The Didache was a collection of the first Christian writings, and scholars believe that the part of this document that mentions the practice of meeting on Sunday to worship God was possibly written as early as 50 AD. but no later than about 125 AD.. As you may recall, Dr. Bacchiocchi conceded 140 AD. for the universal adoption of Sunday observance— too early for the influence of sun worship and impossibly too early for the Roman Catholic Church to have had anything to do with it unless, of course, the Catholic Church is right about Peter being the first pope!

This history does, indeed, relate directly to New Covenant issues. If neither the influence of the Church at Rome, the influence of pagan sun worship, the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, or the Jewish persecutions between 100 AD. and 140 AD. caused Christians to “abandon” Sabbath-keeping, the only remaining explanation is that Christians recognized that the end of circumcision and the writings of St. Paul created the phenomenon of Sabbath abandonment. It is no wonder MacCarty does not want to talk about this subject!

THE SABBATH WILL BE OBSERVED IN THE NEW EARTH, SO HOW COULD ANTI-SABBATARIANS TEACH THAT IT WAS A CEREMONIAL LAW THAT WAS NAILED TO THE CROSS?

After reiterating that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation for the benefit of all humankind long before Israel came into existence, he says the following:

People from every nation who responded to the gospel invitation by putting their trust in God were to be incorporated into His covenant community. It was written in the law: You and the alien shall be the same before the Lord. The same laws and regulations will apply both to you and to the alien living among you” (Num. 15:15-16). Zechariah spoke of a remnant of Philistines who could “become leaders in Judah (Zech. 9:6-
7.) Isaiah specifically appealed to foreign converts: “Let no foreigner who has bound himself to the Lord say, ‘The Lord will surely exclude me from his people.’…For this is what the Lord says: . . ‘foreigners who bind themselves to the Lord to serve him, to love the name of the Lord, and to worship him, all who keep the Sabbath without desecrating it and who hold fast to my covenant—these I will bring to my holy mountain and give them joy in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house will be called a house of prayer for all nations” (Isa.. 56:3-4,6-7, NIV)

The same law that applies to both aliens living in the Israelite community and the Israelites themselves requires that the head of household for both groups must be circumcised in order to keep the TORAH, and therefore, to keep the Sabbath. A short-term alien visitor to the Israelite community was merely required to avoid offending his Jewish hosts by not doing any work during his stay. The Jewish Encyclopedia is clear about this fact.

The “holy mountain” in his passage almost certainly refers to the Jerusalem on this earth, and prior to the death of Christ on the cross. It is no surprise that everyone would be keeping the Sabbath at this time and place in the history of Israel. After all, the people would still be living under the terms of the Old Covenant, the TORAH, with all its 613 rules and regulations, including the requirements of burnt offerings and sacrifices which are NOT a part of the New Covenant dispensation.

MacCarty also attempts to utilize Isaiah 66, which he declares is a situation that takes place in Heaven and presents a picture of everyone coming to worship on Sabbaths:

“As the new heavens and the new earth that I make will endure before me,” declares the LORD, “so will your name and descendants endure. From one New Moon to another and from one Sabbath to another, all mankind will come and bow down before me,” says the LORD. “And they will go out and look upon the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; their worm will not die, nor will their fire be quenched, and they will be loathsome to all mankind.”

Most scholars recognize that this passage cannot be construed as representing the conditions in Heaven. Note that Isaiah says that their name and descendants will endure for as long as the new heavens and the new earth. There is no compelling reason to read the events of the next sentences to follow as being actually in the New Earth itself. Consider also that Seventh-day Adventists have traditionally followed Ellen G. White’s teaching that all the ceremonial laws were nailed to the cross, including the annual and monthly feast days, yet here we have a picture of people observing the monthly and annual sabbath feast days in Heaven? There will be no dead bodies to look at in Heaven. There will be no annual and monthly sabbath feast days, and there will be no weekly Sabbath either.

At the most basic level, Isaiah quotes God saying that just as you can count on the New Earth He will make to last forever, so too you can count on Israel to be victorious over its enemies and become a light to the world if Israel continues to do God’s will. At a more extended level, you could also see this passage referring to what the earthly Jerusalem would have been like had Israel followed God down through the years and accepted Christ at His first advent as their Messiah. Many theologians see this text as referring to the state of the world in a pre-millennial “rapture” where Jesus returns to Earth and reigns 1,000 years in Jerusalem. The one thing this passage cannot possibly mean is that the Sabbath will be observed in Heaven.

What it does say is that those who come before God do so from the time-frame, “from month to month and from week to week”, and not specifically on the Sabbath itself for the purpose of worship.

DR. MACCARTY – THE FACT THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THE VARIOUS COVENANTS CAN PROBABLY NOT BE CHANGED IS ILLUSTRATED BY TWO BIBLICAL STATEMENTS: (1) IN TWO PLACES, PAUL COMPARES THE PERMANENCE OF A PROPERLY EXECUTED WILL TO GOD’S COVENANTS AND STATES THAT THOSE DIVINE COVENANTS ARE LIKE THIS IN THAT THE MOSAIC COVENANT DID NOT DO AWAY WITH THE VALIDITY OF THE PROMISE OF THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT. (2) IN ANOTHER PLACE, PAUL STATES THAT THE LAW, INTRODUCED 430 YEARS AFTER THE PROMISE WAS GIVEN TO ABRAHAM, DID NOT CHANGE THE PROVISIONS OF THE COVENANT MADE WITH ABRAHAM. (3) MACCARTY ASSERTS THAT A PROPERLY EXECUTED HUMAN WILL CANNOT BE CHANGED “UNLESS THE CIRCUMSTANCES TO WHICH THEY WERE ADDRESSED NO LONGER EXIST OR HAVE MATERIALLY CHANGED (P. 188).” (4) THEN HE ARGUES THAT IN REGARD TO THE SABBATH, NEITHER OF THESE POSSIBLE TYPES OF CHANGES APPLIES, SO, THEREFORE, THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW COVENANT CANNOT POSSIBLY ALTER IT. (5) HE STATES THAT JESUS AFFIRMED THAT THERE COULD BE NO CHANGE TO THE SABBATH WHEN HE SAID THE SABBATH WAS MADE
FOR MAN. (6) HE ASSERTS THAT JESUS NEVER QUESTIONED WHETHER THE SABBATH SHOULD BE KEPT, BUT ONLY HOW AND WHY IT SHOULD BE KEPT.

As we have documented elsewhere in the paper, Paul states that the law (TORAH) was given to the Children of Israel as a “tutor” (Gr. “paidagogos”; one who directs a child) because they were extremely stubborn. The Children of Israel had been slaves for more than 400 years and had picked up some very bad habits of thinking along the way. It would appear that the Sabbath, like many other Jewish ordinances, was designed to keep Israel in line and on a straight path. For example, death was the penalty for picking up sticks on the Sabbath.

Jesus lived during the reign of the TORAH— a system which He had designed to keep Israel on the straight and narrow path from the time of the Exodus to the cross. How could He be expected to teach the Jews of His day that they didn't have to keep the Sabbath while the TORAH was still in force? The people did, in fact, have to keep the Sabbath! But Jesus appeared to be preparing His people to understand that the Sabbath was not a moral commandment because He and His disciples broke the Sabbath at times. Jesus, Himself, made no apology for His own actions, nor did he condemn His disciples for breaking the Sabbath in these incidences. The Scriptures state that Jesus DID break the Sabbath.

William Hohmann has this additional comment:

McCarty overlooks or ignores the fact that both old and new covenants are/were also testaments. The old went into effect upon the death and spilled blood of substitute animals while the new covenant / testament came into force upon the death of God Himself in the personage of Jesus Christ and His blood. Paul amply explains how the first covenant ended also upon the death of Jesus even as a marriage covenant ends upon the death of either party. McCarty's statements would have us conclude a marriage covenant does not really end upon the death of either party. God divorced Israel in the Old Covenant, and His death finalized the dissolution of that relationship with Israel. As Jesus stated before His death in regards to Israel, “Behold, your house is left to you desolate.” If it were not enough that God died thus ending that first covenant, the Jewish convert to Christianity also died to that covenant law through baptism; symbolic of death and burial. MacCarty’s actions are one of a person trying desperately to resurrect people back to that which they died to, and that which forever ended upon the death of Christ; the Old Covenant and all therein, including the Sabbath command.

What McCarty does is rehash all the old arguments that Sabbatarians use to prop up the sabbath, thus reinforcing the sabbath among his fellow Sabbatarians, but offers no proper evidence to support the sabbath in New Covenant theology, and does nothing to address all the evidence to the contrary. This is strange scholarship for one who claims to be a scholar.

DR. MACCARTY – ROMANS 14:5 (REGARDING EVERY DAY ALIKE) CAN NOT POSSIBLY REFER TO THE SABBATH BECAUSE THE CONTEXT OF HIS STATEMENT IS IN REGARD TO DISPUTABLE MATTERS, AND THE SABBATH IS NOT A DISPUTABLE MATTER. A NUMBER OF NON-SABBATARIAN BIBLICAL SCHOLARS CONCUR WITH THIS INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 14:5.

If the Sabbath were not a disputable matter, we could not be disputing it right now, but we are. On the other hand, it would be impossible for us to write a paper demonstrating that it is alright to murder, commit adultery, or dishonor our parents.

The Sabbath is a disputable matter. Seventh-day Adventists have been disputing the Sabbath for over 150 years! Dr. MacCarty's claim to the contrary is comical and nothing more than an attempt to obfuscate the issue through semantics. Every SDA scholar we have cited in this book wrote about and debated the sabbath! They may as well claim the sky is not blue, and refuse to look up as proof of it.

Moses wrote his account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in such a way as to forbid even a remote possibility that Hebrew readers could think, even for one moment, that his words represented the establishment of a Sabbath-keeping ordinance. Colossians 2:14-17 is the clearest possible command that the Church not require the observance of it, any more than they would be required to observe Jewish dietary laws, the annual feast days, and the monthly feast days. The fact that Sabbatarianism requires the keeping of the Jewish dietary laws, annual sabbath feast days, and monthly sabbath feast days is a hugely disputable item in itself. This claim of the sabbath being indisputable belies the Sabbatarian's psychological make-up that forces a denial of the facts. The mindset is such that the Sabbath is required, and must be required; therefore there is no credible, believable evidence to the contrary, period. It is exactly as St. Paul describes in II Corinthians, Chapter 3, regarding a veil before the eyes of those who hold to what Moses taught and wrote; the old covenant laws.
In our discussion of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s unfortunate interpretation of Colossians 2:14-17, we have thoroughly refuted this claim and provided the reader with a Greek equivalent translation that shows that this interpretation is next to impossible. And, as we have mentioned before, the apostolic Church — that is, the Church in existence during the time the apostles were still alive— seemed to have no difficulty understanding that Paul’s statement in Colossians 2:14-17 meant that the weekly Sabbath was nailed to the cross. Nothing else could explain why Christians were coming together on Sundays in significant numbers by 70 AD. and had “abandoned” Sabbath-keeping on a universal basis by 100 to 140 AD. If we have to choose between the interpretation of a minority of modern day biblical scholars and the interpretation of the Christians who actually lived while the apostles were still alive, there is no contest. The Christians of the early, apostolic Church were right there in the midst of these events and chose to “abandon” the Sabbath even while some apostles were still alive.

Dr. MacCarty creates good rhetoric for his belief system's views when he talks about anti-Sabbatarians claiming that the 10 Commandments were nailed to the cross. He, then, can look good to his readers who are sympathetic to the Sabbatarian cause. He is seen dashing in to protect the honor of God's Law by protecting the Decalogue at all costs. It has been said that half truths are more dangerous than an out-right lie. What he fails to tell the reader is that a simple understanding of the distinction the Jews made between TORAH and Noachian law instantly helps us recognize the certainty that Paul said that the TORAH was nailed to the cross. He fails to explain to his readers that all of the laws in the 10 Commandments, except the Sabbath Commandment, are mentioned by New Testament writers. He fails to point out that the Noachian laws given to all the peoples of the world in the beginning did not include a Sabbath commandment. These facts provide an insurmountable road block to the New Sabbatarian theology of Doctors Bacchiocchi’s and MacCarty's claim that it was an IOU document that was nailed to the cross instead of the LAW itself. As we have so dramatically witnessed, this fanciful bit of cheap-trick theology unavoidably leads to the absurd conclusion that Paul validated the requirement for observing all the ordinances mentioned by Paul in Colossians 2:14-17 by condemning not the ordinances themselves, but their abuses.

Dr. MacCarty states, “A number of scholars believe that Paul never intended his statement in Colossians 2:14-17 as an abolishment of the Sabbath God Himself instituted at Creation.” He offers an appendix of their comments on Colossians 2:14-17. Who would these other scholars be who also believe God instituted the recurring Sabbath rest from creation other than Sabbatarian scholars? Non-Sabbatarian biblical scholars have no particular reason to study these issues in any particular depth. The understanding of the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation account is a relatively new development when viewed from the perspective of the last 100 years, so it would not be surprising that there are some scholars who are not yet familiar with the fact that Moses deliberately wrote his account of the events of the 7th day to make it impossible for his Hebrew readers to see a Sabbath commandment therein. As we studied earlier, Moses used a total of four Hebrew usage conventions in three key passages of Moses which clearly show that Moses contraindicated a Sabbath commandment in Genesis 2, that the Sabbath was introduced for the first time ever in Exodus 16, and that the Sabbath commandment of Exodus 20 was only modeled after the Creation Week. There are numerous biblical scholars who do not believe the Sabbath was instituted at Creation, and documentation of this scholarly opinion has already been discussed.

Once it is understood, once and for all, that Moses did everything he possibly could to word his comments in Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 to make sure that he did not imply that the Sabbath commandment was instituted at Creation, it is no longer necessary to twist the statements of St. Paul to fit a preconceived belief that must be protected at all costs.

DR. MACCARTY - PAUL'S REBUKE TO THE GALATIANS FOR RETURNING TO THE OBSERVATION OF “SPECIAL DAYS AND MONTHS AND SEASONS AND YEARS” IN GALATIANS 4 IS A REBUKE TO THEM FOR RETURNING TO THE OBSERVATION OF THE SACRED DAYS OF THE PAGAN CALENDAR, RATHER THAN THE JEWISH SACRED DAYS OF THE TORAH. THIS, IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SABBATH-KEEPING. THIS IS THE OPINION OF A NUMBER OF NON-SABBATARIAN BIBLICAL SCHOLARS.

This question has been extensively covered elsewhere in this paper, but a review, especially by Seventh-day Adventist readers, might be helpful. Most readers should be able to settle this question in their minds simply by reading Galatians Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. This is not a problem for a biblical scholar and only requires a little common sense. When the following considerations are reviewed, it is difficult to imagine how anyone could come to the conclusion that the Sabbath is not targeted by Galatians 4:

1. The entire book of Galatians is targeted at the problem of Judaization in the apostolic Church.
2. Chapter Three targets the problem of the Judaizers in the Church at Galatia, rebuking the Galatian believers for their desire to observe points of the Law of Moses. In Paul's discussion of this "law," he states that "it was added because of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise referred had come (verse 19)." Furthermore, he says, "So the law was put in charge to lead us to Christ that we might be justified by faith. Now that faith has come, we are no longer under the supervision of the law (verse 25)." Paul's Jewish readers, understanding the difference between Noachian and TORAH law, would understand that Paul was not saying that Christians were free to disobey the basic moral laws. Note that this law system comes to an end when the Messiah appears, which is consistent with the TORAH concept.

3. At the beginning of Chapter Four, he compares the TORAH to the kind of rules children are subject to and says it represents "slavery under the basic principles of the world (Verse 3)."

4. MacCarty teaches that Paul was admonishing the Galatians for turning back to heathen observances and practices, but Paul states in Verse 8 that they, the Galatians, are known by God. The Galatians are turning back, not to heathen practices, but to out-dated Jewish practices. Paul says, "...how is it that you are turning back to THOSE weak and miserable principles (verse 9). THOSE is clearly a reference to the "principles" he mentioned in verse 3, which are the principles of TORAH law, designed for children who are released from these laws "at a time set by his father (verse 2)." The second phrase is worded the same way as the first one.

5. The clincher comes just a few sentences later when Paul, while discussing the source of the temptation to return to the observation of TORAH rituals and ordinances, identifies the guilty party. He says, "These people are zealous to win you over, but for no good. What they want is to alienate you from us, so that you may be zealous for them (Verse 17-18)." It is clear that "these people" are the Judaizers Paul has been discussing in Chapters Three and Four. Any other conclusion stretches the principles of literary interpretation to a level that is self-evidently absurd.

In conclusion, Dr. MacCarty's attempt to circumvent the relevance of Galatians 4 to the Sabbath debate by attempting to teach that the passage is a rebuke to the Galatians for returning to the observance of the sacred days of the pagan calendar fails to convince. It does not take a biblical scholar to figure out what Galatians 4 means. All it takes is for someone to apply the simplest principles of common sense interpretation, letting the Scriptures speak for themselves. Bottom line is that Paul is saying that the principle is exactly the same, whether the days of the calendar are pagan or TORAH related. In both cases, it represents additional requirements beyond the Gospel for salvation and a tendency to promote the role of human effort in achieving salvation.
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CHAPTER FIFTEEN
ELLEN MAKES MILLIONS WITH HER “VISIONS”

Chapter 15, the first chapter of Book IV, demonstrates how Adventists shoot themselves in the foot by playing up the evidence that Ellen White's visions were attended by supernatural manifestations. A wide variety of witnesses, including both her critics and supporters, are nearly unanimous in acknowledging the supernatural element of her visions—especially the earlier ones. Since Ellen White's prophetic failures are numerous and specific, the only logical conclusion is that her visions came from Satanic sources, rather than from God. We outline how the pioneer leaders of Adventism used the evidence that her visions were supernatural as proof that her message was directly from God— a conviction which made it very easy for the Church to persuade its followers to turn loose of their hard-earned money. We outline how Ellen White used her supernatural gifts to earn a great deal of money for herself, making her a millionaire by today's monetary standards. We note that it is strange that Adventists reject Joseph Smith and other self-proclaimed messengers of God on the basis that they failed the 100% accuracy test, but refuse to apply the same standard to their own prophetess.

Once when we were going to the place of prayer, we were met by a slave girl who had a spirit by which she predicted the future. She earned a great deal of money for her owners by fortune-telling. This girl followed Paul and the rest of us, shouting, “These men are servants of the Most High God, who are telling you the way to be saved.” She kept this up for many days. Finally Paul became so troubled that he turned around and said to the spirit, “In the name of Jesus Christ I command you to come out of her!” At that moment the spirit left her.

When the owners of the slave girl realized that their hope of making money was gone, they seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the marketplace to face the authorities.

(Acts 16:16-19, NIV from Bible Gateway.Com.)

Just like the owners of the fortune-telling slave girl used her to make money for themselves, so the early leaders of the Advent Movement used Ellen White's visions to assure income for the fledgling Church. In reviewing what these early leaders knew about her, it is impossible for an unbiased researcher to come to any other conclusion. There is evidence, which we will soon examine, that supernatural power attended her during her visions. Perhaps these supernatural manifestations were taken as evidence that her visions were from God. Soon, however, it should have been apparent that the spirit that controlled her during these visions was a lying spirit. The accounts of her amazing vision experiences spread far and wide among the Advent believers, and the belief that God was speaking directly to them through Ellen White scared the money right out of their pockets into the Church’s coffers.

Even during the pioneer days of Adventism there was an ever-growing body of evidence that the “angel” who controlled her in vision was a lying spirit. In looking back at our historical time-line, we see that as early as 1861 J.N. Andrews, who wrote a history of the Sabbath, knew that Christians “abandoned” Sabbath-keeping hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Roman Catholic Church. When Ellen White was “shown” that the Catholic Church “changed the day,” Andrews and other leaders had to know that her “angel” guide lied to her about very important matters. By the end of the Civil War, Adventist leaders knew the angel had lied to her about England coming over to fight with the South against the North. By 1866, Snook and Brinkerhoff of the Iowa Conference of Seventh-day Adventists had figured out that Ellen White was a fraud and had published a book documenting their evidence to the point of over-kill. Their book included a lengthily list of contradictions in her writings and statements that disagreed with the known facts of science. One example they mentioned was her claim that the bones of human beings who were several times larger than those of people living today had been found in the ground. Her statement was true in regard to animals, but not in regard to people. Keep in mind that the Seventh-day Adventist Church had organized just three years earlier in 1863. It is incredible to think that Adventist leaders were not confronted with the facts in the Snook and Brinkerhoff book at every turn. Her prophecies failed.

Why didn’t the Church repudiate her as a false prophet at the time? By then what Adventists refer to as “The Work” had grown rapidly to include a network of churches, institutions, and a bureaucracy to care for it and pay the salaries of its
workers. Since Ellen White’s visions gave power to each of the key beliefs of the Church via a “heavenly” endorsement by an “angel” from God, repudiation of Ellen White’s prophetic ministry would have meant an end to the power of Adventism. This kind of event would have meant an end to the salaries of a significant number of Adventist workers, including those of the leaders at the top. The families of these workers might have gone hungry. The leadership might have had to have gone out and gotten honest work. That, was not going to happen!

No one knew the power of the visions to generate money more-so for the “business” of the Church than her own husband, James White, who was a very astute businessman. At the same time, no one else knew better than he did that her visions were fraudulent, with— perhaps— the exception of D.M. Canright, who worked closely with the Whites and other top SDA leaders for nearly 30 years before he apostatized. A story related by Canright in his book, Life of Mrs. E.G. White— Her Claims Refuted, suggests that these early leaders had little faith in the genuineness of her visions:

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

Andrews, as you may recall, authored two important early Adventist books on the Sabbath, and you may have noted that Canright made reference to two of Andrews’ books in his own writings.

You may recall from the chapter on Adventism's long war against the truth, that a former associate director of the White Estate, Ron Graybill, was fired during the 1980’s when copies of his doctoral dissertation were leaked out to Church leaders all over the world. After spending over a dozen years with unlimited access to every word that Ellen White wrote, he reached the following conclusions:

She made fraudulent claims.

Her personal character was seriously flawed.

She appears to have produced her so-called “visions” when necessary to defeat her opposition.

In other words, Ron Graybill concluded that Ellen White manipulated the Church with her visions to maintain her power and that, at the same time Adventist leaders manipulated Ellen White to obtain visions from her that provided apparent support from “God” for their pet projects, their goals, and their power struggles. Again, let me emphasize that Graybill had unlimited access to every recorded word Ellen White wrote that is recorded in documents stored in the vaults of the White Estate. Knowing more about everything that Ellen White wrote than almost any other person with the exception of his predecessors in the White Estate, he determined that her prophetic claims were fraudulent.

The supernatural manifestations that went along with those visions included remarkable feats of supernatural strength, including the near cessation of breathing and a gaze that could not be broken by even extraordinary means intended to distract her. While some of her critics dismiss all of this as the result of a mental condition caused by the blow to the head she sustained as a young girl, most people who witnessed her visions seem to have been impressed that the supernatural was involved. Researchers, including both her supporters and critics, have studied both her own accounts of her vision experiences and the testimony of witnesses who observed her while in vision.

It is a matter of public record that that Ellen White claimed to have an attending “angel” throughout her ministry. Looking back at the train wreck of her prophetic record from the perspective of today (2010), a horrible conclusion is unavoidable. Her angel lied to her on a regular basis. Here is a partial list of the lies she was “shown.”

- Several dates for the Second Coming of Christ between 1844 and 1851.
- That at least one person in an 1859 meeting would be alive when Jesus came.
- England would join the South to fight against the North.
- The Civil War was being fought to preserve slavery.
- Slavery would return to the United States at a later time.
- Moses Hull would die an unexpected death as retribution from God.
- Spiritualism would pervade the mainline churches before long.
• God fooled His people about the Sanctuary question to test them.

• The prophetic charts of William Miller were accurate and exactly how God wanted them to be.

• The development of the black race [implied] was the result of the genetic mixing of people and animals.

• Mountains were formed by high winds piling up debris after the flood. (in *Selected Messages*)

• The bones of human beings many times larger than human beings living today are found buried in the earth as a result of the flood. (In *Selected Messages.*)

• Sun worship influenced Christians to abandon the Sabbath.

• The Roman Catholic Church influenced Christians to abandon the Sabbath.

• Only the ceremonial parts of the law were nailed to the cross.

• The Fox Sisters did not use “human trickery” in regard to the “rappings.”

• That Jupiter had an incorrect number of moons.

• That the main-line Protestant Churches would fully adopt spiritualism and that to “speak against the ‘rappings’ would be considered by them to be a sin.

• That Dr. Harvey Kellogg built buildings in Chicago with funds he diverted from the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

• Logic is considered to be a science. By the rules of logic, there is no other possible conclusion other than this angel guide lied repeatedly to her. The Bible is very clear about the following facts:

**Angels DO NOT lie.**

**Evil spirits DO lie.**

As we mentioned, Ellen White’s critics have always speculated that Ellen White’s visions could have been caused by a serious head injury she sustained while a young girl. Along this line, D.M. Canright cites the opinion of several physicians who were contemporary to Ellen White to that effect, but our research has concluded that the White Estate has effectively demonstrated that the medical credentials and characters of some of the “doctors” who stated that they believed her visions were the result of the head injury were not exceptionally well-qualified to do so. Let us hasten to add the fact that though they did not have the best medical credentials does not necessarily mean that her head injury did not create a major component of her physical manifestations. One expert researcher, SDA Loma Linda Neurologist, Dr. Donald I. Peterson, MD, does not believe her head injury explained the phenomenon of her visions very well. He published an article entitled “Visions and Seizures—Was Ellen White the Victim of Epilepsy?” (Copyright 1988, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Boise, Idaho) He makes a very good case for the probability that Ellen’s particular type of head injury is not the kind of injury that would likely produce visual disturbances. He provides apparently reliable eye-witness accounts of her public visions that suggests the phenomenon observed was supernatural. Dr. Peterson’s paper was written to refute the conclusions of two articles to the contrary, one written by Pediatrician Delbert H. Hodder, MD in a 1981 issue of *Evangelica*, and one written by (then) retired dermatologist, Dr. Molleurus Couperus, in a 1985 issue *Adventist Currents*. Both papers attempt to demonstrate that Ellen White’s visions were primarily due to her temporal lobe epilepsy. However, both writers seem to have difficulty with the fact that witnesses testify to the fact that she did not seem to breathe during her visions (See Donald I. Peterson, “Visions Or Seizures—Was Ellen White the Victim of Epilepsy?”) at: http://www.whiteestate.org/issues/visions.html. He cites the observations of a prominent early SDA leader, J.N. Loughborough, who testified he saw Ellen White in vision “about fifty times” and that while in vision “she does not breathe, yet her pulse beats regularly.”

Dr. Peterson cites Elder Loughborough’s quote of a statement made by Daniel T. Bourdeau, who was skeptical of Ellen White’s visions before he had the privilege of evaluating her during an actual vision himself:

[On] June 28, 1857, I saw Sister Ellen G. White in vision for the first time. I was an unbeliever in the visions; but one circumstance among others that I might mention convinced us that her visions were of God. To satisfy my mind as to whether she breathed or not, I first put my hand on her chest sufficiently long to know that there was no more
heaving of the lungs than there would have been had she been a corpse. I then took my hand and placed it over her mouth, pinching her nostrils between my thumb and forefinger, so that it was impossible for her to exhale or inhale air, even if she had desired to do so. I held her thus with my hand about ten minutes, long enough for her to suffocate under ordinary circumstances; she was not in the least affected by the ordeal.

According to Butler and others, the length of time Ellen White was in vision “varied from fifteen minutes to one hundred and eighty” and possibly more. This, to say the least, is a remarkable length of time to suspend breathing.

Both Ellen White’s critics and defenders are dependent on the historical record. Depositions left by eye-witnesses stating that Ellen White did not breathe while in vision are so consistent, clear, and unequivocal that Hodder is constrained to admit that “it is possible that something ‘supernatural’ was happening.” He seeks to explain away this apparent supernatural phenomenon by theorizing that her breathing was merely “imperceptible.” Similarly, Couperus also theorizes, from his research, that her breathing appeared to be “almost imperceptible.” Neither critic cites sources to support his conclusions.

Another eye-witness account of Ellen White in vision was George I. Butler, a General Conference president during some of the years that she was having public visions. He made these observations:

"All we ask is that people shall be reasonable. We are prepared to support by hundreds of living truthful witnesses all that we shall claim, so far as facts are concerned, of the manifestation itself, for this thing has not been done in a corner. For nearly thirty years past these visions have been given with greater or less frequency, and have been witnessed by many, oftentimes by unbelievers as well as those believing them. They generally, but not always, occur in the midst of earnest sessions of religious interest while the Spirit of God is specially present, if those can tell who are in attendance. The time Mrs. White is in this condition has varied from fifteen minutes to one hundred and eighty. During this time the heart and pulse continue to beat, the eyes are always wide open, and seem to be gazing at some far-distant object, and are never fixed on any person or thing in the room. They are always directed upward. They exhibit a pleasant expression. There is no ghastly look or any resemblance of fainting. The brightest light may be suddenly brought near her eyes, or feints made as if to thrust something into the eye, and there is never the slightest wink or change of expression on that account; and it is sometimes hours and even days after she comes out of this condition before she recovers her natural sight. She says it seems to her that she comes back into a dark world, yet her eyesight is in no wise injured by her visions.

"While she is in vision, her breathing entirely ceases. No breath ever escapes her nostrils or lips when in this condition. This has been proved by many witnesses, among them physicians of skill, and themselves unbelievers in the visions, on some occasions being appointed by a public congregation for the purpose. It has been proved many times by tightly holding the nostrils and mouth with the hand, and by putting a looking glass before them so close that any escape of the moisture of the breath would be detected. In this condition she often speaks words and short sentences, yet not the slightest breath escapes. When she goes into this condition, there is no appearance of swooning or faintness, her face remains its natural color, and the blood circulates as usual. Often she loses her strength temporarily and reclines or sits; but at other times she stands up. She moves her arms gracefully, and often her face is lighted up with radiance as though the glory of heaven rested upon her. She is utterly unconscious of everything going on around her while she is in vision, having no knowledge whatever of what is said and done in her presence. A person may pinch her flesh, and do things which would cause great and sudden pain in her ordinary condition, and she will not notice it by the slightest tremor.

"There are none of the disgusting grimaces or contortions which usually attend spiritualist mediums, but calm, dignified, and impressive, her very appearance strikes the beholder with reverence and solemnity. There is nothing fanatical in her appearance. When she comes out of this condition she speaks and writes from time to time what she has seen while in vision; and the supernatural character of these visions is seen even more clearly in what she thus reveals than in her appearance and condition while in vision, for many things have thus been related which it was impossible for her to know in any other way.

"Peculiar circumstances in the lives of individuals, whom she never before had seen in the flesh, and secrets hidden from the nearest acquaintances, have been made known by her when she had no personal knowledge of the parties other than by vision. Often has she been in an audience where she was wholly unacquainted with the individuals composing it, when she would get up and point out person after person whom she never had seen before, in the flesh, and tell them what they had done, and reprove their sins. I might mention many other items of like nature, but space forbids. These things can be proved by any amount of testimony, and we confidently affirm that they are of such a character that they could not be accomplished by deception." — Review and Herald. June 9, 1874.

(J.N. Loughborough, Heavenly Visions, pp. 76a-76d.)

See: http://www.ellenwhite.info/visions-no-breath-3.htm
Still another interesting eye-witness account of one of Ellen White's visions gives powerful credence to the likelihood that her visions were the result of satanic deception. Dirk Anderson comments on some information he discovered while digging through some really old material he obtained recently. In a letter from a Brother Hicks, dated September 3, 1884, and published in the periodical, *Messenger of Truth*, Vol. 1, No.3, p. 3 (October 1854), Anderson quotes the following excerpt:

“As concerning Ellen G. White's visions, I have heretofore known but little about them. I once saw her have one, and I once saw a table tip over and then tip back again of its own accord so far as I could discern. Neither the phenomenon of the vision, nor of the table tipping did I understand.”

Anderson says the significance of this detail did not occur to him at first:

I marked this quote and didn't pay too much attention to it, but 2 days later I was reading the USA Today newspaper, and since it being near Halloween, they had an article on “ghosts”. While I usually ignore these, this one was about Dan Aykroyd (the actor) and his family's involvement with seances, so I started reading it. In that article Dan's father witnessed a seance and one of the phenomena he reported seeing was “tipping tables”. I then checked the Internet and found that “tipping tables” is a common theme associated with seances. In fact, the online Thesaurus lists “table tipping” as a synonym for a seance. (E-mail Dirk Anderson to Kerry Wynne, Oct. 17, 2009).

The White Estate, by virtually proving that Ellen White's visions were supernatural, takes the issue of the source of her power from the frying pan into the fire. Logic demands this sequence of reasoning. We do not and cannot know for certain if her visions were the result of a medical problem—a brain injury. However, we can know, and do know, with absolute certainty that Ellen White was completely wrong about a whole host of prognostications she made under the influence of her attending “angel.” If we cannot excuse her on the basis of behavior that results from a brain injury, and if the evidence is almost overwhelming that her visions were supernatural, logic requires that we conclude that her “angel” guide was a “fallen” angel on the basis of the Satanic nature of the manifestations that accompanied the visions and the lying nature of the things she was shown in these visions. 100% accuracy of predictions has been required of God's true prophets as long as there has been a recorded history of God's dealings with His people. Adventists apply this principle against the other false prophets of her day, like Joseph Smith, but refuse to apply it to their own prophetess! Over 100 years later we see even more clearly that most of her long-range predictions were total failures, but her prophetic blunders were so great even during the early decades of her ministry that there was no excuse for the early Adventist leaders to regard her as anything but delusional, a fraud, or an instrument of Satan. Again, using the simple science of logic, we are faced with the “unthinkable”:

Ellen White experienced the supernatural in vision according to credible witnesses.

Her predictions failed.

Her supernatural guide lied to her.

God's angels do not lie.

Her “angel” guide was an evil spirit.

The predictions of Ellen White's that came true were apparently the result of either a good guess on Ellen's part or a good guess of the part of the evil spirit which evidently controlled her. Her visions could not possibly have come from God.

THE VISIONS CREATED HOW MUCH MONEY?

The Church manipulated Ellen White and her visions to produce income for the Church. When the leaders needed support for a financial scheme they wanted, they looked to her to supply a vision to back up their desired plan. That she used her visions to make money for herself is beyond any reasonable doubt. When her authority was questioned, she resorted to a vision “from God” to protect herself. The use of her visions for financial gain placed her among the top 1% of money-makers in the world.

In regard to Ellen White's use of her visions to create wealth, there is no substitute for reading Dirk Anderson's well-researched article, “Ellen G. White: Prophet or Profit?” at www.ellenwhiteexposed.com. Anderson makes the following points and provides excellent documentation for his claims:
She earned over 2.2 million dollars in royalties from her books, placing her in the top 1% of the wealthiest people in the world. (Figures in the Year 2005 equivalency)

She earned between $175,000 and $265,000 annually in the 1880's and 1890's when translated into the value of the U.S. Dollar in the Year 2005.

Her posh mansion at Elmshaven would be worth up to 10 million dollars in terms of 2005 dollars.

In 1876 she and James White spent, in terms of 2005 dollars, over $8,400 for a photographic negative while she counseled Adventists about the sin of having photographs of family members in their homes.

She fought with denominational leaders over their view that she was asking too high a percentage for her book royalties.

She used her “visions” to induce Advent believers to purchase her books—a huge conflict of interest, but very effective, since God was presented as commanding His people to purchase her books for themselves and others.

The facts of Ellen White's wealth and under-handed financial tactics were better known in her day than they are today, thanks to the subsequent highly effective damage control techniques of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. For another eye-popping view of the darker side of Ellen White and money, study Life of Mrs. E.G. White - Her Claims Refuted, by D.M. Canright, 1919, Chapter 11. See: http://members.tripod.com/~Help_for_SDAs/LifeofEGWHerClaimsRefutedCanright.html

The entire book is available on-line, and a printed copy of this book can be purchased through Amazon.com

The facts of her use of her prophetic claims to earn money for herself had not been forgotten as late as 1933. Note this passage from Vowless, the SDA-EGW myth-basher from New Zealand:

SUPPOSED “PRECIOUS RAYS OF LIGHT” PROVES USEFUL FOR MONEY-MAKING

The prophets of the Bible were generally hard-working people, and had little. Mrs. White says, “we entered upon our work penniless.” (Test. V.1-75). (We, being Mrs. White and her husband). This point is often brought up by SDA's, but that is as far as they ever say. Why do they not say further? Perhaps it is because of the following:—Soon after they began and became leaders, they commercialized their work and managed to supply themselves well, and when Mr. White died (1881), it is said that he left between 15,000 dollars and 20,000 dollars; for the present, I do not need to show how this was made, but let us quote a couple more of her writings: “If there is one work more important than another, it is that of getting our publications before the public, thus leading them to search the Scriptures.” (Test. V.4-390). “You should lend “Spirit of Prophecy” to your neighbors, and prevail upon them, to buy copies for themselves. Missionaries for God, you should be earnest, active vigorous workers.” (Test. V.4.-391).

So, of course, her books were pushed and sold in large numbers, and as a result, she received large financial, returns through receiving royalties on everything she has written. Her royalties received from one publishing house alone, in Washington, DC., in the year 1911, amounted to 8,000 dollars, which was more than the net profits for the publishing house itself for that year. From one book alone she received over 40,000 dollars, and from all her books over 100,000 dollars up till her death in 1915, and they are fixed that since her death her son is to receive the royalty and still is. Think of it, God giving revelations to anyone to sell to the people! I wonder how much royalty Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Paul, and John and the others received, that is, comparing them with Mrs. White as the Conference does. “The White Elephant of Seventh-Day-Adventism?” by R. Vowless (New Plymouth, New Zealand, P. F. Burrows Ltd., Eliot Street, New Plymouth. Can be accessed at:

http://www.truthorfables.com/white_elephant.htm
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CHAPTER SIXTEEN

ELLEN MAKES BILLIONS FOR THE CHURCH
WITH HER VISIONS AND UN-BIBLICAL TITHING CONCEPT

Chapter 16 demonstrates how Ellen and James White conspired to deceive the Adventist flock about what the Bible taught about tithing to get their followers to give generous amounts of money to the cause. The first giving plan, which Ellen and James claimed was shown to Ellen in vision, turned out not to work very well, so Ellen was “shown” that another plan, introduced by then committed Adventist leader, D.M. Canright, to be the one chosen by God for the Adventist Church. If Ellen White it to be believed, God was confused about which plan would work the best for “His” Church. We explore what the Bible teaches about tithing and show that the plan Ellen White finally settled on could not even be applied to ancient Israel under the Theocracy. We show that despite the fact that Adventist leaders knew no later than 1919 that Ellen White was a false prophet, the Church continued to use this false teaching to extract money in large amounts from its followers. This chapter helps the reader trace cause to effect as we detail the financial and moral corruption that developed from the hypocrisy of Adventist leaders, who taught others to believe what they themselves knew to be impossible. We observe that Ellen White taught that tithe funds were never to be given to the poor, when this practice was actually required of Israel, in some cases, by the Law of Moses. We show that a probable motivation for her over-protective concern for the tithe funds was the fact that she, her husband, and her two sons received ministerial salaries that were directly derived from the tithe funds.

Be sure to set aside a tenth of all that your fields produce each year. Eat the tithe of your grain, new wine and oil, and the firstborn of your herds and flocks in the presence of the LORD your God at the place he will choose as a dwelling for his Name, so that you may learn to revere the LORD your God always. But if that place is too distant and you have been blessed by the LORD your God and cannot carry your tithe (because the place where the LORD will choose to put his Name is so far away), then exchange your tithe for silver, and take the silver with you and go to the place the LORD your God will choose. Use the silver to buy whatever you like: cattle, sheep, wine or other fermented drink, or anything you wish. Then you and your household shall eat there in the presence of the LORD your God and rejoice. And do not neglect the Levites living in your towns, for they have no allotment or inheritance of their own. — Deut. 14:22 through Deut. 14:29 (NIV)

The Seventh-day Adventist Church is the biggest “little” Church in the world. Adventists are known for giving more money per capita than the members of any other denomination. Its business operations span the globe with churches, publishing houses, food factories, hospitals, colleges, and universities. It operates a world-wide social services agency, the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), which, itself, takes in more money each year than the Church receives from all other sources combined. The Church’s combined business operations require a bureaucracy of thousands of church employees and leaders to keep everything going, and none of this would be possible were not for the fact that its cult members believe in the Sabbath and the direct, divine inspiration of its prophetess, Ellen G. White.

In the first years of Adventism, the business model chosen to finance the Church was conceived by James White and called “Systematic Benevolence.” James’ system was adopted by the Advent believers after Ellen White was “shown” “in vision” that it was the system God wanted for His Church. Interestingly, the Whites rejected the twisted and non-biblical “Levitical” tithing system that the Church would adopt later because it was thought to be insufficient to fund the grand scale of “the work.”

“We do not urge the Israelitish tithing system as embracing the whole duty of the believers in the third [angel's] message....That system was necessary in God's plan of the Levitical priesthood; but in closing message presents a far greater call for something of the kind.” R&H, April 9, 1861, p. 164. [Cited in Sanders, TITHING NOT A LAW FOR CHRISTIANS at www.truthorfables.Com]
The Systematic Benevolence system, however, proved to be a failure in generating enough income to fund the visionary plans of the Whites for the Church. Apparently the angel who showed Ellen White that the Systematic Benevolence plan was the one he wanted for the Church was lying about the plan’s potential for success. Ironically, it was D.M. Canright who introduced the so-called “Levitical” tithing system that has made the Seventh-day Adventist Church the biggest little money-making Church of all time:

Dudley M. Canright: in a series of articles in 1876, emphasized Malachi 3:8-11 as “the Bible plan of supporting the Ministry.” He urged Adventists to adopt this plan to glorify God.... R&H, February 17, 1876, p.50, 51. See also Spectrum 1986, Adventist Tithepaying— The Untold Story, p. 139. [Cited in Robert K. Sanders, “Tithing Not a Law For Christians”]

A little unbiased common sense should tell us that the True God could not say that both systems were the best one, but, sure enough, Ellen White's angelic “guide” gave her a second vision “showing” her that the “Levitical” tithing system developed by D.M. Canright was the right plan for the Adventists. Neither system was Levitical, much less “biblical.” Perhaps the “god” who “blessed” D.M. Canright’s “Levitical” tithing system saw its potential to create financial corruption and misery for poor Advent believers who would be moved by the deception of this lie to give up food for their children in order to pay their tithe. Canright's system, “blessed” by Ellen White’s “god”, was so perverted from the biblical model of tithing that it could not have even been used in Israel during the Theocracy, much less than in the Christian dispensation! It appears these early Adventist leaders were so busy looking for biblical and historical evidence to prove that the Seventh-day Adventist Church was the one and only true church in the World that they were too busy to study what the Bible actually taught about tithing and a host of other more important things. Their neglect created a monster, as we will soon see. For now, let us consider what the Old Testament teaches about tithing and how Adventists unlawfully used, and continue to use, the threat of a non-existent Bible teaching in a hypocritical effort to separate Adventist believers from their hard-earned money. You will be amazed, later, to see how these Adventist leaders were using the tithe money back-handedly by the 1970’s to create personal gain for themselves!

THE LEVITICAL TITHING SYSTEM IN SCRIPTURE

Credit for the research on tithing goes to William H. Hohmann.

A biblical tithe is defined as being the tenth of the increase of crops and livestock. These things are dependent upon the land, and under the economy of Israel, the land is what produced wealth. If Israel received rain in season, and the weather was favorable, the land produced abundantly, and all prospered. This reflected the blessings of God bestowed upon the people through the land.

If drought struck Israel, and the resultant shortage of food was extant, both people and livestock suffered, and the people did not prosper. There were other factors that could affect the production of food, such as foreign invasions where such forces devoured the produce and livestock of the land as they proceeded, and the ravages of insects and other pests such as mice, locusts and rats that could devastate the land. These things were perceived as God withholding His blessings due to the collective sins of the people.

The Israelites were commanded to tithe of the increase of their produce and livestock. This tithe was used, or distributed, in basically three ways:

The tithe was given to the Levites.

The tithe was given to the widow, orphan, poor, and foreigner (stranger).

The tithe was used by the owner of the tithe at the festivals held in Jerusalem.

The post exilic Rabbis were confused by this division of the tithe, and concluded there were, instead, three separate tithes. To these rabbinical teachers of the law, everything had to be spelled out exactly, and the ambiguity of the tithe law as codified did not fit their sensibilities.
These are the same Rabbis that are identified in Scripture as the ones who added their own twists to the law, making many points of law overly burdensome. Is it any wonder therefore that they would conclude there were three tithes, taking up to 30% of the increase of those who grew crops and raised livestock?

When the Scriptures surrounding tithing are examined, these three ways the tithe were allocated and used include the support of the Levites! Were the Levites triple-dipping their fellow Israelites?

There was only one tithe. If there were two tithes, or three tithes, then, instead of 10% of one’s increase, it was actually 20% or 30%! Imagine your government informing you, as a parallel, that they were going to tax your income at the rate of, say, 15%, but then informed you that you were required to pay three income taxes! You may well complain, and they would respond with, “hey, your tax is only 15%, quit griping!

In this light, look at how a person’s tithes were to be handled in the third year:

At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates: And the Levite, (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee,) and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come, and shall eat and be satisfied; that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest. — Deut. 14:28-29

When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled; — Deuteronomy 26:12

In the third year, the tithe was to be brought to the gates of whatever city one was near to, and provided to the poor, and also to the Levites who shared in the tithe the other two years.

In many respects, the law was ambiguous when it came to how the person with a tithe was to divide it up. Perhaps this was intentional. A land owner who controlled the basis of nearly all wealth had to decide how generous or how stingy he was going to be in relation to the Levites and poor of the land. A land owner with much in the way of crops and/or livestock, along with his family, could only consume so much of the tithe of their land at the festivals held in Jerusalem. Those, then, who had much could give much from that tithe of the land.

Those who had little may well have only been able to give a little.

In this regard, consider the command not to harvest the corners of one’s fields:

And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the LORD thy God. — Leviticus 23:22

How far in from the corners did this entail? If the land owner wanted to be generous, he could leave a large corner, for example. But also note the purpose of leaving the corners and gleaning was so that the poor of the land could go there and collect food for themselves to eat. So tithing was not the only means whereby the poor attained sustenance. Could this then have been a test designed by God to search out a land owner’s heart? The law said to give a portion of his tithe to the poor. How much was left up to the owner of the tithe. How much of the corners of his fields he left for them was also up to him. Merely complying with the law did not reveal the heart of a person. Their behavior outside the confines of the law could.

These, then, were some of the things that were performed by those who owned land wherein they raised livestock and produce from the ground and their responsibilities in relation to the rest of the people.

In regard to all these instructions, God made this statement, more than once:

Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you. — Deuteronomy 4:1-2
What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it. — Deuteronomy 12:32

This last citation comes from a chapter in Deuteronomy where God addresses the Israelites in regards to tithes. So now the logical question that is raised by all this— Why do so many churches, especially Seventh-day Adventists, violate the very law they claim was not to be altered even down to jots and tittles, and to which God specifically commanded in relation to the tithing law that it was to be observed as commanded; that no one was to “add thereto, nor diminish from it?”

Tithes were never commanded of the people based on their income. Only those who had crops and/or livestock tithed.

Jesus had an interesting observation in relation to this sort of behavior:

This people draweth nigh unto us with their mouth, and honoureth us with their lips; but their heart is far from us. But in vain they do worship us, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. – Matthew 15:8-9

Is demanding tithes of people based on their wages biblical? No! But they have their excuses; their rationales for altering the same law they claim is unalterable down to jots and tittles as well as the tithing law that was commanded by God not to be added to or anything taken away from. Even a bank robber has his rationale and excuses.

The most common rationale put forth for altering the unalterable is to claim the change in circumstances today:

“There is no Levitical priesthood to give tithes to. We live at a time where we no longer have an agrarian society.”

What sort of society did we have in 1888 when the SDA produced their version of the tithing law that they commanded of the members, upon pain of eternal damnation should they not tithe? An agrarian society! They were not interested in livestock and produce. Adventist leaders were, and still are, interested in money. Furthermore they are not interested in you sharing your tithes among the widow and orphan and the poor. They want it all. Oh, they may throw a bone to an occasional widow and orphan alright, but it was never the responsibility of the Levites to turn around and give the poor of the tithes they were given; it was up to the individual whose tithes it was to begin with.

What does a wolf want? How would a wolf go about getting it? Would a wolf, disguised as a minister of God, resort to dire warnings of what will happen to you should you fail to tithe of your wages to them? Would they resort to claims of faithlessness on your part?

What rationalization have Adventists fallen for that made them end up believing and practicing the commandments of men? What justification is there for doing the very same thing they accuse other churches of doing as evidence those churches are of the devil, altering times and laws as cited from Daniel 7:25?

The apostle Paul made his case to the churches in I Corinthians that those who preached the Gospel had a right to live of the Gospel. They were entitled to support. But was this support through the Old Covenant law of tithing? No, for Paul does not use tithing as a justification, but rather the command not to muzzle the ox that treads out the grain as an analogy. Ministers were to be provided for through free will offerings, and not by compulsion. It can be a hard concept for many to understand, but once something is a requirement, then it is no longer done through faith and love. It is done out of fear of retribution. Here is what the apostles thought about using the Gospel for gain.

Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour. And a certain man lame from his mother's womb was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple; Who seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple asked an alms. And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something of them. Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk. — Acts 3:1-6

What would have been the circumstances here if the early church were indeed paying tithes of their wages to the ministry? Would Peter have been without gold or silver?
To claim the tithing law changed to accommodate the changing times is hypocrisy. If you level the false accusation against other Christians and their faith by demanding they explain how it is they could change the day of “worship” from the Sabbath to Sunday, while changing that same law yourself when it comes to tithing, it is the greatest expression of hypocrisy. If anything, you are more guilty than those who worship on Sundays, for nowhere in the Scriptures does it say the people were to gather on weekly Sabbaths for the sake of communal worship! The Christian law of Liberty allows believers to worship whenever and wherever they so desire.

Adventists have demonstrated themselves to be guilty of the very crimes they have charged others with. Even Jesus Christ commanded His followers not to make such condemnative judgments as Adventists do even now. The end result is to find yourself condemned by God for the things you condemned in others.
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

CHURCH CORRUPTION SINCE THE 1970’S

This chapter demonstrates the natural consequences of unparalleled hypocrisy combined with the power of a belief system and tithing concept that successfully turned the Seventh-day Adventist Church into one of the most successful money-making machines in the history of Christianity-- financial and moral corruption of a degree that is virtually unparalleled in the history of modern Christianity. We provide evidence that the hypocrisy created by the bomb-shell revelations of the deceptions of Adventism that surfaced during the 1970’s created an environment ripe for exploitation by those who had ceased to believe in Ellen White, the Sabbath, and the Investigative Judgment and behaved as if they did not even believe in either Heaven or Hell— much less in an Investigative Judgment that would hold them accountable for their actions. Since its development in the late 1970’s there has been no sign that the problem of corruption in Adventism has subsided, and every few years the Church is confronted with a new scandal that seems nearly unbelievable in comparison to the holy claims of Adventist leadership.

There was no extensive financial corruption in the Seventh-day Adventist Church prior to the 1970’s so far as we know. However, during the 1970’s a pattern of nearly continuous and sensational financial corruption has characterized Adventism to this very day. There is a major unresolved scandal at the time of this writing of which most Seventh-day Adventists know nothing. Douglas Hackleman of Members for Church Accountability says in his salient book on the phenomenon of Adventist Church corruption, *Who Watches, Who Cares?—Misadventures in Stewardship*:

Since the late 1970s, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has been buffeted by a concatenation of corporate church financial scandals that have resulted in the unnecessary loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. Ours are lesser losses, in absolute terms, than those of the United Nations food-for-oil fraud, or than the betrayals of stockholders by Enron, WorldCom or Arthur Anderson. But the church losses may be considered more serious because they continue in waves, one after another, and because we believe each instance not only betrays the institution and the members that comprise it but the Higher Source whose selected stewards we claim to be.

There is one question that begs to be answered. Is there a correlation between what Adventist leaders knew about the impossibilities of their three key doctrines and the amount of corruption and hypocrisy that came along about the same time? After what our research has uncovered, it is our belief that there is a strong relationship of cause and effect between the two. With human behavior as complex as it is, there are undoubtedly other factors involved. Western society is getting increasingly liberal. A culture war against traditional values began in the 60’s with the hippie generation. We will simply present the facts and let you draw your own conclusions. This chapter exposes not much more than the tip of the iceberg when it comes to SDA corruption. Many additional examples could be told— a subject for another book.

(1979-1980) THE DAVENPORT SCANDAL COMPLETE WITH “HUSH MONEY” PAYMENTS BY THE CHURCH!

With the Davenport Scandal, we see Adventist leaders en masse behaving like there is no Heaven to win or Hell to shun, much less that they believe the special SDA doctrines of the Sabbath, Ellen White’s inspiration, or the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment! By fate or Providence we find one fearless man, Walter Rea, embroiled in both the exposé of the Church’s cover-up of the fraudulence of Ellen White and the incredible financial corruption of top Adventist leaders in the Davenport Scandal.

While doing some research on Ellen White, Dr. Walter Rea noticed strong similarities between extensive sections of her books with the writings of the authors of books that she kept in her personal library. In short, he discovered massive plagiarism of the writings of those authors. This problem was particularly of concern because she had claimed that God had showed her these things in vision. He approached SDA leaders with his findings, but his discoveries were not welcome. After being double-crossed by the Church he was defrocked and fired. Subsequently he published the *New York Times* best-seller, *The White Lie*, in 1982.
At the same time Dr. Rea was a member of one or more Church finance committees. His work on these high level committees gave him the ability to monitor the ever-increasing misuse of Church tithe funds in the shaky and illegal investment schemes of Dr. Donald Davenport, a Seventh-day Adventist physician and real estate developer. Dr. Davenport promised Adventist denominational entities and church leaders, who were treated as private investors, a much higher than average return on their official church and individual investments with him. In fact, he usually paid individual investors, many of whom were high-ranking Church officials, a higher rate of interest than he paid the conferences they worked for.

Soon something happened that would later add greatly to the Church's damage control challenges. Dr. Davenport and his wife divorced. His wife was a member of the Adventist church Dr. Rea was pastoring at the time, and she came to him with their divorce decree in hand, asking for advice. Immediately Dr. Rea noted that Dr. Davenport's disclosure of their financial assets and liabilities was far shy of what he knew about the extent of the Church's investments with him. He knew this as a result of the inside knowledge he had of the Church's ties with Davenport. To make a long story short, the Church, in addition to firing Dr. Rea for his exposé of Ellen White and his inside knowledge of the Davenport Scandal, took away his retirement benefits. Dr. Rea was able to get those retirement benefits restored by agreeing not to publish his book about the Davenport Scandal, *Pirates of Privilege*, which Rea would otherwise have published in 1984.

As of the time of the writing of this chapter in this book (Summer-Fall 2009), Dr. Rea is 87 years old and enjoying every penny of the “hush money” the Church has been paying him not to expose the extent of their financial iniquities over the last few decades. Wonder of wonders! Adventist leaders are guilty of bribery, and showing themselves willing to do almost anything to cover up the TRUTH about their lies and wrong-doings! The statute of limitations of the California court case that prohibited Dr. Rea from publishing this book has expired, and *Pirates of Privilege* is available now at a few places on the Internet and from Dr. Desmond Ford's Australian web-site, *Good News for Adventists*. Recently this author edited and reformatted this book for electronic publication. It is posted by us on SCIRBD.com with Dr. Rea's permission.

**(1985) HARRIS PINE MILLS**

For years the Church owned Harris Pine Mills, a large furniture manufacturing operation that had been donated to the Church by Harris himself in 1951. By 1984 its annual income had reached nearly $60 million and it employed 2,282 Adventist students. There was a financial set-back in 1985, and Douglas Hackleman gives us the details:

In 1985 financial and management difficulties panicked the chairman of the board, Neal C. Wilson, who was also president of the GC Corporation. As chairman of the board, Neal Wilson forced Harris into Chapter 7 bankruptcy, even though its assets outweighed its debits by roughly $15 million. After changing the liquidation filing to a more flexible Chapter 11 reorganization status, bankruptcy trustee John Mitchell told the February 6, 1987, *East Oregonian*, “It’s the best situation I’ve ever seen for restructuring. Harris Pine basically is back in operation. . . . We should be able to restructure and be profitable by the end of June.”

Wilson has never explained why, when the bankruptcy trustee made clear that the business was recoverable, he was unwilling to be reunited with the business that, weeks earlier, he had described to Adventist Review readers as “this marvelous asset.”

Eventually most of Harris’ timber holdings became the property of the Louisiana-Pacific Corporation. Harris’ primary lumberyard and sawmill in Pendleton, Oregon, is now the site of a Walmart store. The loss to the denomination is incalculable.


Members for Church Accountability  
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**1990 – DAVID DENNIS NARROWLY ESCAPES GC OUSTER FOR GOOD ACCOUNTING**

David Dennis, General Conference auditor, with a reputation for tight accounting practices and the courage to confront GC leaders with account discrepancies, was nearly railroaded out of office by a host of GC leaders who were smarting at his
attempts to restrain their questionable business practices. Elder Russell R. Standish and 15 other retired General Conference leaders successfully protested and blocked, by only one vote, a scandalous attempt to oust him. These individuals were verbally abused at a union conference meeting by then union president Elder Robert H. Carter and two other union conference presidents. (Standish, The Twenty-eight Fundamentals: apostasy proclaimed in silence, p. 121. excerpts posted at Google Books.)

1992 - LAKE REGION CONFERENCE SCANDAL #1


The Indianapolis Star of August 3, 1992, reported the Lake Region Conference which used unauthorized church funds to build a shopping mall in Chicago and also mortgaged the Shiloh Church in Chicago without the knowledge or consent of the members, in order to generate capital, has been used by two banks because of loan defaults. Already the Cole Taylor Bank of Chicago has won its case for $2,260,000 and the Lloyd’s Bank of London is suing for $43,521,475 plus $34,931 in interest. The case is pending. Since the Lake Region Conference “has 22 cents in assets for every dollar of liability,” the court in the first case has ruled that the Seventh-day Adventist church organization must pay the shortfall in the Conference ability to repay the debt. It is likely that the situation is worse. On November 11, Colin and I spoke about this matter to one General Conference official and he informed us that other banks were also suing and that the total cost to our church could be twelve million dollars. Thus dishonest activities by a Conference President [Elder L. R. Paler] have led to loss of large sums for the work of God’s church. The offending Conference President is still a denominational employee with current ministerial credentials.

1994 - FAMILY ENRICHMENT RESOURCES

In 1994 the Church devised a scheme to consolidate and improve its profits from selling religious books and videos. The project was financed largely with tithe funds. This disastrous program lost 1.6 million dollars within a two year period. The consolidated organization was called Family Enrichment Resources. The story is well-worth reading and was reported by Richard Sheldon of Members for Church Accountability. The bungling use of church funds, including excess tithe monies, is particularly striking in this case.

Again, see: www.advmca.org/html/rmc_conf_review.html.

1998 – G.C. PRESIDENT FOLKENBERG OUSTED

In the early 1990’s the Church elected an individual with a track record of questionable financial activities to the exalted position of President of the General Conference. Not long after taking office, Folkenberg maneuvered his younger brother, Robert, into a contractual position with ADRA, the Adventist Development and Relief Agency, and later, to the position of Associate Treasurer of the General Conference in charge of dispensing Global Mission funds to Eastern Europe. This brazen nepotism on the part of President Folkenberg should have raised red flags everywhere because Brother Robert Folkenberg had embroiled the Columbia Union Conference in the Davenport Scandal, causing that conference to lose huge sums of money back in the 1970’s. With the connection of Robert with ADRA, the agency became even further plagued with financial irregularities. In 1998 President Robert S. Folkenberg was forced out of office because of his questionable business dealings with a Sacramento businessman by the name of James Monroe. Not surprisingly, Brother Donald resigned at the same time!

Monroe, who was convicted of eight counts of fraud in 1987 and incarcerated from 1989 until January 1, 1992, claimed he had given Folkenberg the $8,000,000 in trust and that his money was missing. Monroe threatened to sue President Folkenberg and, by extension, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, if he did not get his money back. It appears that he did get all or most of his money back, but that the money came from the Church in the form of a Church insurance policy, rather from President Folkenberg himself. The story of how the Church came to lose an undetermined amount of money to settle with Monroe is almost stranger than fiction.

According to Standish, it appears that Folkenberg had somehow used a General Conference insurance policy to settle the $8,000,000 loss, but Folkenberg and his attorney, a Mr. Prochnower, did not go through Adventist Risk Management Services through the normal channels to obtain the policy or to achieve the settlement with James Monroe. Standish concludes the story on page 142:
When a GC representative called the insurance company to inquire about the money paid to Folkenberg, the claims representative refused to speak to him. The representative said that the GC would have to speak to Folkenberg’s attorney because Prochnower had told the insurance company that the settlement was confidential and ordered the company’s employees not to speak about it to General Conference representatives.

The GC representative replied, “What do you mean, you can’t speak to me? We pay the premiums on these policies!”

To which the claims representative replied that the GC would have to speak to Folkenberg’s attorney.

The GC representative called Prochnower who refused to speak about the settlement, claiming attorney-client privilege.

“We’ve opposed a settlement since we first became aware of this case,” the GC representative stated to Prochnower, but he refused to discuss the matter.

“We may never know exactly what happened or how much money was spent,” stated the GC source who was admittedly “very angry” about the situation. (Article entitled “Folkenberg Uses Insurance Money Secretly” – parenthesis in the original).

As far as we have discovered, The General Conference does not yet know the amount which the Insurance Company had paid to settle the law suit claims of Mr. Moore against Elder Folkenberg.

1998 - ADRA SCANDAL COMES TO LIGHT

In 1994 David Dennis’ lawsuit against the Church for his wrongful dismissal as General Conference auditor alleged that the Adventist Development and Relief Agency was guilty of serious financial and ethical misconduct. The court records show that Dennis charged that Adventist leaders had tolerated the misuse of millions of dollars in charitable donations and overseas government relief by ADRA. Our source is a report from the ultra-conservative Adventist “reform” organization, Pilgrim’s Rest, HCR 77, Box 38A, Beersheba Springs, TN 37305 USA. (This organization’s point-of-view is that the cause of the Church’s abysmal corruption is its failure to follow the writings of Ellen G. White.) The reporter summarizes and comments on August 14th, 1998 Los Angeles Times article about ADRA which carries this title and sub-title, “A HISTORY OF COMPLAINTS DOGS ADVENTIST AID AGENCY: Questionable spending, poor oversight alleged. Group, which gets U.S. funds, says controls are tighter now.”

Here are some selected things uncovered by the Los Angeles Times reporter, summarized by Pilgrim’s Rest, and further condensed by us to focus on the most important facts:

Tennis courts at a Seventh-day Adventist-owned and operated compound were built with funds provided by a Rwandan government agency. These “government” funds represented money from a kick-back by corrupt government agents in the area who had been funneled a large shipment of food and supplies by ADRA which was intended for the poor people of the country, but which ended up being retained by these local better-off Rwandans for their own personal use. A second tennis court was built near-by with “government” funds because the first court had been built at an angle that forced the SDA churchmen who played on it to have to look into the sun. This crime was settled with the Government of Rwanda by a promise from ADRA that it would not engage in corrupt activity in the future. The auditor who dealt with this situation, Wayne Vail, expressed disgust that with all the poverty in the country, funds intended to minister to the poor had been diverted for such a shameful purpose.

In Haiti during the summer of 1997, auditor Vail investigated a complaint from government officials who were questioning the misuse of ADRA funds. One example was that ADRA employees repeatedly visited Miami at government expense to purchase supplies that were available on the Island.

During a two year period, ADRA received $85,000,000 in federal cash from the U.S. government and tens of millions of dollars from other nations and private donors. Out of 400 such organizations that received government funding, ADRA had the third highest overhead.
Records from The Agency for International Development, the U.S. Government agency that funnels money to ADRA and other world relief organizations, show “a vexing pattern of warnings, upbraidings, and occasional funding suspensions of ADRA during the last decade.”

In just one year’s auditing period, 1995, AID auditors found $2,800,000 in improper ADRA billings and suspected that ADRA “had charged the government twice for the same items, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in possible double-billings.”

In 1997, AID auditors reported that ADRA’s overhead rate was the second highest of the 10 biggest recipients of government money. Overhead expenses reflect salaries, travel and other administrative expenses subsidized by the government. It’s 11.1% over-head rate was just behind that of Pathfinder International, a family planning, abortion group, and well above the average 7.4% of this group of the 10 largest recipients of government money.

Over a two year period, $85,000,000 was received by ADRA, and at an 11.1% rate of overhead, that would mean a non-profit “profit” of $9,435,000.

Confirming the allegations of David Dennis in his suit against the General Conference for his illegal dismissal from his position of auditor, the Los Angeles Times said, “Federal records show that in some cases, documentation to substantiate the expenditure of millions of U.S. dollars was found to be ‘inadequate or nonexistent.”

In the last four years (previous to the date of the article), government auditors “have questioned nearly $5,000,000 in ADRA billings for public relations, fund-raising and rent.”

The writer of this Pilgrim’s Rest article adds that the General Conference is not permitted to audit any monies handled by ADRA, yet “in a given year, more money passes through the hands of ADRA than through all the rest of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.”


**2001 – SDA CHURCH SETTLES OUT-OF-COURT WITH DAVID DENNIS**

October 30, 2001, David Dennis withdrew his lawsuit against the General Conference for his unjust dismissal as General Conference auditor. By this time the Church had spent an estimated five to seven million dollars to settle with Dennis out-of-court. These legal fees came from tithe funds because tithe money is what funds the operations of the General Conference in the first place. By the time the Church reached this out-of-court settlement with Dennis, his charges of wrong-doing had been proven to be right on target—especially his warnings about Folkenberg’s financial activities and the squandering of government and private donor funds by ADRA.

About the time all of this trouble between Dennis and the General Conference erupted, a woman came forward alleging that she and Dennis had had sex when she was a house-keeper for him and his wife while the Dennises were serving the Church in Singapore during the 1970’s. His accuser had an extensive history of major psychological problems. Dennis denied these charges, confronted his General Conference accusers with the absurdities of their charges, and pointed out numerous cases where the General Conference had tolerated adultery at the highest levels and had even paid the legal bills of these adulterers in order to help them retain their employment with the General Conference.

It is ironic that the Church goes out of its way to protect adulterous leaders and ministers. In our next entry you will see that the Church has even hired an outside consulting firm to help “retain” its adulterous pastors in the service of the Church. An Adventist leader can lose his job and retirement benefits for questioning unsupportable Bible doctrines and the false claims of the Church’s blasphemous prophetess, or for trying to stop the financial crimes of other leaders, but he can commit adultery and find the Church right there to reach down with a helping hand! By using such a flimsy, questionable, and unsupported excuse to get rid of whistle blower David Dennis, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists has forfeited the trust and respect of every Seventh-day Adventist in the world forever, whether the Church’s teachings are true or not. It is difficult to imagine how the General Conference could descend any deeper into the abyss of iniquity. There seems no limit to what Adventist leaders will do to continue on their pathway of hypocrisy, evil-doing, and lying in the name of God.
By taking shelter under the special protections afforded to religious organizations under the First Amendment and by spending these huge amounts of money in legal fees to keep Dennis' suit out of court, the Church maneuvered him into a position where he was forced to give up his legal battle against the General Conference and to settle out of court. (The First Amendment is interpreted to give religious organizations special protections against law suits which seem to be religiously motivated.) Additionally the Church declined to testify against itself, which appears to represent a disgusting appeal (for a church) to the provisions of the 5th Amendment.

David Dennis is just now (September 2009) publishing his new book, which tells the story from beginning to end. You can order his book, Fatal Accounts— the Audacity of an Adventist Auditor's Quest for Transparency. You can order this book from the liberal, barely tolerated, SDA-related journal, Adventist Today, at the following link:

http://69.89.30.254/catalog/75/merchandise

2004 – CHURCH HIRES OUTSIDE FIRM TO DEAL WITH CLERGY IMMORALITY

By 2004, so many Adventist pastors were involved in adultery that the Church had to hire an outside consulting firm to salvage these ministers so they could continue in their denominational employment. According to the late ultra conservative SDA researcher, Russel Standish, one union president boasted to his brother, Colin Standish, he had “saved” at least 17 ministers from being dismissed from the Adventist ministry. Standish tells the story of how a certain Adventist pastor known throughout the Adventist world for his books and speaking engagements was retained in the ministry, despite nearly watertight evidence that he had committed adultery. The accused adulterer’s secretary, Judy Wright, was convinced of his guilt and wrote a letter to Elder Thomas Mostert, President of the Pacific Union Conference, and to Elder Steven Gifford, President of the Southeastern California Conference, regarding what her disgraced boss told her one day. She wrote:

[The Union President] stopped by my office and offered his help. He said he had counseled a number of other ministers through similar crises and that every one of them is still in the ministry. He [the accused pastor] said [the Union President] advised me to deny everything. In fact, it sounded like he thought I should deny everything, whether I was guilty or not. (Letter dated April 16, 1989. The bracketed words were inserted by Standish to facilitate clarity. See Standish, p. 137.)

2005 – LAKE REGION CONFERENCE SCANDAL #2

The Lake Region Conference is the focus of a Federal probe, accused of financial irregularities and immigration violations (South Bend Tribune, 25th July, 2005, cited in Russell R. Standish, The twenty-eight Fundamentals: apostasy proclaimed in silence, p. 117.):

The Lake Region Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is under federal investigation in connection with misuse of funds and illegal immigration activities, which could threaten the organization’s non-profit status.

The revelations shocked many of the estimated 730 delegates who attended a special meeting Sunday.

The following people were put on paid administrative leave in the wake of auditing and illegal immigration practices in the Lake Region Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, based in Chicago:

Hugo Gambetta, vice president for multicultural ministries. He was stripped of his ministerial credentials and license on Friday. He has been on paid administrative leave since July 11.

Treasurer Leroy B. Hampton resigned last week after his July 11 suspension.

Four pastors, all ministers in Chicago churches, are on paid leave: Ciro Aviles, Osmin Hernandez, William Rojas, and Alfredo Solis.

“There’s been a lot of instances of lying and a case of personal enrichment,” Walter Wright, president of the Lake Union Conference, told delegates (South Bend Tribune, 25 July, 2005).”
JULY 1996 – EMBEZZLEMENT OF FUNDS BY AN AUSTRALIAN CONFERENCE TREASURER

Rob van Buuren of the South Australian Conference confesses to “borrowing” huge sums of money. The Adelaide Advertiser reported this in its story:

A former senior official with an Adelaide fundamentalist church is being investigated over allegedly defrauding the church of almost $500,000.

Money is believed to have been siphoned from the Seventh-Day Adventist Church [sic] over a six year period.

The funds had been given to the official by Adelaide members in the form of trust funds and deceased estates.

He allegedly used the money to support a failing family cleaning business.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church [sic] president, Pastor Neil Watts, said yesterday the official had “succumbed to the temptation to borrow some money.” “The whole thing is very sad,” he said.

Pastor Watts said the official “confessed” his actions to the church and planned to repay some funds, although it is not expected he will be able to reimburse the full amount. (The Adelaide Advertiser, 28th August, 1996, p. 1).

Standish reports that later the same newspaper ran a follow-up story on this event with a headline that read, ‘SEVEN YEARS OF SIN—CHURCH TREASURER JAILED FOR STEALING $906,000.” The writer of this story tersely observed, “Even Robert Adriaan Van Buuren must have sensed the irony as he ordered the personalized number plate ROB for his gleaming new Holden Statesman in 1991.”

BEYOND 2005

Call it business as usual for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. ADRA continues to operate out of control. Despite continued pressure on the new General Conference president, Jan Paulsen, who replaced Robert S. Folkenberg, he (Paulsen) refuses to investigate, discipline, and prosecute those who were guilty of criminal activity at the GC and ADRA. If Ellen White is correct, whether she is inspired or not, those who do not rise up to stop sin in the camp are just as guilty as those who perpetrate the sin. Paulsen says he has “prayed” about it and does not believe that it would accomplish any real good for the Church. Some of the best public relations techniques in the world have been largely successful in achieving damage control, as usual. Most rank-and-file Adventist clergy and lay members have no clue that such things are going on at the General Conference and elsewhere, much less understand its significance.

Does it appear that Jan Paulsen believes in the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment? What if his name comes up as one of the living being judged after God is through judging the dead, and he has not repented and done what God and Ellen White would expect him to do—prosecute the guilty! Was it not Ellen White who said that those who see wrong doing and do not do the best they can to stop it are just as guilty as those who are actually doing wrong? Could he possibly believe that Ellen White is a prophet of God, whose counsel he refuses to follow? How can he sleep at night? What about the millions of dollars of tithe money donated by, in part, the poor and the widows of the Church? As the leader of the Church, he is responsible for correcting the evils of the system.

Meanwhile, ADRA continues to solicit SDA believers with their mailing campaigns that show pictures of impoverished children in foreign lands which play on the sympathies of the reader, successfully inducing many sincere Church members to part with their hard-earned cash. Wynne points out that his 87-year-old mother just received such a letter from ADRA yesterday! This money, which in reality is coerced from the Church members, continues to be embezzled, misused, and squandered!

The Church, confronted with absolute proof that Ellen White was a fraud repeatedly throughout the history of Adventism, continues to tote her as the inspired mouthpiece of God. Additionally confronted with the impossibilities of the Sabbath and Investigative Judgment doctrines, it forges ahead telling the same old lies it has told now for almost 140 years. This hypocrisy has obviously stultified the consciences of Adventist leaders and clergy to the point where they behave as if there is no Heaven to win or Hell to shun, must less believe in the Sabbath, Ellen White, and the Investigative Judgment.
By now the Adventist Church has become a mammoth business operation that is, to many, a culture of business, rather than a vehicle to preserve and foster the Christian Faith. Many Pastors and Church leaders do not believe what they are teaching others, and this hypocrisy opens the door to sin. When it comes to money, the Church has everything to lose and nothing to gain by coming to grips with the fact that, to the point of over-kill, Adventism has been proven to be absolutely FALSE. As we have seen, there appears to be a direct correlation between what Adventist leaders learned in the 1970’s about the impossibilities of Adventism with the development of the unstoppable corruption that has plagued the Church ever since.

Adventist teachers, pastors, college professors, and leaders at all levels are nearly powerless to stand up and call the three pillars of Adventism by their right name—LIES— because they will lose their jobs. Unless reform happens all at once, from the top down, and with as many people as possible on the same page, Adventism may implode.

The conservatives like the Standish Brothers, the late Russell, and Colin, and Vance Ferrell of Pilgrim’s Rest are right, up to a point, that Adventism has become corrupt by its failure to follow the counsels of Ellen White. Whether she was inspired or not, she taught a wealth of moral principles of the highest order that those who claim to revere her as a prophet of God do not follow. Let’s get to the root of the problem! Adventist leaders do not follow the counsel in her writings because they know that she lied about the source of her visions, the Sabbath, and the Investigative Judgment. It is our belief that individuals who refuse to search for TRUTH and to follow it at any cost must have a deep, underlying spiritual problem. God cares about TRUTH. His children should also!
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

Does Religion Have To Make Any Sense?

By William H. Hohmann

Discerning Truths and Deceptions

Chapter 18 looks at the concept that religion must make sense in order to be credible. William Hohmann demonstrates that in a sense, religion is a science. It is subject to the rules of logic and common sense, just like the physical and psychological sciences. Inductive study methods are required to understand biblical truth, and using the Bible to support a preconceived idea leads to unsupportable conclusions that are an embarrassment to the Faith and hurt the Christian witness of the believer. Unbelievers seem to be able to quickly “smell out” anything about religion that seems to be arbitrary. The idea that one day has intrinsic sacredness in and of itself it hard to swallow, and promoting this idea false idea, specifically contraindicated by St. Paul, is just another roadblock to the Gospel for many potential converts to the Faith. Hohmann shows us how to study the Bible in a way that helps us understand the principles, major themes, and concepts of Scripture, especially as they apply to the deceptions of Sabbatarianism.

Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. — John 17:17

When I was being recruited into a Sabbatarian “church” (I use the word loosely) I had no real understanding of how to discern between truth and deceptions. I concluded simply that if something were in Scripture, and it was a command from God, then that was that. It was a simplistic view of Scripture, shared by many.

This group I was recruited into went the extra step to insure the chances of me ever abandoning them and the “truths” they revealed to me would be slim. All sorts of dire warnings were attached to these beliefs. The devil would do everything he could to deter me from their truths. It was God who really revealed these truths to me, and I must guard them with my life, seeing as it was my life that was indeed at stake.

I was warned that even some members from the group may well succumb to the wiles of the devil, and that they in turn would try to sway me from “God’s truths.” Those who would leave “the Church” were deceived and disgruntled ex-members with an ax to grind. That they might have left due to legitimate reasons regarding doctrinal issues was seen as an impossibility. If it’s the truth, then there can be no legitimate reason for abandoning the truth.

Thus indoctrinated, the chances of ever learning the truths of Scripture from any person or source using the proper tools of Scripture were greatly diminished. Yet, miracles still happen.

Dear reader, please ask yourself an important question, and answer. If the devil, that deceiver, was behind your beliefs, would he not do everything possible to prevent you from examining any and all other sources of information? I know... you “proved” everything a long time ago, and you see no need to go over it all again. Scripture calls that behavior having ears dull of hearing, and eyes dull of seeing. You are merely complying with the conditioning you underwent to prevent you from ever truly examining your beliefs in the light of Scripture as Scripture was intended to be used.

You may well be saying to yourself how you have been studying Scripture for years, even decades, yet if you are not working from the proper perspective, your beliefs may end up being nothing more than a house of cards.

Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. — 2 Timothy 3:7

It is so much easier to remain smug in one’s beliefs and to dismiss others and their witness that things are not as they seem to be. It is easier to dismiss the witness of those who left your fellowship with epithets of their character. It is easier
to claim loyalty to the organization you believe provided you with truth than to admit you might be in error and disloyal to the Word of God.

There are rules that a person must use in order to discern truth from error. The first and greatest rule is so simple that it is easily overlooked, and so easily dismissed.

Scripture is the "God-breathed and Inspired" Word of God. As such, no person or church has the right to alter Scripture or its application.

Sounds simple. Sounds easy. But once you truly begin to evaluate your beliefs in this light, you just might be surprised, and dismayed.

How important then is it to never alter Scripture or its application?

There are Scriptural examples regarding how seriously God takes what He commands. Saul, the king of Israel, was rejected by God for interpreting for himself how to comply with what God had commanded him. Saul's rationalization for his disobedience was unacceptable. Why then would we believe God to be any less resolute regarding the rest of His Inspired Word?

“And Samuel said, When thou wast little in thine own sight, wast thou not made the head of the tribes of Israel, and the LORD anointed thee king over Israel? And the LORD sent thee on a journey, and said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. Wherefore then didst thou not obey the voice of the LORD, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the LORD? And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the LORD, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God in Gilgal. And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being king. And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice. Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel.” – 1 Samuel 15:17-26

If we do not abide by the written Word of God, are we not rejecting the Word of God? Are we not being stubborn by not believing what God has inspired to be written? Are we not being rebellious?

Jesus berated the religious leaders of His time who altered Scripture and its application, by showing they had no right to keep the commandments of God according to their traditions Yes, God is serious about His Word. We have no right to edit it.

“Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” – Matthew 15:2-9
Sabbatarians are taught (and believe) that they are keeping the commandments of God in accordance with Scripture, as contrasted to mainstream Christianity who they believe do not keep God's commandments at all. The fact of the matter is that Sabbatarians attempt to keep commandments of God that God did not command or require of them, and that these commandments they do attempt to keep, they keep in accordance with the dictates of men, and not God. This shall be revealed later.

At the very end of the book of Revelation, God gives a warning to those who would think to add to the words of that book or take away from those words. Yes, God is very serious about His written Word.

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” — Revelation 22:18-19

Some Sabbatarians claim the mark of the beast, discussed in the book of Revelation, is related to worship on Sundays; that those who worship on Sundays receive the mark of the beast. Is this an example of adding to the book of Revelation?

We are without excuse should we find ourselves altering Scripture or its application. Why then do people resort to altering Scripture and/or its application? There are a number of reasons.

1. People don’t believe what God says. It becomes an example of faithlessness.
2. The person who is altering Scripture and its application is a wolf who seeks power and control over others in order to “feed his own belly” at the expense of others.
3. People buy into the alterations of Scripture and its application as taught to them by others who in turn are deceived also.

The process works this way:

A person is confronted by a passage of Scripture that they do not believe. They conclude that the error lies with Scripture; that the passage is perhaps a bad translation, or the true meaning is somehow obscured in semantics, or they conclude that the passage does not impart all the information relevant to the issue, and they see the need to “fill in the blanks” by combining it with other Scripture so as to make it appear to comply with what a person does believe.

At this juncture, a person, in order to reconcile the conflict, resorts to the methods of “interpretation” that lead to deceptions and falsehoods. I call these the methods of deception, and they are many.

These include, but are not limited to the following:

Rationalizations, inferences, assumptions, faulty drawn conclusions, eisegesis (proof texting; taking Scripture out of context), redefining words and terms, and the use of logical fallacies.

The tools or methods of proper understanding and scholarship include the following:

Proper use of logic, proper use of one's critical thinking skills, and proper exegesis (understanding a passage of Scripture in context), the proper definition of words and terms.

There are a number of useful rules one uses when it comes to critical thinking.

Beliefs can be stated as claims, to which we examine the Scriptural evidence that supports or refutes the claim.

**Is the claim of such a nature that it defies the ability to refute the claim?**

This is a variation on what is commonly known as the falsifiability test. The claim cannot be worded in such a way that we cannot prove or verify the claim, and where there is no way to disprove the claim. A common example is a person who claims to have personal revelations from God. A deceiver would be unable to produce evidence to truly support his claim, and we would be unable to provide evidence to disprove his claim. Such claims are useless when it comes to determining truths from lies, and as such, are better left rejected. We must ask ourselves if God would endorse this sort of thing, where
we have no way to verify one's claim to divine guidance. God's written word admonishes us to prove all things. We cannot prove whether a person has direct revelations from God or not. We can be reasonably certain that a false prophet would claim such.

**Is there comprehensive evidence in Scripture to support the claim?**

Oft times, those who are trying to support an erroneous belief will resort to flooding the issue with assumptions and rationalizations, as well as other claims in an attempt to shore up a belief that otherwise would succumb to the proper methods of examination. In other words, they attempt to make a flood of assumptions look like comprehensive Scriptural support.

**Does the claim hold true for all circumstances affected by it?**

An example would be the claim that being under the Law does not mean one is free to break the law, rather it means not being under the penalty of the Law, that penalty being a death sentence. This belief attempts to claim people are still obligated to keep the law though no longer under the condemnation of the law. The law becomes toothless.

The claim lacks logic. Regardless, a law without teeth is a useless law. But the law is not so toothless when you examine other beliefs held by those who claim this belief; how the law is used in relation to salvation.

Also, the claim does not hold true for all circumstances affected by it. If being "under" the law means one is under the condemnation of the law, then what of Jesus who was born under the law? Was He therefore under the condemnation of that law? Some have actually argued He was! Yet such was not the case.

> But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. — Galatians 4:4-5

**Is any evidence that appears to refute the claim addressed by the one making the claim using the proper methods of examination in order to show the claim is not truly refuted?**

If one is putting forth claims and evidence regarding a particular belief and does not address apparent evidence to the contrary, then this person has stepped over the line regarding the proper discernment of Scripture and into the realm of falsehoods and indoctrination.

When a false belief system is created, the methods of deception are employed, and the adherents of the false belief system are conditioned to abandon their critical thinking skills. They are not taught the proper methods of examining Scripture. They are given proof texts with conclusions that sound reasonable and true, and taught to regard them as unalterable and above question. It is all quite effective.

One of the side effects of using the methods of deception is the cognitive dissonance that results. This is where a person ends up believing two things that are impossible for both to be true at the same time. For example, Sabbatarians interpret Matthew 5:17-18 to be a case of the old covenant Law remaining inviolate even down to jots and tittles; the strokes of the letters that make up the words of the Law. Yet much of the Law Sabbatarians do not even attempt to keep, and those points of Law they claim they do keep they alter way beyond jots and tittles. The tithing law is a good example of this. According to the Law, a tithe was a tenth of the increase of produce and/or livestock. No one was ever commanded to tithe on their wages. The tithe was shared with the Levites, widows, orphans, and the poor, as well as used by the tithe owner for the festivals held in Jerusalem. That is the Law, down to jots and tittles.

Nothing is said in the Law requiring people to tithe of their wages, and give it to ministers. Can it be claimed this argument is an argument through silence? Can tithing based on one's wages be justified by claiming the Bible doesn't say you can't pay tithes of wages, and give it to ministers? As fanciful as this idea may sound, Sabbatarians use just this sort of argument when it comes to New Testament Scriptures in order to justify sabbath keeping. This is why it is of utmost importance that we stick to the Word of God and add nothing to it while also never subtracting from it.

People are taught to reject and ignore God's Word as God inspired it to be recorded, all the while believing they are in compliance with God's Word. No wonder then that Jesus remarked that the deceptions that would come along after Him would be so good that, if it were possible, even the very elect would be deceived.

We either learn what the proper methods of examining Scripture are and how to use them, or we risk being deceived even to the point of believing a false gospel. Is there salvation in believing a false gospel? I doubt it.
When it comes to the old covenant Law, even the Ten Commandments, the Word of God has God commanding the Israelites to keep that covenant Law. God did not command any other group to keep that covenant Law. To conclude Christians are bound to the Ten Commandments is to alter Scripture and its application. The Ten Commandments applied to the Israelites who were a party to that covenant. No others, including Christians, are a party to that covenant. For those who believe all mankind are bound to the Ten Commandments and the Sabbath, even this observation in this context is rejected in favor of their belief. To them, the idea of the Ten Commandments not applying to all mankind is anathema; an impossibility, and helps to demonstrate what is being discussed in this article. They do not believe God. Yet God made that a covenant law, and covenants have parties to them.

To those with that mindset, somehow and in some way it must be shown all mankind is obligated to observe the Ten Commandments. They just know that God wants all mankind to be keeping and observing the Ten Commandments. To them, the Ten reveal what God wants of mankind. Yet to believe and teach this is to go contrary to God's Word as recorded.

God was addressing the Israelites in regards to the Ten Commandments and Sabbath. God was not being careless. God was not suffering from some mental disorder, where He forgot to clearly mention all mankind were to follow the Ten Commandments. God made the ten commandments the core or central point of a covenant. Covenants have parties to them.

So the Sabbatarian belief that all are required to keep the Ten Commandments is an example of faithlessness and rebellion, as covered earlier, for the Sabbatarian does not believe God only commanded that covenant Law to be kept only by the Israelites. They attempt to add Christians and/or all mankind to that covenant, resorting to the methods of deception.

In order to circumvent the Word of God, the methods of deception are brought into play.

**Claims are made that resist falsification:**

“The Ten Commandments is the eternal law of God.”

“The Ten Commandments are God's law of love.”

“The Ten Commandments are God's moral law.”

“The Ten Commandments were written by the finger of God.”

“The Ten Commandments were stored 'in' the ark of the covenant, whereas the rest of the law; the book of the law, was stored on the outside of the ark.”

“The Ten Commandments reflect love for God (first 4) and love for fellow man (last 6).”

“To reject the Ten Commandments is to demonstrate one's contempt and rebellion against God.”

“God never changes, therefore God does not change His Law”

**Claims are made that are rationalizations, sometimes couched in an accusation:**

“If the Ten Commandments were not applicable to all, then people would be free to murder, commit adultery, steal, etc. without fear of divine retribution.”

“People just don't want to submit to what God commands and what is God's will.”

**Eisegetical proof texts are employed:**

“The carnal mind rebels against God's law.” – Rom 8:7

“We establish the law” – Rom 3:31

“The law is holy, just, and good” – Rom 7:12
“Sin is the transgression of the law” – 1 John 3:4

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets...” Mt 5:17

All this and more in order to overcome the most basic rule of understanding Scripture: that we have no right to alter Scripture and its application, seeing as it IS the Word of God.

What could help in this regard is to use an example from another group’s beliefs where you with your own belief system are not associated except in the methodology.

Some groups hold to the belief that blood transfusions are a sin and violate Scripture. As evidence to support this belief, the following Scriptures are cited:

It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood. — Leviticus 3:17

Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings. Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be cut off from his people. — Leviticus 7:26-27

And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. — Leviticus 17:10

A blood transfusion is seen as consuming blood. They see no difference between taking blood in through the mouth or through an I.V. They argue you wouldn't take milk or water in through an I.V. Yet, it is a facetious argument, easily seen as such by those who do not buy into that particular belief. Just try to convince someone who holds to this belief they are wrong though, and that their argument “doesn’t hold water.”

What are the consequences of this belief that goes beyond the scope of Scripture? People who otherwise may well have had life-saving medical treatment end up dead instead. God, it would seem, prefers human sacrifices.

God and the Israelites were the parties to the old covenant Law. Regardless of how you “chop up” the old covenant Law (redefining words and concepts), even claiming the Ten Commandments to be a separate covenant, it can still be demonstrated the parties to that covenant Law were God and the Israelites and no others. There was a provision in the old covenant for those not born of Israel to enter into that covenant relationship with God through circumcision. Were Gentile Christians required to undergo circumcision? No. Were they required to keep the Law? Not according to Acts 15. The very Law people claim Christians should keep excludes Christians if they refuse circumcision.

I could easily go through all the proof texts employed by Sabbatarians, and show the flaws, but it isn't necessary. This has been done in other articles available at www.truthofables.com anyway. Regardless, it becomes an exercise in futility, for no matter how well you expose the proof texts for what they are, and that they do not actually support the erroneous belief, they will produce yet another, and another proof text or rationale to support their flawed beliefs. They seek only to validate their beliefs, even at the expense of Scripture; God's Word.

Either you believe what God has inspired to be written as written, or you do not. If you do not, then you demonstrate your faithlessness. You demonstrate your rebellion. All the proof texts in the world cannot save you.

Did God command non-Israelites to keep the Ten Commandments? No.

“Yea, but...”

Did God command non-Israelites to keep the Sabbath? No.

“Yea, but...”
When it came to the Sabbath and the Israelites, God was specific and detailed in His instructions regarding the Israelites keeping the Sabbath.

When the New Covenant was being instituted, not a peep came from Christ regarding Gentile (non-Israelite) Christians keeping the Sabbath. What do Sabbatarians think then? Was it was just an oversight on His part? The rationalizations fly in flocks.

God is not going to violate His covenants, and we need to understand the nature of His covenants.

What was the nature of the old covenant?

It was a legal contract between God and the Israelites.

It was also seen as a marriage contract between God and the Israelites.

Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD. A voice was heard upon the high places, weeping and supplications of the children of Israel: for they have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the LORD their God. — Jeremiah 3:20-21

It was also treated as a testament, put in force through the shed blood of substitute animals.

For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. — Hebrews 9:19-20

Can someone, not a party to a covenant, be held to the conditions of said covenant? No. Yet Sabbatarians insist on enjoining some of the conditions of the old covenant Law on Christians.

Would God deal with us illegally, holding us to the conditions of a covenant we are not a party to? No. Yet this is exactly what Sabbatarians attempt to do with the Ten Commandments.

If God wanted Christians to keep the Sabbath, He would have made such a command in the New Covenant. God would not have left this matter up to us to discern through assumptions and rationalizations.

**What is the nature of the New Covenant?**

It is a covenant between God and those God has given His Spirit to, as foretold in Scripture. Like the old covenant, it was to be a covenant between God and Israel also, but as the old covenant had a provision that allowed those not of Israel to enter into that covenant through circumcision, Gentiles were “granted repentance unto life” by being given God’s Holy Spirit also, as a result of their belief in the gospel. Their “circumcision” was performed by God, and it was a spiritual circumcision of the heart.

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. — Romans 2:28-29

The law of the New Covenant; the conditions, revolve around faith and love. It is about being led by the Holy Spirit, and not a written code of law. (Rom 3:27; II Cor 3; Rom 7:6)

The New Covenant was prophesied to not be like the old covenant.

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: — Jeremiah 31:31-32
Whereas the old covenant was essentially a contractual agreement, where God made promises physical in nature that would be fulfilled based on the performance/compliance of the Israelites, and punishments should they fail to fulfill the conditions of that covenant, the New Covenant is treated more like a marriage covenant, and has superior promises that are spiritual in nature. This, by the way, is the theme of the book of Hebrews; the superiority of the New Covenant over the old.

God (Christ) trusts and loves this wife. The wife trusts and loves the husband. Christ did not need to put “pre-nups” in this marriage agreement for the purpose of exposing a treacherous and cheating, adulterous, faithless wife.

The church is the bride of Christ. Those under the old covenant were faithless and seen by God as being a treacherous wife, whom God divorced.

And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also. — Jeremiah 3:8

Those were the people of the old covenant, letter of the Law. Jesus' death on the cross finalized the break with Israel and the old covenant. Paul explains this in Romans 7. Christ was now freed from the old covenant with the old treacherous wife and free to marry the new bride; the church; a faithful wife.

The gospel relationship.

The gospel is a message of salvation through faith in Christ.

Those who do not believe the gospel as stated, resort to the aforementioned process in order to make the gospel acceptable to them. They apply the same methodology to the gospel as they do anything else in Scripture they do not believe as stated. Sabbatarian legalists add the Law and Sabbath keeping to the gospel.

They deny this, of course, because they do not believe they are really altering the gospel. They claim they believe in salvation through faith in Christ. One need only ask them what happens to their salvation should they quit keeping the Sabbath. Rather than outright admit this, they again resort to the methods of deception in order to obfuscate the obvious. Rationalizations regarding sin are cited, using proof texts such as I John 3:4 to claims of being hateful towards God and “His Law.”

They “tweak” the gospel in order to make it acceptable to themselves. Again, the gospel as stated, to them, is seen as having left out some details that are found elsewhere in Scripture. If “sin is the transgression of the law,” and no sinner will attain to salvation, then it is a simple matter to conclude one cannot be sinning by breaking the old covenant law in order to be saved.

This conclusion, innocent as it may appear, falsifies the gospel, and succeeds in bringing Christians back under the old covenant Law, and everything that goes with it, including being once again under sin and condemnation. Paul warns Christians against this in places like Galatians 5:1.

Plain and simple declarations made under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit are cast aside:

“For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” — Romans 6:14

But if you are under the Law, sin has dominion. Ever listen carefully to the argument that you are not under the Law, yet still obligated to keep it, and that, should you transgress it, you come back under the Law, and you sin and could lose your salvation? Talk about redefining words and terms! Talk about cognitive dissonance!

“But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” — Galatians 5:8

“But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.” — Galatians 3:23-25
The Faith has been revealed. The Law is history. The Christian in possession of the Holy Spirit is complete in Christ, and there is no need to be under the Law that was for the faithless and spiritually immature; for it is the immature, the children, who need a schoolmaster. God's Holy Spirit is sufficient.

What then of all the proof texts and rationalizations that have been used to try and prove Christians must keep the Law and Sabbath?

They can all be explained. They have all been explained. But, explaining them to someone who believes they must keep the Law and Sabbath is a waste of one's time, for they are, as stated before, the anchor Scriptures the unwary and deceived rely on so heavily.

It is those who are beginning to see the truth of the gospel, and the lies of legalism and Sabbatarianism that benefit from the explanations that show the fallacies of the proof texts used to support legalism and Sabbatarianism. This article and the others here are for them.

To those of the legalistic and Sabbatarian persuasion who may have read this far, who rely so heavily on their “proofs” of Scripture that you believe backs your belief, I once again point out that there is no Scripture where God/Christ commands Christians to keep the Law and the Sabbath. No one has the right to alter Scripture or its application. But that's what you must do in order to believe as you do.

Salvation is for the faithful; those who believe the gospel as stated in God's Word. Salvation is for those who believe God for what God has said, and not what people think God said. Salvation is for the humble who would not dare alter Scripture.

Salvation is not for those who feel free to rationalize around Scripture, making Scripture over to their preconceived beliefs, making God over into their own image; an act of rebellion and faithlessness.

To those who believe they must keep the Law, how is that working out for you? Do you keep the law perfectly, as required? Those who are proponents of the law make another claim, that the Holy Spirit enables a person to keep the Law. So again, how's that working out for you? Now that you have the Holy Spirit, you keep the law perfectly, as required, right? You are now without sin, right?

Has it never occurred to you that your focus in relation to others who do not believe as you do one of trying to convince them to keep the sabbath and Law, instead of a focus on preaching the gospel? Sabbatarians are constantly referring to preaching the truth about the sabbath, and rarely, if ever, the truth of the gospel.

Haven't you noticed that when confronted by people who do not believe as you do, your response is to attack those who oppose your view, accusing them hating God and "His Law" all the while perceiving their opposition to your beliefs as being a case of them persecuting you?

The apostle Paul declares in II Corinthians chapter 3 that those who remain in the teachings and writings of Moses have a veil before their eyes. What did Moses teach and write? The Law. Who then has a veil before their eyes? Those who hold to the Law. Through the use of the methods of deception, a whole new “reality” is created by the Sabbatarian legalist. It is a fantasy world, built upon rationalizations, proof texts, and denial regarding the facts of Scripture where the deceptive tactics are given greater weight than the plain and simple declarations found in the Word of God. God's Word is spun away, circumvented through alterations of Scripture and its application.

Covenants have been covered. Christians are not a party to the old covenant Law that ended.

The gospel has been covered; salvation through faith only, without the “benefit” of the Law.
Many Seventh-day Adventists have written to challenge why I renounced keeping the 7th day Sabbath that begins sundown Friday through sundown Saturday after 47 years. To answer their objections is the reason for this article, “Sabbath Not a Law for Christians.”

When I was a Sabbath keeper, I was questioned by non-Sabbath keepers, “Why do you still hold on to the Sabbath and renounce the other old covenant teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church”? They asked, “Would not the same arguments that I use to show that tithing and refraining from the eating of unclean meats are no longer binding on Christians be the same arguments to show the Sabbath is no longer binding on Christians”? After careful study I have had to conclude they were correct.

**THE COVENANTS**

Seventh-day Adventists arbitrarily divide the old covenant into two divisions, moral and ceremonial. They claim that the Ten Commandments are moral and the rest of the law/covenant is ceremonial. They have offered no biblical evidence to support a two-part division of the old covenant. There are moral and ceremonial commands in the whole law as well as a ceremonial command in the Ten Commandments.

1. The Bible writers never declared the old covenant was a two-part covenant. The Jews understand that there is but one law/covenant and it is all equally holy and binding. When Israel vowed to keep the covenant, it was one covenant not a two-division covenant.

   **Ex. 24:3 (NIV)** - When Moses went and told the people all the LORD'S words and laws, they responded with one voice, “Everything the LORD has said we will do.”

   A. There are 613 commands in the old covenant that Israelites were required to keep perfectly.

   B. The Ten has one ceremonial command, the Sabbath, which is not a moral command.

Sabbath keeping was given to Israel as a weekly ritual “to rest” from labor. It was never commanded as a communal day of worship. Israel was commanded to remember their deliverance from Egypt and that God created the world. The Sabbath is not a moral command as no person has ever been charged with sin for breaking the Sabbath except Israel of the Old Covenant.

2. The Old Covenant is a binding agreement God made with Israel at Sinai.

   **(NIV)** Moses then took the blood, sprinkled it on the people and said, “This is the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words.”

SDA’s teach that the Sabbath is binding on all nations and all people for all time when in fact it was given only to one nation Israel. Circumcision was the entry sign into the covenant. Gentiles could only legally keep the Sabbath and be accepted by God, if they joined the Israelite community through circumcision and kept all the requirements of the Covenant.
3. The sign of the Old Covenant between God and Israel was the Sabbath. God never made the Sabbath a sign for Christians in the New Testament. Do you find Christians mentioned in the text? Can you legally enjoin on Christians that which God has not enjoined on them?

Ex. 31:16 - 17 (NRSV) - Therefore the Israelites shall keep the Sabbath, observing the Sabbath throughout their generations, as a perpetual covenant. 17 It is a sign forever between me and the people of Israel that in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.”

4. Circumcision is just as much a perpetual covenant for Israel as the Sabbath. Circumcision was first made with Abraham as an “everlasting covenant.”

Gen. 17:9-10, 13-14 (NIV) - Then God said to Abraham, “As for you, you must keep my covenant, you and your descendants after you for the generations to come. 10 This is my covenant with you and your descendants after you, the covenant you are to keep: Every male among you shall be circumcised. 13 Whether born in your household or bought with your money, they must be circumcised. My covenant in your flesh is to be an everlasting covenant. 14 Any uncircumcised male, who has not been circumcised in the flesh, will be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

4. God then gave circumcision to Israel along with the Sabbath in the Law of Moses.

John 7:21 - 24 (NIV) - Jesus said to them, “I did one miracle, and you are all astonished. 22 Yet, because Moses gave you circumcision (though actually it did not come from Moses, but from the patriarchs), you circumcise a child on the Sabbath. 23 Now if a child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the Law of Moses may not be broken, why are you angry with me for healing the whole man on the Sabbath? 24 Stop judging by mere appearances, and make a right judgment.”

6. The Old Covenant ended at Calvary with the death of Jesus.

When a party to a covenant dies, said covenant ends. In this case it was Jesus who died, and He made that covenant with Israel. Thus the old covenant ended, even as a marriage covenant ends upon the death of either party. The surviving person is free to marry again, even as Jesus now takes the church as His new bride. If a mate dies, the surviving person is no longer married to a corpse. Rom. 7 shows this comparison of marriage and dying to the law through Christ. SDA’s are married to the old covenant corpse. They read Sabbath-keeping in the Old Covenant (contract) God made with Israel and apply it to themselves. They do not accept the fact that they were never a party to that covenant. The only way for them to legally keep the Sabbath is through circumcision and they are then obligated to keep ALL the requirements of Old Covenant with its 613 commands, which they do not do. They refuse to kill Sabbath breakers and stay at home on Sabbaths as the law requires. Thus they are lawbreakers, and subject to the condemnation of that law.

WHAT ENDED AT THE CROSS?

Jesus Abolished Israel’s law with Ten Commandments and regulations.

Eph. 2:15 (NIV) - by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations.

Notice, “the law” is singular that was abolished, not laws. There was just “one law” the Mosaic Law with many commands and regulations, and it was abolished by Jesus.

God canceled the written code and regulations nailing it to the cross. SDA’s claim that the “written code” was not the Ten, but the law that Moses wrote.

Both God and Moses wrote the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments written on stone tablets by the finger of God were placed inside the Ark of the Covenant, and they were also written by Moses on parchment and placed outside the Ark in the Book of the Covenant. Otherwise you would not be reading it in your Bible. Col. 2 and Ex. 24 explain this.

Col. 2:13 - 14 (NIV) - When you were dead in your sins and in the uncircumcision of your sinful nature, God made you alive with Christ. He forgave us all our sins, 14 having canceled the written code, with its regulations, that was against us and that stood opposed to us; he took it away, nailing it to the cross.
Ex. 24:3 - 4 (NIV) When Moses went and told the people all the LORD's words and laws, they responded with one voice, "Everything the LORD has said we will do." Moses then wrote down everything the LORD had said. He got up early the next morning and built an altar at the foot of the mountain and set up twelve stone pillars representing the twelve tribes of Israel.

vs. 7 - then he took the Book of the Covenant and read it to the people. They responded, "We will do everything the LORD has said; we will obey."

Jesus was taken down from the cross, but the law with the Sabbath remains nailed to the cross for eternity. SDA's try their best to pry the nails from the cross to make the Sabbath binding on Christians.

"The first Covenant" had "stone tablets of the covenant."

There is no way to avoid the fact the the old covenant included the Ten Commandments.

Heb. 9:1 – Heb. 9:4 (NIV) - Now the first covenant had regulations for worship and also an earthly sanctuary. A tabernacle was set up. In its first room were the lampstand, the table and the consecrated bread; this was called the Holy Place. Behind the second curtain was a room called the Most Holy Place, which had the golden altar of incense and the gold-covered Ark of the Covenant. This ark contained the gold jar of manna, Aaron's staff that had budded, and the stone tablets of the covenant.

The Old Covenant with the Ten Commandments is obsolete.

Heb. 8:7 – Heb. 8:13 (NIV) - For if there had been nothing wrong with that first covenant, no place would have been sought for another. But God found fault with the people and said, "The time is coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. It will not be like the covenant I made with their forefathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, because they did not remain faithful to my covenant, and I turned away from them, declares the Lord. This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time, declares the Lord. I will put my laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God and they will be my people. No longer will a man teach his neighbor, or a man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest. For I will forgive their wickedness and will remember their sins no more.” By calling this covenant “new," he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.

The Ten Commandments were a ministration of death and condemnation.

2 Cor. 3:6 - 9 (NIV) - He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant—not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, fading though it was, will not the ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious? If the ministry that condemns men is glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness!

Only one who was a party to that law/Sabbath could die to that law/Sabbath. No one alive today was a party to the old covenant. For someone to insist on keeping the Sabbath and other old covenant points of law is to insist on being bound to a dead mate.

Christian Jews are "released from the Law" and now serve the Spirit and not in the way of "the written code".

If you have not died to the law/Sabbath you are holding onto a corpse. Good luck with that!

Rom. 7:4-6 (NIV) - So, my brothers, you also died to the law through the body of Christ, that you might belong to another, to him who was raised from the dead, in order that we might bear fruit to God. For when we were controlled by the sinful nature, the sinful passions aroused by the law were at work in our bodies, so that we bore fruit for death. But now, by dying to what once bound us; we have been released from the law so that we serve in the new way of the Spirit, and not in the old way of the written code.

The law was a witness against Israel not Christians.
God gave the law to Israel to show them their sins and the law was a witness to it. They were a stiff-necked, rebellious, idolatrous, faithless nation.

Deut. 31:26-27 (NIV) - “Take this Book of the Law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God. There it will remain as a witness against you. For I know how rebellious and stiff-necked you are. If you have been rebellious against the LORD while I am still alive and with you, how much more will you rebel after I die!

The law was a school master (paidagogos) to bring Israel to Christ, not Christians who were never under that law. How can SDA’s who claim to be justified by faith, want to be under Israel’s schoolmaster (law)?

Gal. 3:23-25 (KJV) - But before faith came; we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster [paidagogos] to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

A paidagogos was one who accompanied a child, who was usually a slave of the parents of the child, and even administered punishment as required. Once the child came of age and was mature, the paidagogos was dismissed from this oversight of the child. Those who insist on living by that law demonstrate their immaturity; still needing a law to tell them everything they are to do or not do.

Christ is the end of the Law for Israel.

The law made no one righteousness and no one could keep it perfectly.

Rom. 10:4 (NIV) - Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for everyone who believes.

Rom. 3:20 (NIV) - Therefore no one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law; rather, through the law we become conscious of sin.

The Law of Sin and Death is the Ten Commandments.

2 Cor. 3:6-7 (NIV) - He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant—not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, fading though it was.

The law was made for rebellious Israel, and not Christians with the spirit of God.

1. Do Christians need a law to tell them not to worship idols, not to murder and steal?

1 Tim. 1:9 (NIV) - We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

How can Christians be righteous before God without the law?

Christians will receive their righteousness from the gospel and will live by faith.

Rom. 1:17 (NIV) - For in the gospel a righteousness from God is revealed, a righteousness that is by faith from first to last, just as it is written: “The righteous will live by faith.”
Rom. 3:21-23 (KJV) - But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; 22Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: 23For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

Paul was not under the Law.

Be like Paul and win SDA's and other Sabbatarians that put themselves under the law.

Cor. 9:20 (NIV) - To the Jews I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the law I became like one under the law (though I myself am not under the law), so as to win those under the law.

Rom 6:14 (NIV) - For sin shall not be your master, because you are not under law, but under grace.

Gal 5:14 (NIV) - The entire law is summed up in a single command: “Love your neighbor as yourself.”

Gal 5:18 (NIV) - But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law.

The Apostles opposed the Judaizers that were trying to impose the law on Gentiles.

The issue was keeping the Law of Moses. Notice that the Sabbath was not included in the discussion. In the Jewish mind a gentile must first be circumcised before he could keep the Sabbath. This would have been an excellent time to tell the gentiles to keep the Ten as do SDA’s.

Acts 15:5 (NIV) - Then some of the believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees stood up and said, “The Gentiles must be and required to obey the law of Moses.”

Acts 15:10 - 11 (NIV) - Now then, why do you try to test God by putting on the necks of the disciples a yoke that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? 11No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are.

Acts 15:19 - 21 (NIV) - “It is my judgment, therefore, that we should not make it difficult for the Gentiles who are turning to God. 20Instead we should write to them, telling them to abstain from food polluted by idols, from sexual immorality, from the meat of strangled animals and from blood. 21For Moses has been preached in every city from the earliest times and is read in the synagogues on every Sabbath.”

The Sinai Covenant is Slavery represented by earthly Jerusalem. Jewish and Gentile Christians are free in the New Jerusalem in heaven which is of faith.

What was given on Mount Sinai? The Ten Commandments with the Sabbath.

Gal 4:21 - Gal 4:31 (NIV) - Tell me, you who want to be under the law, are you not aware of what the law says? 22For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the slave woman and the other by the free woman. 23His son by the slave woman was born in the ordinary way; but his son by the free woman was born as the result of a promise. 24These things may be taken figuratively, for the women represent two covenants. One covenant is from Mount Sinai and bears children who are to be slaves: This is Hagar. 25Now Hagar stands for Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present city of Jerusalem, because she is in slavery with her children. 26But the Jerusalem that is above is free, and she is our mother. 27For it is written: “Be glad, O barren woman, who bears no children; break forth and cry aloud, you who have no labor pains; because more are the children of the desolate woman than of her who has a husband.” 28Now you, brothers, like Isaac, are children of promise. 29At that time the son born in the ordinary way persecuted the son born by the power of the Spirit. It is the same now. 30But what does the Scripture say? “Get rid of the slave woman and her son, for the slave woman’s son will never share in the inheritance with the free woman’s son.” 31Therefore, brothers, we are not children of the slave woman, but of the free woman.
The New Covenant is God writing his laws on the Christian’s heart.

**Hebrews 8:10 (NIV)** - This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time, declares the Lord. I will put my laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God and they will be my people.

What are the laws that God has written on our hearts?

SDA’s would have you believe that God is writing the same old covenant law of sin and death on our hearts. The Apostles tell us what they are.

Law of Faith. To know we are justified before God without keeping the old covenant.

**Rom. 3:27-28 (NRSV)** - Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28 For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.

The Law of the Spirit has set us free from the law of sin and death.

**Rom. 8:1 - 4 (NIV)** - Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death. 3For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, 4in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.

Live by the Spirit. If you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

**Gal. 5:16 – Gal. 5:21 (NIV)** - So I say, live by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the desires of the sinful nature. 17For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want. 18But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law. 19The acts of the sinful nature are obvious: sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery, idolatry and witchcraft; hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage, selfish ambition, dissensions, factions 21and envy; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God.

Law of Christ.

**Gal. 6:2 (NIV)** - Carry each other’s burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ.

Law of liberty.

**James 2:8 -9 (NIV)** - If you really keep the royal law found in Scripture, “Love your neighbor as yourself,” you are doing right. 9But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as lawbreakers. 10For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it. 11For he who said, “Do not commit adultery,” also said, “Do not murder.” If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker.

James mentions two distinct laws—that is, (1) the royal law and the law of liberty (which are identical) and (2) “the whole law” (which includes the entire Torah, all the Laws of Moses). James tells us that the royal law is “Love your neighbor as yourself.” This law, found in Leviticus 19:18, is one of many laws that the Lord gave to Moses to instruct Israel regarding how to live moral lives and develop good interpersonal relationships with others. James also states that, as in the old covenant law, if you broke even one point of the whole law, you were guilty of the entirety of the old covenant. Likewise, if you fail to show proper love for even one person by showing partiality, you are guilty of breaking the law of Liberty. Therefore to break one point in the Ten or in the “whole law” consisting of 613 commands, YOU are a lawbreaker.
Jesus gave a new commandment to love one another.

Will a Christian that loves one another, murder, steal, commit adultery, and worship idols? There is no need for that obsolete law or the Ten Commandments. Love does no harm to one's neighbor therefore love fulfills the law. Keeping the law does not fulfill it. Another way to look at this is that, if a Christian has love for even his enemies, he would not commit these acts, seeing as these things are a result of an unconverted heart, not motivated by love. Do you trust the spirit to guide you? If not you have no faith just as Israel.

**John 13:34 - John 13:35 (NIV)** - “A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another.

35 By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.”

The world will know you are Jesus’ disciples if you love one another.

Paul tells Titus what to teach. Notice that nothing is said about keeping the Sabbath.

**Titus 2:11 - Titus 2:15 (NIV)** - For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men. 12 It teaches us to say “No” to ungodliness and worldly passions, and to live self-controlled, upright and godly lives in this present age, 13 while we wait for the blessed hope—the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, 14 who gave himself for us to redeem us from all wickedness and to purify for himself a people that are his very own, eager to do what is good. 15 These, then, are the things you should teach. Encourage and rebuke with all authority. Do not let anyone despise you.

**DO SABBATARIANS FOLLOW JESUS’ EXAMPLE?**

Sabbatarians enjoy pointing to Jesus as our example to keep the Sabbath. Is this a valid argument? If we are to follow Jesus' examples of how he lived under the old covenant, we should consider this:

Do Sabbatarians Follow Jesus’ Example? No!

• Jesus wore tassels on a robe with a blue cord.

• Jesus paid tax to the temple and supported temple worship

• Jesus went to a Jewish synagogue on Sabbath and read from the Torah in Hebrew.

• Jesus spoke out against the Jewish Leaders.

• Jesus limited his study only to the Torah.

• Jesus kept all 12 sabbaths including eating the Passover lamb.

• Jesus did not baptize anyone.

• Jesus did not own a home, did not marry, was not employed, had no income, stayed in other peoples homes, rode a donkey.

**Paul Used the Sabbath For Evangelism.**

1. Whenever the Apostles are mentioned in connection with the Sabbath, it was for evangelism and not Sabbath keeping. Paul often went to the Temple and synagogues to preach Christ to both Jews and Gentiles. It is never recorded that Paul or the Apostles preached Sabbath keeping to Jews or Gentiles. Notice Acts 17:2. Paul did not go to the synagogue to keep the Sabbath or to worship. Worship was done at the Temple, not the synagogues. The synagogues were used to teach the Torah. Paul taught from the Torah how Christ fulfilled the prophecies found in the Torah. Not once in the book of Acts is the Sabbath a point of discussion. Gentiles were coming into the church by the thousands and were not taught to keep the Sabbath Command or the penalties for breaking the Sabbath.
Acts 17:2 - Acts 17:4 (NIV) - As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned with them from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead. “This Jesus I am proclaiming to you is the Christ, he said. Some of the Jews were persuaded and joined Paul and Silas, as did a large number of God-fearing Greeks and not a few prominent women.

Does Paul, quoting the Ten Commandments, prove that the Sabbath is binding on Christians?

Paul was always silent when it came to Sabbath keeping. He does quote the Ten Commandments, but not as a duty for the church. Paul is saying the duty for Christians is to love your neighbor as yourself and it is this that fulfills the requirements of the Torah/Law. The Jewish audience that Paul was addressing believed that if they kept the Ten Commandments they were fulfilling all the Torah/Law but they were not, if they did not love their neighbor.

Rom. 13:8 – Rom. 13:10 (NIV) - Let no debt remain outstanding, except the continuing debt to love one another, for he who loves his fellowman has fulfilled the law. The commandments, “Do not commit adultery,” “Do not murder,” “Do not steal,” “Do not covet,” and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

ANSWERING SABBATH COVENANT ARGUMENTS

Here is a list of some often-used arguments to support Sabbath-keeping:

Argument: God rested on the Sabbath at Creation; he made the day holy, and sanctified the day. Therefore all mankind is bound to keep the day holy.

Gen. 2:2-3 (NIV) - By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing; so on the seventh day he rested from all his work. And God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it he rested from all the work of creating that he had done.

The term “Sabbath” is not mentioned in the creation account. God rested from creating on THAT seventh day; He didn’t continue creating by creating a repetitive day of rest. God rested / ceased from His creating on that particular seventh day from the creation that was completed the sixth day, and He sanctified THAT particular seventh day, and not the recurring seventh day.

God “rested” from that work because He was done with that work. A lawyer in court “rests” his case when He is done and has no more to offer to the court. Genesis also shows that that day shows having no end. God is still at rest from that work, and, according to the author of Hebrews 4, believers have the opportunity to enter into God’s rest that He began then. The believer enters into God’s rest “Today” seeing as that day has yet to end. This is the rest the Sabbath pointed to, and was a shadow of.

By using this argument that “this rest couldn’t possibly be just for God” a rationalization is made to include Adam and Eve, and the rest of mankind into a physical, weekly seventh day rest. If this rest were not just for God, then mankind would be given the potential to enter into this same rest, right? And isn’t that what the author of Hebrews is getting at? We can enter into God’s rest, so why would we want to enter into that shadow rest that pointed to Christ, and is indeed this rest? See Col. 2:15-16. Sabbatharians’ logic gets side-tracked due to their preoccupation with the weekly, physical Sabbath that was but the shadow.

It is not logical to conclude, that we therefore enter into another rest that God did not enter into; the weekly Sabbath. God commanded Israel to rest on that reciprocal seventh day, and did not command Himself or claim He rested on weekly Sabbaths. The witness of Christ confirms this when He declared that the Father works on sabbaths as well as Christ.

Sabbatharians desperately need to establish the recurring seventh day Sabbath here in order to make the case for it applying to Christians who were not a party to the old covenant, and to make the case that the Sabbath is somehow special and “eternal.”

The term “Sabbath” is not used in the Genesis account and there is no internal evidence God sanctified every seventh day. It was THAT first seventh day that God sanctified and rested; not every seventh day thereafter as recorded in John
5:16-17. God kept the manna that he gave Israel in the wilderness from spoiling on the Sabbath day. God preserves life and holds the worlds in place on the seventh day.

The Father and Jesus work on Sabbaths.

**John 5:16 - 17 (NIV)** - So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him. 17Jesus said to them, “My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working.”

**Argument: Adam and Eve kept the Sabbath.**

There is no internal evidence Adam and Eve were commanded to keep the weekly Sabbath, or anyone else prior to Israel being at Sinai when the Law of Moses was put forth and codified. It is more wishful thinking. Their line of reasoning here has been one of “once holy, always holy” and this includes Christians, so why isn’t that ground at Sinai not still holy? You can’t have it both ways. Those that claim Adam and Eve kept the Sabbath are doing so by speculation.

The Bible does tell us that the Sinaitic Covenant which includes the Sabbath was not made with the fathers such as Adam, Noah, Isaac, Jacob and Abraham.

**Deut. 5:2 -3 (NIV)** - The LORD our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. 3It was not with our fathers that the LORD made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today.

**Argument: Abraham kept all God’s commandments. Therefore he kept the Sabbath.**

**Gen. 26:5 (NIV)** - because Abraham obeyed me and kept my requirements, my commands, my decrees and my laws.”

This is another false claim that is speculation. The Sabbath was not included in God’s covenant with Abraham. Circumcision evidently was more important to God than the Sabbath as God made circumcision the covenant sign and not the Sabbath with Abraham.

**Gen. 17:10 - 11 (NIV)** - This is my covenant with you and your descendants after you, the covenant you are to keep: Every male among you shall be circumcised. 11You are to undergo circumcision, and it will be the sign of the covenant between me and you.

**Argument: The Sabbath is a lasting covenant. Therefore it will never end.**

**Ex. 31:16 -17 (NIV)** - The Israelites are to observe the Sabbath, celebrating it for the generations to come as a lasting covenant. 17It will be a sign between me and the Israelites forever, for in six days the LORD made the heavens and the Earth, and on the seventh day he abstained from work and rested.”

So if the Sabbath stands now because it was an eternal, everlasting covenant, then so does circumcision.

**Gen. 17:13 - 14 (NIV)** - Whether born in your household or bought with your money, they must be circumcised. My covenant in your flesh is to be an everlasting covenant. 14Any uncircumcised male, who has not been circumcised in the flesh, will be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

The new covenant was not to be like the old covenant!

**Jer. 31:31 - 33 (NIV)** - “The time is coming,” declares the LORD, “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. 32It will not be like the covenant I made with their forefathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, because they broke my covenant, though I was a husband to them,” declares the LORD. 33“This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel after that time,” declares the LORD. “I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be my people.
God told Israel the time would come that he would stop their Sabbaths.

Hosea 2:11 (NIV) - I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days— all her appointed feasts.

SDA’s want to make just the 7th day Sabbath holy and an “eternal covenant” to meet their agenda and discard the other ten rest sabbaths found in Deuteronomy 23. The Sabbath was a shadow of the finished work of Christ. Why Sabbatarians want to live in the shadows and deny the finished work of Christ is a mystery to me. Paul tells us that these weekly, monthly and yearly Sabbaths are temporary— shadows which meet their reality in Jesus.

Col. 2:16 - Col 2:17 (NIV) - Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ.

Argument: Isaiah proves the Sabbath is eternal, as it will be kept in the earth made new.

Isa. 66:22 - Isa. 66:24 (NIV) - “As the new heavens and the new earth that I make will endure before me,” declares the LORD, “so will your name and descendants endure. 23From one New Moon to another and from one Sabbath to another, all mankind will come and bow down before me,” says the LORD. 24“And they will go out and look upon the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; their worm will not die, nor will their fire be quenched, and they will be loathsome to all mankind.”

If the messages of Isaiah apply to the Christian Church, then we are faced with a lot of problems. Read this carefully:

Isa. 65:17, tells about when God will create a new heaven and earth. vs. 20, people that do not live to be 100 will be accursed. (People will die in the new earth?) vs. 22, people will live as long as a tree. (Many trees do not live 20 years) vs. 23, women will bear children. (Jesus tells us, there will be no marriage in heaven.) As you can see this has nothing to do with the Christian belief of the New Heaven and the New Earth. If Israel had been faithful/obedient to God these blessings would have come to them. Isaiah’s prophecy applies only to Israel and not to new covenant Christians. Will the saints really need a weekly Sabbath to rest from their labor, to remember they were delivered from Egypt and that it was God that created the world? I think not.

Every Sabbath in the new earth you can go out each Sabbath and view dead bodies and worms that do not die.

Isa. 66:22 - 24 (NIV) - “As the new heavens and the new earth that I make will endure before me,” declares the LORD, “so will your name and descendants endure. 23From one New Moon to another and from one Sabbath to another, all mankind will come and bow down before me,” says the LORD. 24“And they will go out and look upon the dead bodies of those who rebelled against me; their worm will not die, nor will their fire be quenched, and they will be loathsome to all mankind.”

There is no death or dead worms in the New Earth. As you can see Isaiah’s prophecy has nothing to do with the new covenant description of the New Heaven and the New Earth.

Argument: The Sabbath will be kept in the New Jerusalem!

Rev. 21:23 – Rev. 21:25 (NIV) - The city does not need the sun or the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God gives it light, and the Lamb is its lamp. 24The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their splendor into it. 25On no day will its gates ever be shut, for there will be no night there.

How indeed can the Sabbath be kept in the New Jerusalem without any night to define the start and end of the day? Is God going to ring a bell? It is ridiculous to think the saints will need a day “of rest” once a week to commune with God or to rest from work. God does not rest on the seventh day, why would the saints?

Argument: Jesus did not abolish the Ten Commandment law; therefore the Sabbath is binding.

(This argument used by Robert Sanders with the permission of William H. Hohmann.)
Matt. 5:17 – Matt. 5:19 (NIV) - “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not
come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the
smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is
accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the
same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be
called great in the kingdom of heaven.

The above declaration by Jesus Christ is interpreted by those who hold to Sabbath keeping as proof that the Ten
Commandments, including the Sabbath command, is binding on Christians. At first glance, this appears to be true, until
one subjects the above to proper Biblical scholarship and critical analysis.

If it were a matter of being points of law, then the phrase “law or the Prophets” would not make sense, seeing as there is
no law codified in the Prophets to “fulfill”. It is erroneously concluded that it is the law that is “fulfilled” and not the
prophecies located in the law and prophets.

The first problem that arises is over the interpretation of “fulfill” in verse 17. The Sabbatarian argument is that this “fulfill” is
to be understood as “filling to the full” or “filling up” the law. Jesus came to bring it up to full strength, as it were. This view
forces a conclusion that Sabbatarians overlook in this interpretation. The law was deficient or incomplete; the same law
they claim to be “God’s law” and a perfect, eternal law.

And if it is being “magnified” in this regard, how can this be accomplished without altering it way beyond jots and tittles?
What of those portions of “God’s law” that are sacrificial and ceremonial in nature that the Sabbatarian insists are not
binding on Christians? What happened to their “jots and tittles”?

And finally, how can you fill up or fulfill the law in that portion of scripture referred to as “The Prophets” where there is no
codification of law? The opening declaration again states: Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I
am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. How can one “destroy” the prophets, and how can one “fulfill” the prophets?

So here we have a situation where one cannot fulfill that section of the Bible called the Prophets regarding law, seeing
there is no law codified in the Prophets that has the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed. But this potential exists in the law
and the prophets in regards to prophesies, as there are prophesies in the law and the prophets.

The next question to be asked is, Did Jesus come to fulfill the prophesies found in the law and the prophets? Yes he did.
At this point, we need to address the context of verse 18:

Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Seeing as the law and prophets are addressed in the preceding verse, we cannot quickly assume that now just the law, or
the first 5 books (the Pentateuch) are being solely addressed, for quite often the term “the law” is used to indicate the
entire old testament.

Those who hold to the “fill the law to the full” view are quick to point out that not all things were fulfilled prophetically by
Jesus; the heavens and earth are still here, ergo the context is about filling up the law. If not A, then B is the logic, without
examining any other possibilities. This is commonly called “black and white thinking” and is poor Biblical scholarship. We
have already seen how this does not hold up in regards to verse 17, and when we try to apply this understanding to verse
18, even greater problems arise.

If this is about filling up the law, then we have a condition here that once the law is filled up, completed, or brought up to
full strength, then it passes away with the passing of heaven and earth. Does it make sense to build up the law for the
purpose of doing away with it, especially in light of a belief that insists this law is eternal?

Do we run into such illogical errors when we conclude it is a matter of things prophesied to occur culminating in a new
heaven and earth? Not at all. When all things foretold in the law have come to realization, then all things have been done
and there is an end to those things followed by the new heavens and earth.

What then of the apparent conflict where it is claimed Jesus did not “fulfill” all prophesies that culminate with the passing
of heaven and earth? It is a result of trying to connect two things that are actually separate in the context of the two
verses.
Verse 17: Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

This needs to be taken in the context of that moment. Did Jesus come at that time; at that moment to fulfill all things as related to in verse 18, or did he come at that time to fulfill what was prophesied concerning his coming then and there?

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. — Luke 24:44

Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. — Luke 18:31 Is Jesus here referring back to when he spoke the words here in Matthew 5:17? It sure looks that way.

What is so conveniently overlooked by Sabbatarians is that verse 18 compliments verse 17 from this time perspective. First, Jesus came to fulfill those things written of him in the law, prophets, and psalms. Verse 18 begins a new thought that follows this same line of reasoning concerning fulfillment of scripture. 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.

Likewise, absolutely everything written in the law culminating in the passing of this heaven and earth will also be fulfilled. Nothing will be left undone. No prophecy will go unfulfilled. Everything will be done “by the book.”

Jesus came at that time to fulfill “all things” concerning him for that time and place. Likewise, all things prophesied to occur in this age will also come to pass. After all these things have been accomplished, this heaven and earth pass away and the new age begins, starting with the new heavens and the new earth, as also prophesied. Jesus speaks from the perspective of then and there to the perspective of the future from then and there.

If we were to enter that time and listen to what was being said then, and take into account what the people were thinking then about Jesus and the confusion surrounding him and what he taught, we might have concluded he had come to do something contrary to the prophesies in scripture, seeing as he was not doing those things they thought and believed the coming Messiah would do regarding Israel and the kingdom restored to her. It would be like Jesus saying to us:

Don’t think I am going to act contrary to what was written and prophesied concerning me and my appearing; I am going to do exactly what was written of me. Likewise, all things will be done written in the law foretold to the end of the age and time. He then continues his dissertation to the people concerning the kingdom of God (heaven) and talks about those who will be great and those who will be least, depending on how well they heed his words that followed.

This Sermon on the Mount was not about law; it was about Jesus the Messiah preaching the gospel and his coming kingdom, often couched in parables as a veil to their understanding. Those who attempt to read into the narrative their pet beliefs will surely not understand the gospel being preached even now.

Now we come to verse 19: Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Notice the context says “these” commandments and not “the” commandments. Does the context leading up to verse 19 indicate that Jesus was talking about commandments? No. Does Jesus begin referencing commandments following this verse? Yes, unless one wishes to redefine what a commandment is, as though Jesus did not proceed to give commands to those followers of his that he was addressing.

The Sabbatarian likes to conclude that Jesus was talking about Old Covenant commandments by force-fitting them into the preceding verses, and ignores that Jesus proceeds to give commandments to his followers in the context of that statement in what follows. Jesus then goes about, quoting from the law commandments in the law, and proceeds to alter points of law way beyond jots and tittles! How is this possible if he was claiming just moments before that none of the law was to be altered even down to the strokes of the letters of the law until heaven and earth had passed? But this sort of cognitive dissonance is common when holding to misinterpretations and misrepresentations of scripture.

The pattern now is one of “the law says this, but I say unto you that” where in some cases the law is totally nullified in the process. For example, performing one’s oaths. But Jesus commands that his followers swear not at all; to not make an
oath to begin with. It is also stated in the law that one was to hate their enemy and love their neighbor. Jesus declares we are to love even our enemies.

The most telling of all is Jesus’ teaching on divorce. The law (this same law called “eternal” and “perfect” and not to be altered even down to the strokes of a letter) allowed a man to divorce his wife for just about any reason. What was Jesus’ take on divorce as found in the law?

The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. — Matthew 19:3-9

The law allowed for an easy divorce. It was a concession in the law because the people were carnal; devoid of God’s Spirit. So the law allowed for something that was wrong from the beginning. So much for the claim that the law existed from creation and was kept by the Patriarchs of old!

(End of the argument by William H. Hohmann cited by Sanders.)

Has Jesus altered the law beyond jots and tittles? Only a blind one would say no.

**Argument: The Lord’s Day is the 7th day Sabbath, because Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath.**

This is one of many examples of Sabbatarians twisting the meaning of words in the Bible. The term “Lord’s Day” is used one time in the Bible and it does not say it is the Sabbath. It is another assumption.

*Rev. 1:10 (NIV)* - On the Lord’s Day I was in the Spirit, and I heard behind me a loud voice like a trumpet.

The Sabbath is always called in the Greek *Sabbaton* or in the Hebrew *Shabbath*. Strong’s: G4521 σαββατον sab’bat-on Of Hebrew origin [H7676]; the Sabbath (that is, Shabbath), or day of weekly repose from secular avocations (also the observance or institution itself);

The Church fathers in the first centuries called Sunday, “the Lord’s Day” because Christ rose from the grave on Sunday. They choose this day as a celebration for their deliverance from sin and salvation by Christ. This tradition does not make Sunday a holy day or a Sunday Sabbath.

**Argument: Worshiping on Sunday is honoring the sun god and the Papal Sabbath.**

Jesus rose from the grave early on the first day of the week, Sunday. Jesus met with his disciples on the first day of the week after the resurrection. Was Jesus honoring the sun god or the Papal Sabbath? The pagans of the Roman Empire never celebrated a weekly day to the sun god. It is despicable for Sabbatarians to insinuate those that go to church on Sunday are worshiping or honoring a pagan god or the Pope of Rome. When SDA’s go to prayer meeting on Wednesday evening, for example, are they worshiping the pagan god, Woden, chief god in Norse mythology? As you can see this is a ridiculous allegation to make against Christians that worship the Creator.

*Editor’s note: Recall that the Roman calendar utilized an 8-day week and the day named in honor of the sun was somewhere in the middle of that week. Therefore, the Roman day named in honor of the sun would only occasionally fall on the day of the 7-day week Jewish calendar that is named in honor of the sun, which was, of course, the first day of that week. Also recall that Christians were meeting on Sundays hundreds of years before there was a pope or a Roman Catholic Church and that the Gentile Christians probably never kept the Sabbath in significant numbers. Additionally, keep in mind that Mithraism, the sun worship cult in the Roman Empire, did not become developed enough within Roman society until 200-300 AD. to have been a likely source of influence on Christian worship practices.*

**Argument: The Ten Commandments are the eternal Gospel from the beginning of the World.**

If so did Adam honor his mother?
Argument: Hebrews 4 proves Christians are to keep the Sabbath.

Heb. 4:9 – Heb. 4:11 (NIV) - There remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God; for anyone who enters God’s rest also rests from his own work, just as God did from his. Let us, therefore, make every effort to enter that rest, so that no one will fall by following their example of disobedience.

Israel had the 7th day Sabbath ritual, but they did not have the sabbath rest in God which is of faith. “God's rest” is rest for their souls not from chopping wood, working in a factory, etc. Now God wants Christians to have the rest in him that Israel failed to enter. If we are led by the Spirit, we will enter that rest. Christ is the Christians sabbath rest of faith and trust which we enjoy daily.

Argument: Commandments in the NT means the Ten Commandments.

SDA’s use these two texts to show that “God’s commandments” are the Ten Commandments. There is nothing in the texts that tell us this.

Rev. 14:12 (NIV) - This calls for patient endurance on the part of the saints who obey God’s commandments and remain faithful to Jesus.

1 John 2:3-4 (NIV) - We know that we have come to know him if we obey his commands. The man who says, “I know him,” but does not do what he commands is a liar, and the truth is not in him.

Christians indeed keep God’s commandments that God addressed to Christians. But if we are going to assume that this means old covenant commandments, then why not commandments God gave to other individuals in the Bible? God commanded one prophet to bake his bread over cow manure. It is a commandment of God. Shall we keep this commandment also?

Baking Bread Over Cow Manure

Ezek. 4:14 - 15 (NIV) - Then I said, “Not so, Sovereign LORD! I have never defiled myself. From my youth until now I have never eaten anything found dead or torn by wild animals. No unclean meat has ever entered my mouth.” “Very well,” he said, “I will let you bake your bread over cow manure instead of human excrement.”

Jesus commanded his disciples to preach to people. Do you do this?

Mark 6:8 - 10 (NIV) - These were his instructions: “Take nothing for the journey except a staff—no bread, no bag, no money in your belts. Wear sandals but not an extra tunic. Whenever you enter a house, stay there until you leave that town.

Jesus commanded Peter to pay their taxes by getting a coin out of the fish’s mouth. Do you do this?

Matt. 17:27 – (NIV) - “But so that we may not offend them, go to the lake and throw out your line. Take the first fish you catch; open its mouth and you will find a four-drachma coin. Take it and give it to them for my tax and yours.”

Argument: The Ten Commandments point out sins.

The Ten Commandments point out sins for those the Ten were given. God would never hold anyone accountable to a covenant he did not give to them or make with them.

Argument: Rich young man was told to have eternal life he must keep the commandments.

Matt. 19:16 - 19 (NIV) - Now a man came up to Jesus and asked, “Teacher, what good thing must I do to get eternal life?” 17Why do you ask me about what is good?” Jesus replied. “There is only One who is good. If you want to enter life, obey the commandments.” 18Which ones?” the man inquired. Jesus replied, “Do not
murder, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not give false testimony, honor your father and mother,’ and ‘love your neighbor as yourself.’

What Sabbatarians commonly neglect is the rest of the context that proves the claim to be false.

**Matt. 19:20 - 26 (NIV)** - “All these I have kept,” the young man said. “What do I still lack?” 21Jesus answered, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me.” 22When the young man heard this, he went away sad, because he had great wealth. 23Then Jesus said to his disciples, “I tell you the truth, it is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. 24Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.” 25When the disciples heard this, they were greatly astonished and asked, “Who then can be saved?” 26Jesus looked at them and said, “With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.”

**Argument:** Aren’t all Christians (even SDA’s) in agreement with God today that, with the help of God’s Spirit, we WILL keep His Law because we LOVE Him and we WANT to keep His Law of love?

This is an assumption. The Bible never tells us that God’s spirit enables anyone to keep the old covenant law!
APPENDIX II

J.N. Andrews on the Didache

In his 1912 book, *Advent History of the Sabbath*, Andrews provides a very complete study of the section of Chapter 14 which has been translated in such a way that it demonstrates that Christians were meeting on the first day of the week as early as 50 AD. It is understandable that, failing to understand the real problems with Sabbatarianism, he would find it necessary to somehow demonstrate that the translation of this passage is wrong. The more evidence there is that Christians were keeping Sunday during the life-time of the apostles, the more difficult it is to make Ellen White's apostasy theory of the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians seem plausible—that is, unless you consider Peter to be the first pope.

The Greek wording of this passage is incomplete, making it impossible to be 100% certain how to translate it correctly into English. However, when all the facts presented by Andrews are taken together, it is easy to understand why scholars, for the most part, stand by the anti-Sabbatarian wording of the translation in English.

The following is a Greek/English Interlinear translation of the Didache Section 14 dealing with Sabbath observance. The majority of translators translate it as THE LORD’S DAY, although several meanings are possible. Please note that in my text, the Greek words are not represented in Greek characters:

1. According to 'the Lord's things' - of [the] Lord: gather break bread and give thanks, confessing out

   1 kata kuriakhn de kuriou sunacqentev klasate arton kai eucaristhsate, proexomologhsamenoi

   the failings of you, so that pure the sacrifice of you be.

   ta paraptwmata umwn, opwv kaqara h qusia umwn h.

(The above quotation is from a Greek/Interlinear translation by Wieland Willker from the critical edition of Funk/ Bihlmeyer (1924) at this address: http://home.earthlink.net/~dybel/Documents/DidacheIlnr.htm

Here are the key points Andrews makes about the translation problem:

1. Other writers, contemporary to him, used the Greek word in question to mean, the Lord’s Supper, the Lord's Day, or the Lord's Life.

2. Over the next 100 years, writers came to use this Greek word almost exclusively to mean the Lord’s Day.

3. John used the adjective form of this Greek word in Revelation 1:10—“on the Lord’s Day.” Andrews seems to suggest the passage should be translated something like, “When you come together at the Lord’s Supper, break bread and give thanks.” The majority of scholars believe the passage should be translated something like, “When you come together on the Lord’s Day, break bread and give thanks.”

In the mind of Andrews, the issue is the supposed unscriptural transfer of the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, making Sunday a man-made, rather than a God-given, ordinance. He is right about Sunday being a man-made ordinance in a sense of the word, but this fact is not relevant to the Sabbath-Sunday question at all. He knows nothing of the deliberate anti-Sabbatarian wording of Moses’ wording of the Creation events of the 7th day, the weekly Sabbath being a part of TORAH law only, and the absolute requirement that a Jew or Gentile must be circumcised before keeping the Sabbath. This knowledge deficit allows him to draw the illogical conclusion that since gospel writers and Justin Martyr—contemporary writers to the author(s) of the Didache—did not use the Didache’s Greek word when designating the first day of the week, the writer/writers of the Didache were not likely to have used it to mean The Lord’s Day. Andrews articulates his point-of-view as follows:

But we have another chain of proof. All the Gospels give to Sunday its regular Bible name—first day of the week. If the Didache is said to be the first evidence that henceforth this Bible term was changed into
Justin Martyr was writing to a Jewish critic of Christians, Trypho, and would probably not risk offending his Jewish sensibilities by designating the first day of the week with this decidedly Christian term. The Gospel writers were telling the story of Jesus as it took place in His contemporary setting—before Sunday became known as the “Lord’s Day.” Note that John the Revelator, writing late in the First Century, used the adjective form of the Greek word. Furthermore, it would seem to be uncharacteristic of Greek literary usage to construct a sentence that would read something like, “At the Lord’s Supper, break bread and give thanks.” Andrews sums up his arguments as follows:

We are now brought down to the close of the second century, and what is the result?—According to its first use, the term applied to the Lord’s Supper. John uses the same adjective in speaking of the Lord’s Day. The conclusion from its use in the New Testament is, the word means the Lord’s or belonging to the Lord, whatever may be referred to. Ignatius uses the very same preposition, the same case, the same gender, as is found in the Didache, to be rendered, “according to the Lord’s life.” This fully sustains the first conclusion reached from the New Testament—it may be the Lord’s Supper, the Lord’s Day, or the Lord’s life.

It would not make any sense to translate the passage something like, “According to the Lord's life, break bread and give thanks.”

When all the facts are considered and the Sabbatarian bias is removed from one’s thinking, it is clear why scholars had little choice but to choose to translate this passage in the best possible way, and that best possible way does not support Ellen White’s apostasy/conspiracy theory of why Christians “ceased” to keep the Sabbath and adopted Sunday observance during the first years of the development of the Christian Faith.
Since Tertullian lived and wrote shortly after Sunday observance had become universal, what he has to say about the Sabbath-Sunday question is extremely important to understanding the way the early church view the matter. Tertullian in his work, *Against the Jews*, clearly teaches that the Sabbath of the Decalogue did not exist at Creation and that circumcision is required as a prerequisite to Sabbath-keeping. He explains that there was natural law before the Mosaic Law; that the Mosaic Law became obsolete at the cross; and that the Christian dispensation is based on the principle that we must love God supremely and others as ourselves as taught by Jesus. In another work, *Against Marconium*, he mentions the word “Sabbath” in the context of the Sabbath Festival, which Christians observed as a celebration, and discusses whether Christians should fast on that day or should not fast on that day. There is a certain passage from *Against Marconium* that some Sabbatarians quote out of context to make him look like he later adopted Sabbatarian views.

Here we quote Tertullian from Chapter Two of *Against the Jews*. He is explaining that none of the patriarchs kept the Sabbath because the natural laws established at Creation did not provide for it:

“In short, before the Law of Moses, written in stone-tables, I contend that there was a law unwritten, which was habitually understood naturally, and by the fathers was habitually kept. For whence was Noah found righteous, if in his case the righteousness of a natural law had not preceded? Whence was Abraham accounted a friend of God, if not on the ground of equity and righteousness, (in the observance) of a natural law? Whence was Melchizedek named priest of the most high God, if, before the priesthood of the Levitical law, there were not Levites who were wont to offer sacrifices to God? For thus, after the above-mentioned patriarchs, was the Law given to Moses, at that (well-known) time after their exodus from Egypt, after the interval and spaces of four hundred years. In fact, it was after Abraham's four hundred and thirty years that the Law was given. Whence we understand that God's law was anterior even to Moses, and was not first (given) in Horeb, nor in Sinai and in the desert, but was more ancient; (existing) first in paradise, subsequently reformed for the patriarchs, and so again for the Jews, at definite periods: so that we are not to give heed to Moses' Law as to the primitive law, but as to a subsequent, which at a definite period God has set forth to the Gentiles too and, after repeatedly promising so to do through the prophets, has reformed for the better; and has premonished that it should come to pass that, just as the law was given through Moses John 1:17 at a definite time, so it should be believed to have been temporarily observed and kept.”

“And let us not annul this power which God has, which reforms the law's precepts answeralby to the circumstances of the times, with a view to man's salvation. In time, let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day because of the threat of death, teach [apparently, “prove”] us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the Sabbath, or practiced circumcision, and were thus rendered friends of God. For if circumcision purges a man since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did He not circumcise him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? At all events, in settling him in paradise, He appointed one uncircumcised as colonist of paradise. Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised, and inobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering Him sacrifices, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was by Him commended; while He accepted what he was offering in simplicity of heart, and reprobated the sacrifice of his brother Cain, who was not rightly dividing what he was offering. Noah also, uncircumcised—yes, and inobservant of the Sabbath—God freed from the deluge. For Enoch, too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, He translated from this world; who did not first taste death, in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might by this time show us that we also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God. Melchizedek also, the priest of the most high God, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was chosen to the priesthood of God. Lot, withal, the brother of Abraham, proves that it was for the merits of righteousness, without observance of the law, that he was freed from the conflagration of the Sodomites.”

The following quote is from Chapter III, entitled “Of Circumcision and the Supersession of the Old Law”, also seems to connect Sabbath-keeping with the ordinance of circumcision.”

209
But Abraham, (you say,) was circumcised. Yes, but he pleased God before his circumcision; nor yet did he observe the Sabbath. For he had accepted circumcision; but such as was to be for a sign of that time, not for a prerogative title to salvation. In fact, subsequent patriarchs were uncircumcised, like Melchizedek, who, uncircumcised, offered to Abraham himself, already circumcised, on his return from battle, bread and wine.

And from Chapter IV, “Of the Observance of the Sabbath,” Tertullian makes the connection between circumcision and Sabbath-keeping direct:

It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary.

Thus, it is initially astonishing when his later work (believed to be later work), Against Marconium, argues with this heretic that Jesus did not rescind the Sabbath when He apparently broke it.

Marconium questioned Christ’s claim to divinity because, as he claimed, God would not break one of His own rules. In the following passage from Against Marconium, Tertullian demonstrated that while Jesus lived under the Old Covenant which He Himself has established, He was consistent in keeping His own Sabbath, even though He had every right to abolish one of His own rules if He so chose to do so. The passage is lengthily, but a study of it demonstrates the context of what he said and pulls it into harmony with everything else we know that Tertullian said about Sabbath-keeping:

Now, that we may decide these several points first, lest we should be renewing them at every turn to meet each argument of our adversary which rests on some novel institution of Christ, let this stand as a settled point, that discussion concerning the novel character of each institution ensued on this account, because as nothing was as yet advanced by Christ touching any new deity, so discussion thereon was inadmissible; nor could it be retorted, that from the very novelty of each several institution another deity was clearly enough demonstrated by Christ, inasmuch as it was plain that novelty was not in itself a characteristic to be wondered at in Christ, because it had been foretold by the Creator. And it would have been, of course, but right that a new god should first be expounded, and his discipline be introduced afterwards; because it would be the god that would impart authority to the discipline, and not the discipline to the god; except that (to be sure) it has happened that Marcion acquired his very perverse opinions not from a master, but his master from his opinion! All other points respecting the Sabbath I thus rule. If Christ interfered with the Sabbath, He simply acted after the Creator's example; inasmuch as in the siege of the city of Jericho the carrying around the walls of the ark of the covenant for eight days running, and therefore on a Sabbath day, actually annulled the Sabbath, by the Creator's command— according to the opinion of those who think this of Christ in this passage of St. Luke, in their ignorance that neither Christ nor the Creator violated the Sabbath, as we shall by and by show. And yet the Sabbath was actually then broken by Joshua, so that the present charge might be alleged also against Christ. But even if, as being not the Christ of the Jews, He displayed a hatred against the Jews' most solemn day, He was only professedly following the Creator, as being His Christ, in this very hatred of the Sabbath; for He exclaims by the mouth of Isaiah: Your new moons and your Sabbaths my soul hates. Isaiah 1:14. Now, in whatever sense these words were spoken, we know that an abrupt defense must, in a subject of this sort, be used in answer to an abrupt challenge. I shall now transfer the discussion to the very matter in which the teaching of Christ seemed to annul the Sabbath. The disciples had been hungry; on that the Sabbath day they had plucked some ears and rubbed them in their hands; by thus preparing their food, they had violated the holy day. Christ excuses them, and became their accomplice in breaking the Sabbath. The Pharisees bring the charge against Him. Marcion sophistically interprets the stages of the controversy (if I may call in the aid of the truth of my Lord to ridicule his arts), both in the scriptural record and in Christ's purpose. For from the Creator's Scripture, and from the purpose of Christ, there is derived a colourable precedent — as from the example of David, when he went into the temple on the Sabbath, and provided food by boldly breaking up the show-bread. Even he remembered that this privilege (I mean the dispensation from fasting) was allowed to the Sabbath from the very beginning, when the Sabbath day itself was instituted. For although the Creator had forbidden that the manna should be gathered for two days, He yet permitted it on the one occasion only of the day before the Sabbath, in order that the yesterday's provision of food might free from fasting the feast of the following Sabbath day. Good reason, therefore, had the Lord for pursuing the same principle in the annulling of the Sabbath (since that is the word which men will use); good reason, too, for expressing the Creator's will, when He bestowed the privilege of not fasting on the Sabbath day. In short, He would have then and there put an end to the Sabbath, nay, to the Creator Himself, if He had commanded His disciples to fast on the Sabbath day, contrary to the intention of the Scripture and of the Creator's will. But because He did not directly defend His disciples, but excuses them; because He interposes human want, as if depreciating censure; because He maintains the honour of the Sabbath as a day which is to be free from gloom rather than from work; because he puts David and his companions on a level with His own disciples in their fault and their extenuation; because He is pleased to endorse the Creator's indulgence: because He is Himself good according to His example— is He therefore alien from the Creator? Then the Pharisees watch whether He would heal on the Sabbath day, Luke
6:7 that they might accuse Him— surely as a violator of the Sabbath, not as the propounder of a new god; for perhaps I might be content with insisting on all occasions on this one point, that another Christ is nowhere proclaimed. The Pharisees, however, were in utter error concerning the law of the Sabbath, not observing that its terms were conditional, when it enjoined rest from labour, making certain distinctions of labour. For when it says of the Sabbath day, In it you shall not do any work of yours, Exodus 20:16 by the word yours it restricts the prohibition to human work— which every one performs in his own employment or business— and not to divine work. Now the work of healing or preserving is not proper to man, but to God. So again, in the law it says, You shall not do any manner of work in it, Exodus 12:16 except what is to be done for any soul, that is to say, in the matter of delivering the soul; because what is God's work may be done by human agency for the salvation of the soul. By God, however, would that be done which the man Christ was to do, for He was likewise God. Wishing, therefore, to initiate them into this meaning of the law by the restoration of the withered hand, He requires, Is it lawful on the Sabbath-days to do good, or not? To save life, or to destroy it? Luke 6:9. In order that He might, while allowing that amount of work which He was about to perform for a soul, remind them what works the law of the Sabbath forbad— even human works; and what it enjoined— even divine works, which might be done for the benefit of any soul, He was called Lord of the Sabbath, Luke 6:5, because He maintained the Sabbath as His own institution. Now, even if He had annulled the Sabbath, He would have had the right to do so, as being its Lord, (and) still more as He who instituted it. But He did not utterly destroy it, although its Lord, in order that it might henceforth be plain that the Sabbath was not broken by the Creator, even at the time when the ark was carried around Jericho. For that was really God's work, which He commanded Himself, and which He had ordered for the sake of the lives of His servants when exposed to the perils of war. Now, although He has in a certain place expressed an aversion of Sabbaths, by calling them your Sabbaths, Isaiah 1:13-14, reckoning them as men's Sabbaths, not His own, because they were celebrated without the fear of God by a people full of iniquities, and loving God with the lip, not the heart, Isaiah 29:13, He has yet put His own Sabbaths (those, that is, which were, kept according to His prescription) in a different position; for by the same prophet, in a later passage, He declared them to be true, and delightful, and inviolable. Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: He kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of His disciples, for He indulged them with the relief of food when they were hungry, and in the present instance cured the withered hand; in each case intimating by facts, I came not to destroy, the law, but to fulfill it, Matthew 5:17, although Marcion has gagged His mouth by this word. For even in the case before us He fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition; moreover, He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath and while imparting to the Sabbath day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by His own beneficent action. For He furnished to this day divine safeguards,— a course which His adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honouring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it. Since, in like manner, the prophet Elisha on this day restored to life the dead son of the Shunammite woman, you see, O Pharisee, and you too, O Marcion, how that it was proper employment for the Creator's Sabbaths of old to do good, to save life, not to destroy it; how that Christ introduced nothing new, which was not after the example, the gentleness, the mercy, and the prediction also of the Creator. For in this very example He fulfills the prophetic announcement of a specific healing: The weak hands are strengthened, as were also the feeble knees, Isaiah 35:3, in the sick of the palsy.

In Book V, Chapter One of Against Marconium we find Tertullian directly discussing the abolishment of the Sabbath, quoting an Old Testament passage— perhaps paraphrasing it— in which God prophesied that He would destroy the sabbaths and the Sabbath at some time in the future. In his discussion of the abolishment of the law, Tertullian sounds very much like modern day anti-Sabbatarians. Here is just one passage:

Now, from whom comes this grace, but from Him who proclaimed the promise thereof? Who is (our) Father, but He who is also our Maker? Therefore, after such affluence (of grace), they should not have returned to weak and beggarly elements. Galatians 4:9 By the Romans, however, the rudiments of learning are wont to be called elements. He did not therefore seek, by any depreciation of the mundane elements, to turn them away from their god, although, when he said just before, Howbeit, then, you serve them which by nature are no gods, Galatians 4:8 he censured the error of that physical or natural superstition which holds the elements to be god; but at the God of those elements he aimed not in this censure. He tells us himself clearly enough what he means by elements, even the rudiments of the law: You observe days, and months, and times, and years Galatians 4:10 — the sabbaths, I suppose, and the preparations, and the fasts, and the high days. For the cessation of even these, no less than of circumcision, was appointed by the Creator's decrees, who had said by Isaiah, Your new moons, and your sabbaths, and your high days I cannot bear; your fasting, and feasts, and ceremonies my soul hates; Isaiah 1:13-14 also by Amos, I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies; Amos 5:21 and again by Hosea, I will cause to cease all her mirth, and her feast-days, and her sabbaths, and her new moons, and all her solemn assemblies. Hosea 2:11 The institutions which He set up Himself, you ask, did He then destroy? Yes, rather than any other. Or if another destroyed them, he only helped on the purpose of the Creator, by removing what even He had condemned. But this
is not the place to discuss the question why the Creator abolished His own laws. It is enough for us to have proved that He intended such an abolition, that so it may be affirmed that the apostle determined nothing to the prejudice of the Creator, since the abolition itself proceeds from the Creator.

In summary, Tertullian is completely consistent in his view of the Sabbath between both his works, Against the Jews and Against Marconium. In the quote used by Sabbatarian apologists to suggest that he was inconsistent or had possibly changed his mind about the Sabbath over time, he merely demonstrated that while living under the jurisdiction of his own Mosaic Covenant, Jesus kept the spirit of His very own Sabbath law. In the chapters following this statement in question from Against Marconium, he reiterates his position that the Sabbath has been abolished and quotes an Old Testament passage in which God says that He will put an end to the Sabbath at some time in the future.
Chapter 7 from *The Lord’s Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer To Seventh-day Adventism On This Subject.*

Chapter VII

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE ORIGINATED WITH THE EASTERN, OR GREEK CHURCH, NOT WITH ROME IN THE WEST.

This is a very important fact bearing on the Sunday question. Adventists are constantly pointing to "Rome," to the "Pope of Rome," to the "Roman Church," to the "Roman Papacy," to the "Roman Councils," and to the "Roman pagans "as the originators of Sunday observance. They publish "Rome's Challenge," "Rome's Catechism," etc. Their cause stands or falls with these claims. It is easy to show that all these assertions are groundless. The change of the day was made in the Eastern Greek Church in the time of the apostles, and was carried thence to Rome, not from Rome to the East. The proof of this is abundant.

Generally people know little about the Greek Church, hardly know that it exists. Yet it is the oldest Church and numbers now one hundred and fifty millions. Generally people suppose that Rome is the "Mother Church," which is not true. As we all know from the book of Acts, the Christian Church began in the East, in Asia, not in Rome.

It started in Jerusalem in the East; thence spread over Judea, Samaria, Asia Minor, Greece, Egypt, Damascus, and far-off Babylon on the Euphrates. Rome and the West came later.

Notice briefly; Jesus and all the apostles lived in the East, where the Greek language was spoken. Every book of the New Testament except Matthew was written in Greek. Revelation, written as late as AD. 96, is in Greek. Largely the preaching of the apostles was in Greek. The Gospel began at Jerusalem in the East (Acts 2:1-11). Notice who heard that first sermon on Pentecost: "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene and strangers from Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God."

Here were persons from far-off Parthia, Media, and Mesopotamia, away east on the Euphrates, about two thousand miles east of Rome; then come Egypt and Libya; then Arabia; then Asia Minor; then Macedonia; then Crete - all these were in the East. Only one city in the West was named as being represented at Pentecost - Rome. These first converts carried the Gospel into all these far Eastern countries. The apostles soon followed
and raised up Churches there. See where Paul went - Damascus, Arabia, Antioch, Ephesus, Troas, Corinth, Philippi, Galatia - all Grecian cities. Revelation is written to the seven Churches which are in Asia, none in Rome (Rev. 1:4). Peter's first letter seems to have been from Babylon (1 Pet. 5:13).

Paul was the first minister to visit Rome. This was not till AD. 65. (See Acts 28.) Even then Paul found only a few brethren at Rome, and these were Jews (Acts 28.), but no bishop or Pope.

For three or four hundred years after Christ the Bishop of Rome had no authority even over a large share of the Churches at home in the West. Over the great Eastern Greek Churches he had none whatever. On the other hand, for about three hundred years the Church at Rome was a Greek mission, supported and ruled over by the Greek Church, as we will soon see.

Long before Paul visited Rome great Churches of thousands had, for half a century, been established in the East, even in far-off nations outside the Roman empire.

Notice another fact. All the first witnesses for the Lord's Day were not Romans, but Greeks living in the East. (See Chapter VI.) These were Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Dionysius, Clement, Anatolius, Origen, Eusebius, etc. Not a single one of the first witnesses for the Lord's Day was a native of Rome. This speaks volumes as to the birthplace of Sunday observance. It was born in the East, not in Rome in the West.

What the Christian world owes to the Eastern, or Greek Church, is thus stated in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," Article "Greek Church": "This Church is the oldest in Christendom, and for several centuries she was the chief bearer [missionary] of our religion. She still occupies the sacred territory of primitive Christianity, and claims most of the apostolic sees, as Jerusalem, Antioch, and the Churches founded by Paul and John in Asia Minor and Greece. All the apostles, with the exception of Peter and Paul, labored and died in the East. She produced the first Christian literature, Apologies of the Christian Faith, Refutation of Heretics, Commentaries of the Bible, Sermons, Homilies, and Ascetic Treatises. The great majority of the early Fathers, like the apostles themselves, used the Greek language. Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basle, Gregory of Nazienzen, Gregory of Nyssia, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, the first Christian emperors since Constantine the Great, together with a host of martyrs and confessors, belong to the Greek communion. She elaborated the ecumenical dogmas of the Trinity and Christology, and ruled the first seven ecumenical councils which were all held in Constantinople or its immediate neighborhood (Nicaea, Chalcedon, Ephesus). Her palmy period during the first five centuries will ever claim the grateful respect of the whole Christian world."

Notice that the Eastern, or Greek Church, ruled the first seven general councils which were all held in the East, none of them in the West, or papal territory. The date of these seven councils was AD. 325, 381, 431, 451, 557, 680, and 787. All these were dominated by the Eastern Greek Church, not one by Rome. These take us down this side the latest date Adventists fix for the change of the Sabbath.

Hence, if the Roman Church, or Pope, or Papacy changed the Sabbath, it could only have changed it in the West, for it had no authority or influence over these hundreds of great Greek Churches in the East, many of them outside of Roman rule.

The following is from the Right Rev. Bishop Raphael, head of the Greek Church in America. Few Protestants are aware of the importance and number of that great primitive Church. Read it:

"The official name of our Church is 'The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church.' It was founded in the time of the apostles and by the twelve apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone, beginning on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2). Our Church has never been subject to the Roman Church or to the Latin Popes or to
the Papacy. The Roman Church herself was a Greek mission for nearly three hundred years, and the Greek language was the tongue in which the Liturgy, or Mass, was said in the City of Rome.

"The first seven General Councils, beginning with Nice AD. 325, on down to 787, which were the only General Councils acknowledged alike by Eastern and Western Christendom, were all held within the domain of the four ancient Eastern Patriarchates. They were dominated by the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church. Even the Popes of Rome, as in the case of Pope Leo in the matter of the exaltation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to an equality in temporal and spiritual powers, to Rome (vide Acts of the Fourth General Council-Chalcedon), were compelled to assent, like all others, to the Decrees of the General Councils, which latter were always higher than Popes or Patriarchs.

"Rome never dominated any of the first seven General Councils; on the contrary, they dictated to her and in some cases, e. g., Pope Honorius, excommunicated and condemned Popes as heretics.

"The name 'Catholic' was common to all Orthodox Churches, Eastern or Western, Greek or Roman, for eight hundred years after Christ. Rome, in the West, exclusively assumed the name 'Catholic,' yet prefixing it by the appellation 'Roman,' by default on the part of the schismatics within her own patriarchate, in the sixteenth century; but the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church of the East has never from the first been known by any other name than 'Catholic,' nor has she set aside the title in any official document. It is her inalienable property as the Mother Church of Christendom (vide Nicene Creed, Article 9), which, without a single omission, has been from the first proclamation read in our churches. Rome and all Western Christian Churches have never denied to her the title of the 'Mother Church' nor 'Catholic.' Her Apostolicity and Catholicity have been and are acknowledged in all lands and in all ages.

"Our Church, which includes all the very first Churches founded by the apostles, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Alexandria, and even Rome, for the first three hundred years, has kept the 'first day of the week' as a day of rest and in holy remembrance of the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord from the dead. From the dawn of Christianity she bears witness that it has been the Sacred Day on which the faithful assembled for the partaking of the Lord's Supper, for the saying of public prayer, and the hearing of sermons.

"Our Holy Traditions, the Sub-Apostolic, Anti-Nicene and Sub-Nicene Fathers, as well as all of our historians, also bear testimony to this fact. Under the head of the Fourth Commandment in our Catechism, which is accepted by the whole Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church, this instruction is given. And both the Roman Church and all other Churches which regard the authority of antiquity, calling themselves Protestant, agree on this very fact, viz., that the Lord's Day (the first day of the week) has been observed from the morning of the Resurrection till this moment.

"The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church consists to-day of not only the four ancient Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, but of the great Churches of Russia, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, Montenegro, Albania, Cyprus, Mount Sinai, and the four independent Churches of Austria, etc., and here in America, under the Holy Synod of Russia, a prosperous Mission, consisting of different national Churches, which extends from the northern limits of Canada to the City of Mexico. All these Churches are equal in authority and united in Doctrine, Discipline and Worship. She is the same Church without break, in her succession of bishops, traditions and teaching, from the days of the twelve apostles, when they met in the Upper Room at Jerusalem before there was ever heard of or thought of a Pope in Rome, and when St. James, spoken of as the first Bishop of Jerusalem, presided over the council of the Apostles and Brethren, when they considered the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Faith.
"The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church has never perceptibly changed in Doctrine, Discipline or Worship since Apostolic Days, and numbers to-day about 150,000,000 members."

RAPHAEL HAWAWEENY,
Bishop of Brooklyn, and Head of the Syrian Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Mission in America

March 30, 1914

Their catechism is very plain on this point. The Longer Catechism of the Greek Church says:

"Is the Sabbath kept in the Eastern Church?"
"It is not kept strictly speaking.

"How does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment?"
"She still every six days keeps the seventh, only not the last day of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the day of the Resurrection, or Lord's Day.

"Since when do we keep the day of the Resurrection?"

"From the very time of Christ's Resurrection."

The catechisms of a Church are the very best authority as to what that Church believes. Here are the Churches raised up by the apostles themselves and have continued this ever since. They have always kept Sunday. Here is a clear and emphatic testimony from the highest authority in that great Eastern Church. All her historians, bishops, councils, catechisms, and traditions agree in witnessing to the observance of the Lord's Day from the very beginning of the Church. This is not a mere theory, but an actual historical fact witnessed to today by one hundred and fifty million members. And all outside history confirms this.

All the first writers to defend the faith against both pagans and heretics were members of this early Eastern Church. None were Romans. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity now held in common by the Greek, the Roman, and Protestant Churches were first formulated and settled by the Eastern Church, not by the Roman Church. Her great scholars and teachers, her Christian literature, her preachers, and world-wide influence, far exceeded that of Rome and the West for over six hundred years. Rev. A. H. Lewis, Seventh-Day Baptist, admits that the Greek Church was the Mother Church.

He says: "In the changes of the first four centuries after Christ, the Eastern Church, which was really the Mother Church, and the home of primitive Christianity, was kept unaffected by way of influence which started the strong current of empire westward by way of Rome. But the truth is that a very large factor of church history is the Eastern current, and especially so in regard to the earliest ideas and practices, that of the Apostolic Period." (Sabbath and Sunday, pp. 220, 221)

This is true, and is an important concession from a Sabbatarian confirming the above from Bishop Raphael. Justin Martyr states in explicit language that as early at least as AD. 140 that Mother Church was keeping Sunday. (See previous chapter.) How then could Rome, two hundred years later, introduce Sunday to this old Church? How could Sunday originate with the pagan Romans in the time of Constantine, AD. 321?

It was her apostles and consecrated missionaries who carried the Gospel to Rome and the West and Christianized them. It was not Rome and the West that taught the East. It was exactly the other way. Specially was this true of the observance of the Lord's Day. It was carried from the East to the West, from the Greeks to the Romans. It was not pagan Romans, as Adventists say, who introduced the keeping of the Lord's Day to the
great Eastern Church, but it was the Eastern Church that carried that day West and taught the converted pagans to observe it.

The following is from "The Historians of the History of the World," Article "Papacy," Vol. VIII, p. 520: "But the history of Latin Christianity was not begun for some considerable (it cannot but be indefinable) part of the first three centuries. The Church of Rome, and most, if not all, the Churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their Scriptures Greek, and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual, their liturgy, was Greek. Through Greek the connection of the Churches of Rome and the West was constantly kept up with the East."

The "Britannica," Article "Papacy," says that the Church at Rome was not founded till AD. 41-54. Then it says of the fourth century: "The Roman Church, having ceased to know the Greek language, found itself practically excluded from the world of Greek Christianity." "During the fourth century it is to be noticed that, generally speaking, the Roman Church played a comparatively insignificant part in the West."

These historical facts show that Rome for centuries was taught and ruled by the Eastern Greek Church, not the East by Rome. The following is from the noted scholar, the late Dean Stanley, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford, in his "History of the Eastern Church." It is of the highest authority. He says: "By whatever name we call it 'Eastern,' 'Greek,' or 'Orthodox' - it carries us back, more than any other existing institution, to the earliest scenes and times of the Christian religion." (Lecture 7. p. 56)

"Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, are centers of local interest which none can see or study without emotion, and the Churches which have sprung up in those regions retain the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out everywhere else" (page 57). Again Stanley says: "We know, and it is enough to know, that the Gospel, the original Gospel, which came from the East, now rules in the West" (page 95). The Church in far-off Eastern Asia, Chaldea, the home of Abraham," was the earliest of all Christian missions-the mission of Thaddeus to Agbarus" (page 58). A delegate from that Church came to the Council of Nice, AD. 325.

"The early Roman Church was but a colony of Greek Christians or Grecized Jews. The earliest Fathers in the Western Church, Clement, Irenseus, Hermas, Hippolytus, wrote in Greek. The early Popes were not Italians, but Greeks" (page 65).

Consider carefully these facts. It was the Eastern Greek Church which sent missionaries to Rome, founded that Church, furnished it her teachers and supported it as a mission for centuries. For over two hundred years the observance of the Lord's Day was fully and universally established among all the thousands of the old Eastern Churches before the Church at Rome in the West ceased to be taught and supported as a Greek mission. Read the previous chapter. This shows that Sunday-keeping went from the East to the West, not from Rome to the East. Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and others show that the Greek Churches were all observing the resurrection day in the first part of the second century when they were yet sending teachers and pastors to Rome. Would not these carry their home custom there and teach it to the Roman Church? Certainly, and that is the reason why the West and the East were always agreed about keeping the same day, the Lord's Day. Did that "mission" force on all the old, long established, powerful Eastern Churches a Western Roman pagan day of worship, and that without a word of protest from these Apostolic Churches? Candid men will not accept such an unreasonable assertion.

Again I quote from Dean Stanley. "She [the Eastern Church] is the mother, and Rome the daughter" (page 66)."

All the first founders of theology were Easterners. Till the time of Augustine (355-430) no divine had arisen in the West; till the time of Gregory the Great (596-604) none had filled the papal chair. The doctrine of
Athanasius [the Trinity] was received, not originated, by Rome" (pages 71, 72). This indicates how dependent Rome was for centuries on the East and how far behind the East Rome was in learning and influence.

Again: "There can be no doubt that the civilization of the Eastern Church was far higher than that of the Western" (page 76). "The whole force and learning of early Christianity was in the East. A general council in the West would have been an absurdity. With the exception of the few writers of North Africa, there were no Latin defenders of the faith" (page 100). For over four hundred years the East was the mother, the missionary, the teacher, the leader, the ruler, while the West was the child, the mission, the taught, the led, the one to receive, not give. With the rest of the Gospel the East brought the Lord's Day to Rome and taught it to the less educated Roman.

Here is a notable fact: While the Jewish Christians, and perhaps a few Gentiles living among them, continued for a while to keep the Jewish Sabbath, all Christians, Jews or Gentiles, without a single exception, kept the Lord's Day. Not one single Church in all the early history of the Church has ever been found which did not hold their assemblies on Sunday. Let Adventists name one if they can. They never have, and never can. Another notable fact is: While there was some dispute with a few about the Sabbath, there is not the slightest hint of any dispute among the widely scattered and differing sects of Christians about the Lord's Day. Only one reason can be given for this; namely, the custom of keeping the resurrection day must have begun at the very first with the apostles and was universally accepted by all from the beginning.

Starting out from Jerusalem after Pentecost, the apostles and teachers went everywhere carrying the practice of the Mother Church to all nations.

"The Lord's Day," Rev. 1:10, was thus accepted by all, Rome with the rest. Here is another great fact. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others wrote extensively against all heresies, but not one ever mentioned Sunday observance as a heresy, though it was often mentioned incidentally as a well-known existing Christian practice.

The "Advent History of the Sabbath," edition of 1912, makes this confession: "Although Ireneus writes five books against the heresies, it is rather strange that he himself nowhere alludes to Sunday" (page 334). If the Lord's Day had been a heresy lately introduced from the pagan Romans, he certainly would have named it. His silence is proof that Sunday was not a heretical, pagan institution, for he wrote against all that. Weigh this fact well.

SUMMARY

1. The Eastern Greek Church was first, the Roman Church second and later.

2. The Eastern Church was the mother, the Roman Church the daughter.

3. Christianity went from East to West, not from West to East.

4. The Greek Church was for three hundred years the Missionary Church, while Rome was only the Mission Church.

5. The Greek Church for centuries sent teachers to teach Rome, while Rome never sent teachers to teach the Greek Church.

6. For three hundred years all the great scholars, writers, preachers, leaders, and defenders of the Christian faith were Eastern Greeks, none Western Romans.
7. For six hundred years the learning and scholarship of the Christian Church was in the East, not in the West.

8. For three hundred years the Greek Church furnished the liturgy for the Roman Church.

9. The early Bishops of Rome were Greeks, not Romans.

10. For over five hundred years the Eastern Greek Church far outnumbered the Western, or Roman, Church.

11. For the first eight hundred years all the general councils were held in the East, in Greek territory, were ruled by the Greeks. None by Rome. Rome had to accept these decrees though these councils never recognized the supremacy of the Papacy, but condemned one of the Popes.

12. The Eastern Church has from first to last always opposed and denounced the Papacy of Rome.

13. No Papacy or papal rule has ever had any place in the Eastern Church.

14. The Eastern Greek Church has never accepted a single dogma, doctrine, or practice from the Roman Church—not one. Note this fact.

15. The Eastern Church at the Council of Nice, AD. 325, formulated the creed of Christendom which Rome accepted at her hands.

16. Rome never claims to have taught Sunday-keeping to the Eastern Church, though she always claims everything possible.

17. All the thousands of Eastern Churches, composed of millions of Christians, scattered through all nations as far East as India, had been for centuries settled and established in their religious customs before the date when Adventists say Rome introduced Sunday observance from the pagan Romans into the Roman Church.

18. In all church history there is not the remotest reference to any dispute between the Roman Church and the Greek Church about keeping Sunday.

19. The histories, the catechisms, the teaching of her bishops, and her traditions, all agree in teaching in the most positive terms that the Eastern Greek Church has always kept the Lord's Day from the days of the apostles.

20. The Eastern Church strongly asserts that she has kept the Lord's Day from the very beginning.

21. Her catechisms, her historians, and her traditions all confirm this.

22. There is no record of any period in all her history when she did not observe the Lord's Day. Adventist, find it if you can.

23. There is no record showing, or intimating, that she ever received Sunday from Rome or the West.

24. There is no record of any period this side of the apostles when she began keeping the Lord's Day.

25. Justin Martyr, a Greek Christian, a Church Father of the Eastern Church, two hundred years before the date of Constantine's Sunday law, gives a full detailed account of the observance of Sunday by his brother Christians of the Eastern Church.
26. Eusebius, the first church historian, an Eastern Greek bishop of Palestine, before Constantine's law was issued, says, "We have transferred to the Lord's Day all the duties of the Sabbath" (page 153 of this work).

27. The Greek Church, which gave us the Lord's Day, also gave us our New Testament Scriptures long before Rome had any Scriptures in her own tongue.

28. It was the Greek Church which, through her early scholars and councils, gave to all Christendom, Rome included, our canon of inspired New Testament books.

29. The Eastern Church has always jealously held to her own custom against all efforts of Rome to change them.

30. The Roman Catholic Church always teaches that the "Holy Catholic Church" changed the Sabbath in the days of the apostles. (See Chapter IV.) But there was no Roman Pope or Papacy in existence at that time. Even Adventists will admit this. So Rome bears witness that the day was changed in the East, not at Rome. Mark well this fact.

31. With all these notorious facts before us, it is absurd to say that Rome changed the Sabbath, originated the observance of the Lord's Day, and handed it over to the old Eastern Church and then to all Christendom. Such a theory is an utter perversion of all the plainest facts of the history and traditions of the Christian Church. In the matter of the observance of the Lord's Day, we are not dealing with a mere theory as in the question of election, foreordination, falling from grace, condition of the dead, etc., but with an actual condition, with historical facts.

Today there are said to be two hundred and fifty million Roman Catholics, one hundred and fifty million Greek Catholics, one hundred and fifty million Protestants, all agreeing in reverencing the Lord's Day, all agreeing that it originated with the apostles. In proof of this all appeal to their present practice, to their entire church history in the past, to all their traditions of their Churches, and to their catechisms. If all this is to be ignored as of no weight, then all the experience and history of all the world is worthless.

FIVE MONUMENTAL WITNESSES OF ALL CHRISTENDOM

Today we have with us, the world over, five monumental witnesses to the life of Christ, all mentioned in the New Testament.

1. The Church. "I will build My Church" (Matt. 16:18).


4. The Lord's Supper. "Eat the Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. 11:19).

5. The Lord's Day. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day " (Rev. 1:10).

Today all Christendom has all five of these in some form; all have come down hand-in-hand together, and one is as old as the other, and each has always been held as sacred as the other, and all have been equally blessed of God.
The Lord's Day is older than some of the New Testament books, its early beginning is better and more clearly attested than most of the New Testament books, especially Hebrews and Revelation.

**THE EASTER CONTROVERSY**

This question furnishes strong proof that the Lord's Day originated with the beginning of the Church itself, and was universally observed by all Christians from the very first. Of this controversy Dean Stanley says: "It was the most ancient controversy in the Church." (History of the Eastern Church, p. 173) It began immediately after the death of the apostles. The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," Article "Easter," says: "In the early Church there was no uniformity in the day observed." Some Churches celebrated it on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, the day of the Passover, no matter what day of the week it came on. The Churches of Syria, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, and Asia Minor followed this date. Others celebrated it on the day of the Resurrection, no matter what day of the month it came on. The Eastern Churches of Egypt, Greece, Palestine, Pontus, and the Church of Rome followed this custom. This shows that the apostles felt that it was a matter of indifference and had left no definite instruction about it.

The above named Encyclopedia says: "In the second century this difference was the occasion of a protracted controversy which agitated all Christendom." In AD. 154 Polycarp visited Rome and tried to reach an agreement but failed. In 197, Victor, Bishop of Rome, threatened to excommunicate those who held to Nisan 15th, but no one obeyed him. Even the Churches in the West paid no regard to his order, while the Eastern Churches condemned and defied him. This shows how little influence the Bishop of Rome had at that date. This controversy continued to divide and agitate the Church till it was settled by the Council of Nice AD. 325. The council says: "It has been determined by common consent," indicating that it was not a matter of vital importance either way.

Remember that this question was settled by the Eastern Church, not by Rome, for this council was entirely dominated by the East.

Now notice: This simple question as to whether Easter was to be celebrated on a certain day of the month, or on a certain day of the week, divided all Christendom in a hot debate for nearly three hundred years, yet it pertained to only one day in the whole year! Nor did it pertain to more than a few hours' service even in that one day. Now compare this with the question of the Lord's Day. This came every week during the entire year, fifty-two days, and it embraced the whole day, twenty-four hours every week, yet during all these three hundred years of the early Church there was not one word of division over the observance of the Lord's Day. The question never came up for discussion as to any difference between any parts of the Church, East or West, North or South, Greece or Rome. During the entire Easter controversy the Lord's Day was often mentioned, but only incidentally as an institution well known to all and equally regarded by all, East or West. This uniformity could not have been obtained unless all the apostles had agreed in it and had established it at the very beginning of the Church so that there was no question about it later. Opponents of the Lord's Day have never been able to satisfactorily answer this.

Further, while there were some still who kept the Jewish Sabbath for a while, all these invariably kept the Lord's Day. No exception to this can be found whether orthodox or heretic. All observe the Lord's Day. Even Sabbatarians are compelled to admit this.

Elder Andrews says: "Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's Day." (Testimony of the Fathers, p. 11)
Yes, while some did, for a while, keep the Sabbath, yet even they, in every instance, also kept the Lord's Day.

"I have read this chapter and find it correct. - BISHOP RAPHAEL."

Bishop Raphael was educated in three seminaries: Damascus, Constantinople, and Kiev, Russia. He has twice received the degree of "Doctor of Divinity." He is the head of the Greek Orthodox Church in America. Hence, he is well qualified to state correctly the position of the Eastern Church on this question.