Doctrinal Discussions

**A Compilation of Articles Originally Appearing
in The Ministry, June, 1960-july, 1961,
in Answer to Walter R. Martin's Book
The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism**

**Prepared by the Ministerial Association General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Washington DC.**

**REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Printed in U.S.A.

Contents

Preface

The material that has gone into the preparation of this book first appeared in a series of articles in The Ministry magazine. Because of its excellence, there was a demand from the field that it be put into more permanent and available form. This has now been done, and we are certain that many will find it helpful and informative. We commend it to all earnest students of the Word, in full assurance that a careful perusal of it will again demonstrate the solid scriptural basis of Seventh-day Adventist teaching. The writers have set forth clearly, logically, and in a scholarly manner the reasons for their faith. They are to be commended for work well done.

When Walter Martin's book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism first appeared, it was read by Seventh-day Adventists with unusual interest. The title was intriguing. Adventists could but be appreciative that he had taken the time actually to investigate what Seventh-day Adventists do believe. Previous writers, almost without exception, had been content to accept statements grown distorted and even fantastic through their years of circulation, as authentic. That this was not done in this instance, -but the actual facts sought from authentic sources, immediately won for the author the commendation of Adventists generally. Also his conclusion that Seventh-day Adventists are not just another strange sect holding fantastic theories and wholly unscriptural doctrines, but that in the great Christian fundamentals they are truly Christian, classes him, in Adventist opinion, with conscientious investigators. But his efforts to disprove the binding claims of the seventh day Sabbath and the law of God, which God Himself gave by voice and in written form, his labored arguments to disprove these and other doctrines, such as man's conditional immortality, all of which seem to Adventists so clearly Biblical, are difficult to understand. But it must be remembered that Mr. Martin feels himself firmly established in contrary views, in which he has been schooled. Since he is an able polemicist, and has undertaken to write concerning some dozen different religious groups, it is natural for him to disagree with those holding teachings different from his own, and to become somewhat argumentative in his disagreement-a privilege Adventists certainly would not deny him.

The arguments Mr. Martin uses are not new. Practically all, with some variation, can be traced back to a certain rather ambitious person who spent some thirty years in intimate association with Adventists and in actively propagating their beliefs before he thought he discovered at long last that they were all wrong.

To have various points of his faith questioned and attacked should stimulate the Christian to further Bible study and a re-examination of the reasons for his faith. This, in the end, should lead to very beneficial results-either the discovery of weaknesses and even perhaps error, or to a firmer conviction and added assurance for his beliefs. The latter we believe is the result of the incident now under consideration. These appeals to the great source of truth, the Bible, we believe clearly establish the solid scriptural foundation of Seventh-day Adventist doctrines.

R. R. FIGUHR
President, General Conference

Editorial Foreword

These articles have been slightly edited for publication in book form, but are substantially as they appeared originally in The Ministry.

It should be understood that the authors were asked to confine themselves mainly to points raised in Walter Martin's attack on Seventh-day Adventist teachings, and they therefore do not pretend to present complete coverage of the doctrines in question.

The various views on the law in Chapter II have been added here because we think our readers may be interested in having these opinions of other communions.

EDITORS
The Ministry

1. The Law in Adventist Theology

EDWARD HEPPENSTALL
Professor of Systematic Theology, Andrews University

No BIBLICAL TRUTH is more important than that which deals with the relationship of the law and the gospel, and it is imperative that we know the full revelation of God on this subject. Walter R. Martin, in his disagreement with the Adventist position, is unequivocal. These two positions are diametrically opposed to each other. Only one of these can be true.

In his book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism we read: "We admire the desire of our Adventist brethren to obey the commandments of God; but we ask, what commandments? If they answer 'The Ten Commandments,' we reject their effort to bring us under bondage, for we 'are not under the law, but under grace.'" - Page 201.

And again on page 203: "The concept of Law in Seventh-day Adventism, then, leads them to the un-Biblical and at times legalistic position that although they are 'under grace,' by failing to 'keep the commandments' they are in danger of coming under law again."

This emphatic opposition to the idea that the Ten Commandments have any further claims upon the believer demands a clear answer. He believes that if the Christian is under obligation to keep these commandments, he is therefore "under law." And since "under law" is the mark of one who has not yet appropriated and experienced the grace of Christ, then such professing Christians are living contrary to the Word of God, and "under bondage," guilty of Pharisaism or legalism. He assumes that such scriptures as Romans 6:14; 7:1, 4; Galatians 3:23-25 support his prior position on the law.

The word law (Hebrew torah) includes all of God's revealed will, not merely the Ten Commandments. The expression "the law and the prophets" (Matthew 7.12) indicates a twofold division of the Old Testament. A more common division among the Jews was the Law, the threefold: "The Law, The Prophets, The Psalms" (Luke 24:44).

A careful understanding of the words, terms, and arguments used in these passages is essential to any proper interpretation. In the Greek the word for "under" is hupo (no). It carries with it the meaning of- in subjection to, subject to the dominion of, under the power or control of, under the law's jurisdiction." For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse" (Galatians 3: 10). The meaning here is that one is subject to the curse, with no escape from it. Paul says in Romans 7:14: "But I am carnal, sold under sin," that is, in slavery to, under the dominion and power of.

Biblical Meanings of the Phrase "Under Law"

"Under law," as used in the New Testament, does not always have the same meaning. There are two principal uses of the term.

The first is in Galatians 3:23-25: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.... But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. "Under law" in Galatians can be understood only in light of the context. Several points should be kept in mind:

1. There is a time element involved, where one is said to be no longer under law." This point of time is the coming of Christ in history: "Till the seed should come" (Galatians 3:19); "before faith [the gospel in Christ] came" (verse 23); the verb is in the aorist tense, indicating single action at a point in time. "After that faith is come" (verse 25); Under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" (chap. 4:24).

From these scriptures a change in relation to law with the coming of Christ is definitely indicated. One cannot dismiss the time factor by saying that this applies merely to one's personal experience. The use of the word faith in these verses is preceded by the definite article in the Greek, meaning "the faith." It cannot, therefore, refer to the quality of faith in human experience, but "the faith," or the gospel, as fully revealed with the coming of Christ.

2. The scope of the term “under law- in this passage has particular reference to the jurisdiction of law in the Jewish economy. When the Scripture says Christ was “made under the law” (Galatians 4:4), it means that He was born under the Jewish system. In 1 Corinthians 9:20, 21 Paul says that in order to become all things to all men, both Jews and Gentiles, he is willing to work under the system or jurisdiction of either one: “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that 1 might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that 1 might gain them that are under the law.” Paul will obey every reasonable regulation of the Jewish system in order to win them. He did this when he returned to Jerusalem for the last time. In endeavoring to satisfy the demands of some of the Jewish brethren he sponsored believers who had taken a Nazarite vow and went into the Temple with them, which was a factor in his arrest and imprisonment. In doing this he placed himself “under law [i.e., under jurisdiction].” Paul could not possibly mean “under legalism,” or under bondage spiritually, for this would be a denial of his very gospel.

In working for the Gentiles he says: “To them that are without law, as without law.” Paul does not mean that he will now live as they live, in terms of lawlessness; but he is willing to live under their system and jurisdiction in order to win them. Missionaries do this when they must live in new countries and under another type of culture and way of life.

3. Just what does “under law” as used in this passage actually mean? In Galatians 3:24 Paul writes: “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ.” “To bring us” is not in the Greek, but the preposition eis (Greek), meaning “with a view to.” The passage should read then: “The law was our schoolmaster with a view to the coming of Christ.” The entire law, including both moral and ceremonial aspects, revealed by God, existed with a view to the coming of Christ at that supreme moment in history. The law was intended by God to keep before the minds of Israel and men everywhere that the real meaning and purpose of the law lay in the full and final revelation when Christ would come to this world.

Up until then the law acted as a schoolmaster or tutor. With the coming of Christ they no longer needed the law for this historical function. Thus, before the cross they were “shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed” (Galatians 3:23).

Prior to the entrance of sin Adam had direct access to God, face-to-face communion. With the entrance of sin this personal access was changed. Sin separated him from direct contact with God. From that day until the cross, God no longer confronted man as before. Instead of the actual visible presence, God revealed His will in terms of law. Man now stands under a jurisdiction of law, a revelation of God’s will in commandments, statutes, objective requirements, set over against him. Law was not the ultimate revelation of God to sinful man, but it pointed to that ultimate revelation in Christ. Without this coming of Christ the law would have no meaning and no saving message from God. This period until the coming of Christ is thus spoken of as being “under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father” (Galatians 4:2). This was a period of restricted knowledge of God, of truth, of the work of the Holy Spirit, and of God’s answer to the sin problem.

“And the times of this ignorance God winked at. But now commands all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained. Whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead” (Acts 17:30, 31).

The restricted or limited knowledge of God’s redemptive work and solution to the sin problem is contrasted with the new covenant in Christ: “For this is the covenant that 1 will make with the house of Israel after those days, said the Lord. 1 will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and 1 will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest” (Hebrews 8: 10, 11).

“And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent” (John 17:3).

The distinction between Old and New Testament is not one of disagreement or opposition, but one of progressive revelation toward the fullness of time witnessed by all the law and the prophets, when the Son of God would become incarnate in the flesh, and the Redeemer of mankind.

4. What was God’s purpose of “under law” in this jurisdictional sense? Principally twofold: First, to give sin the character of transgression (Galatians 3:19). The Greek word parabasis, as distinct from hamartia, makes sin to be transgression against the revealed and known will of God, against a codified law; therefore, all sin is against God, against His personal will, and not against some human standard. This the psalmist understood when he said, “Against thee, thee only, have 1 sinned” (Psalm 5L4).

Second, the law not only gave sin the character of rebellion against a personal God but showed that forgiveness comes alone from God, and taught men the need for a Savior, to look for a Redeemer in point of time. Until the cross the race of men was legally under condemnation; from a judicial point of view all were lost until the debt of sin was paid at Calvary. The sacrificial system pointed forward to that moment. The sacrifices were not the answer to the sin problem. They expiated no sin. They "can never take away sins" (Hebrews 10: 11). It is apparent at once that in any court of justice the death of an animal could never pay for the killing of man, or expiate that sin. God never intended that the blood of animals could either pay the price of sin or redeem man.

Hence, when God gave the law with a view to foreshadowing Christ, He had in mind this historical moment when the debt of sin would be paid (Colossians 2:14, 15) and the redemption of lost man actually accomplished. The moral law made escape impossible apart from the initiative and act of God at the cross; the moral law made sin appear for what it was, placing the whole race "under sin- (Galatians 3:22). The ceremonial features of the torah, or the law, were in reality the gospel in the Old Testament, and complemented the moral law, in that without it the case of man would have appeared completely hopeless.

Thus the law made the coming of Christ as the deliverer absolutely essential. It is this coming that is Paul's concern in Galatians 3. The cross is the redemption of all men; sinners are no longer "under the curse." They are a redeemed race legally (Galatians 3:13; aorist). Thus the law acted as a tutor with the coming of Christ in view. It is this function that ceases at the cross. Law no longer acts as a tutor with Christ in view in terms of time. Christ has come. Christ has borne our sins. Christ has redeemed us. This is no longer a possibility, a hope to be realized. It is an actuality. We do not need the law to point forward to some future time when sins will be expiated, when the redemption price will be paid. No, it has been done already.

This historical achievement of Christ is the center of the hopes of all men. To this the Jewish system with its revelation of law pointed. In their thinking the Jews separated Christ from the law. They put a "vale" over their minds so that they could not see Christ (2 Corinthians 3:14-18). Consequently, they made the law an end in itself. Their history is one long record of legalism. The Jews were given a codified law, but this did not make them legalists. They lived under the jurisdiction of law, but this did not in itself make them pharisaical. Their failure to keep Christ in view led to the perversion of law. The law as God gave it was no perversion, nor was it legalistic. The law was the paternal revelation of God's will to be magnified to the full with the coming of Christ.

Walter Martin fails completely to distinguish between the proper and improper function of the law. This has led him into devious paths and a wholly false interpretation.

The second use of "under law" lays particular stress upon the experimental aspect of it. In Romans 6 and 7 Paul shows that the Christian does not live either under the dominion of sin or under the dominion of law.

In Romans 6 the Christian is freed from the dominion of sin: "Let not sin therefore reign. . . . For sin shall not have dominion over you: for you are not under the law, but under grace- (verses 12-14). The law reveals how real is the dominion of sin. "The strength of sin is the law" (1 Corinthians 15:56). The only way of escape is by death. "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Romans 6:2). "He that is dead is freed from sin- (verse 7). A life "under grace" frees the believer from sin's dominion.

In Romans 7 we find that the believer must also obtain freedom from the dominion of law. "The law hath dominion over a man as long as he lives" (verse 1). The dominion of law is the same as "under law."

In reading this chapter through, the condemning power of the law over the "flesh," that is, the carnal nature, is apparent. Paul sees no possibility apart from Christ of escape from this controlling, condemning power of the law. Paul recognizes the divine function of law in making sin "exceeding sinful" (verse 13), and confesses that the "law is spiritual" (verse 14). Paul cries out for deliverance from this dominion. Deliverance comes as he exclaims: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (chaps. 7:25; 8: 1). How did Paul escape from the dominion of law, that is, from "under law"? He had to die to the sinful nature. "Wherefore, my brethren, you also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that you should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead" (chap. 7:4).

The part that dies to law, however, or to the dominion of law, is not the inner or new man, but "the flesh," described in Romans 7:1-3 as the first husband or the "old man" of sin. Death of the first "husband" is the only way to escape from the dominion of sin and the dominion of law. This carnal nature will not and cannot conform to the law of God. "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law

of God, neither indeed can be- (chap. 8:7). The law condemns that nature which refuses to be subject to it. It has no other choice.

But there is another part of Paul, the new man in Christ, which does not feel this way at all about the law of God. On the contrary, Paul says: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man" (Romans 7:22). This is the new man in Christ, the Christian. This new man is in harmony with the law of God because he is born of God.

Thus it is clear that the carnal nature of man has no other choice but to come under the dominion of both sin and the law; that as long as this carnal nature is permitted expression in the life, this will be its experience in relation to the law of God. The Christian must learn to "mortify the deeds of the body" (Romans 8:13). He must choose one of two things: The dominion of law or the dominion of Christ. As a Christian, Paul recognizes the seriousness of this choice when he sums up the nature of the conflict and the possibility of living "under law" or "under grace." "So then with the mind 1 myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" (chap. 7:25). That Paul has in mind the law including the Ten Commandments is obvious, since he quotes from the tenth commandment in verse 7, that commandment which exposes the seat of sin within him.

There is not the slightest hint of any change in the law, in its operation, and its claim upon the individual. But that there is a change somewhere no one can doubt; that change is in the believer. The believer dies with Christ and rises to live with Christ. Certainly there is a change in the believer's relation to the law. What is this change? Does he now disregard the law? Does he now dispense with it? Does he make the law void? Does Paul support Martin's contention that the law of God is no longer binding upon the believer? NO! Where hitherto he had found himself with "enmity against the law of God," under its power and condemnation, he now finds himself in harmony with it. And in this new life in Christ he exclaims: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man."

Paul is very emphatic in maintaining the integrity of the law of God. Every time there is the slightest possibility that his hearers might conclude there is any change in the law he cries out, "God forbid." "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Romans 3:31; 7:7; Galatians 3:21).

Paul's concern regarding the law of God makes him cry out not against the law, but against that part of himself that is not subject to the law of God-the old sinful nature (Romans 7:24). Unfortunately, we find Martin crying out against the law of God. The difference is decisive. To fail to understand the simple difference between "law" as the revelation of God's will and "under law" as man's life situation in the flesh when brought under its dominion, is tragic. It seems incredible that a man who claims to be a serious student of the Bible should be guilty of such gross misinterpretation. But the worst tragedy is that many who will read his book will probably believe it.

The Believer's Relation to the Law of God

Paul makes very clear in 1 Corinthians 9:20, 21 just what the believer's relation to the law is. He says: "Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ." The phrase "under the law" in this passage is an unfortunate translation. In the Greek, Paul uses not hupo but ennomos, which means "in law" to Christ.

It is at this point that Christians should distinguish between law in the Christian life and the "under law" experience. Rashly to conclude that to escape from "under law" is to be free from "law" is to fail to comprehend the very basis of the apostle's argument. Adventists firmly assert that the Christian must be free from "under law," for he is no longer under its dominion, its power of condemnation and judgment. He stands with Paul-'1n law" to Christ.

What Paul is saying here is that as far as the Christian's relationship to God's law is concerned, it is entirely dependent upon his relationship to Christ. If his relationship to Christ is not right, then his relationship to the law is also wrong. Without Christ, without becoming united or married to Christ, he must come "under" the dominion of the law. But when united with Christ, the relationship is no longer one of the dominion of law, but "in law." This places the law in its rightful place.

Christ came to "magnify the law, and make it honorable" (Isaiah 42:21). He magnifies it; He is not a substitution for it. To construe that one having been saved from "under law" no longer needs the law of God, is to take a position entirely contrary to the Word of God. For Paul declares: "He is not without law,

but in law to Christ." To be "in law" to Christ means to have a heart and mind and will that are no longer at variance with the divine will as revealed in all the Scriptures, including the Ten Commandments. It is just this enmity against the Ten Commandments that is changed. This "in law" to Christ is identical with Paul's affirmation in Romans 7:22, "1 delight in the law of God after the inward man." Paul says that we are "married" to Christ, the second "husband" (verse 4), not to be free from the law, but free from its dominion. Paul knows only one way of coming into harmony with the law of God that is by coming into union with Christ. Then "the righteousness of the law" is "fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (chap. 8A).

What the "in law" relationship to Christ does is to give the Christian a passion for righteousness, a passion for obedience to God's revealed will both in the Old and in the New Testament, not out of the pressure of law, but out of this new relationship to Christ (Romans 7:6).

The Relationship of Love and Law

The most tragic and pitiful effort of Martin to do away with the Ten Commandments, however, is his separation of love and law.

On page 203 of his book, he writes: "The great foundational moral law of the universe is therefore declared to be unchanging love. This is vastly different from the national or Mosaic law given only to Israel. That law was designed to be fulfilled, even though it was based upon the eternal principles of the moral character of God. And when its fulfillment did take place and the character of God was imputed to the believer and imparted to his life by the power of the indwelling Spirit, the entire Mosaic system passed away; but the eternal principle, its foundation, remained, and is operative today as the law of love, the supreme 'commandment' and the only 'law' under which the Christian is to live."

He goes to great lengths to oppose the position of some who draw a sharp line of distinction between the moral law and the law of Moses. But his confusion of law and love is a far more serious deviation from the Scriptures.

On page 200 he quotes Luke 10:25-28, with Christ's answer to the lawyer's inquiry regarding the way to eternal life as the law of love. Note the statement: "Clearly, the Lord Jesus did not subscribe to the Seventh-day Adventist view that 'commandment-keeping means keeping all of the Ten Commandments,' none of which He mentions in this passage. Christ did not say, 'Keep the Ten Commandments, especially the fourth one, and thou shall live.' He said, in effect, 'Obey the law of love upon which all the law and the prophets rest, and thou shall live."

But why does this writer not include Christ's answer to an identical question in Mark 10:17-22 by the rich young ruler? Here Christ quotes from the Ten Commandments, and says exactly what Walter Martin claims He did not say. Why did not Jesus give the same answer here that He gave to the lawyer? Did Jesus have two sets of commandments or just one? The very obvious and simple truth is that Jesus knew of no separation between law and love. Any reference to the revealed law of God, whether in the framework of the Ten Commandments or of the two great principles of love, proceeds from the complete unity that Christ insists upon in Matthew 22:36-40: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." The term "law" here refers to the Pentateuch, which includes the Ten Commandments. Jesus says that "the law" and the two great principles belong together. To take any other position is to be at complete variance with that of our Lord.

Furthermore, on page 193 we find the author declaring that in the fulfillment by Christ of the law, the Lord Jesus Christ "instituted the universal principle of divine love as the fulfillment of every aspect and function of the law."

But how could anyone make "the law- as embodied in the Pentateuch or the Old Testament belong to the period before Christ, and the universal principle of divine love to the New Testament period? In Luke 10:25-28 the same lawyer is indicated as the one giving the answer to his own question. It was the lawyer himself who repeated the two great principles of love in reply to Christ's searching question. How did he know them so well? Because they were part of the one law given to Moses and to the Jews from the very beginning. Listen to Moses as he quotes the law in Deuteronomy 6:4, 5, the Shema or creed to be repeated every Sabbath day: "Hear, 0 Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shall love the Lord thy God

with all your heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which 1 command thee this day, shall be in your heart. And thou shall teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sits in your house, and when thou walks by the way, and when thou lies down, and when thou rises up." No clearer instruction on the "supreme commandment" is found anywhere in the whole Bible. This "supreme commandment" of love was the governing principle, the foundational principle, of the Mosaic law as it is of the entire Bible.

In the previous chapter, Deuteronomy 5, Moses had just repeated to the people again the Ten Commandments of the Ten Commandments. He follows this up with the great commandment on love. Moses knew nothing of any fictitious separation between love and law that Martin sets forth. For any man to be in disagreement with Christ, with Moses, and with Paul is tragic indeed.

Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount knew of no separation between love and law. His spiritual interpretation of the Ten Commandments is the eternal position of God. Christ sets forth the true spiritual meaning as contrasted with the externalism of the Jews. What Christ is seeking to change are the people to whom He originally gave the commandments. Christ is saying that only in the framework and under the experience of love to God and man do the Ten Commandments have any power or vitality.

A careful reading of the Bible reveals that there are numerous written expressions of the will of God. The Sermon on the Mount is one of them. The New Testament is just as specific on this point as the Old Testament. It seems that Martin wants just one law, "the law of love." He wants nothing in the form of a written code such as given to Moses. Then why stop with the Ten Commandments? From the point of view of obedience, the two great commandments are no easier to keep than are the ten. To change the law, to insist on the elimination of a codified law given to Moses, does not help whatsoever. Is it just the Ten Commandments that creates a problem for the experience of the believer? The Ten Commandments, or even the law of Moses, cannot be cut out of the Bible and set aside by itself while the commandments of love remain in force. Either all must go or all must remain.

Love is first a gift, the gift of God, not a law. In Jesus Christ we learn that in the gift of His Son we are loved supremely by God. It is this love that creates oneness, the unity of all law. It is love that sets forth God's will whether expressed in the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, or any of the other revelations of God's will. Each is a revelation of God's great heart of love. What we all need to see is that the laws of God are not arbitrary. God requires of us obedience to all His commandments, not because He wants to exercise authority as the Supreme Being in the universe but because God Himself is like that: every commandment of God is the expression of love for His creatures. God does not change. It is in the experience of oneness with God that all of God's requirements have meaning and power for His creatures.

We do not eliminate or abrogate the law in order to become free men, to escape bondage. It is the center of our devotion that counts, the lordship of Christ, not the dominion of law. "If you love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15).

To live by love means that a man is saved, not by the right creed in either the Old Testament or the New, not by the right law, but saved when his heart is right, when he has come into the love relationship with God. This is the test of all true religion.

What Christ, Moses, and Paul are saying is that obedience to the law of God cannot be commanded upon the old sinful nature and get an obedient response. This comes alone from being a new man in Christ, the beloved of the Lord, the bride of Christ.

The Law of God or the Standards of Men

The conflict today is between the law of God and the laws of men. There are systems of morality in the world today, also in other religions and other cultures, which grow out of their own cultures and are a form of self-discovery. The same is true with the religious standards set up by men. They are not the laws of God, because they come not by revelation in His infallible Word but wholly from the creations of man's own thinking and the perversities of man's mind and heart. These systems may appear to have much that is desirable. They may come so close to the genuine revelation from God that it is hard to distinguish between them except by the Holy Scriptures. They aim at the development of man. They propose to make man religious. Plato and Aristotle had their systems; so did Emmanuel Kant and almost all the philosophers. But they simply produced a humanistic morality and religion with claims to a way of salvation apart from that of the Bible.

The law of God is a revealed law; it is not produced by man. It is not the product of human

findings and human struggles toward the light. The Ten Commandments is not a product of its day, nor is the Sermon on the Mount a product of the local culture of Christ's time. The law of God wherever and whenever it is found in the Bible is never a set of mores belonging to the moral order which that particular society developed or changed, either by time or by circumstances. God's law is the law of His kingdom. The law of God as well as the gospel tests all human laws, and all human manipulations of His laws, and all human systems of salvation. God's will is the judgment of all other laws. There is nothing relative about God's law. This is true of the entire revelation of God in His Word.

The moment a man seeks to submit his life to the truth of the Bible, to do the will of God, he finds that obedience to God cannot possibly be done within the framework of human pressure, human systems, human interpretations, and abstract law. It can be done only in a love relationship to Christ, with a deep sense that all sin is against God. This loving obedience is the opposite of all pressure of society, human laws, and governments. In the joyful restoration to acceptance and fellowship with God the believer comes into the glad liberty of God's children and grateful obedience to God's revealed will in His Word.

Such a standard of righteousness cannot possibly be changed. It cannot be thought of as varying with the times. The standard of God's law demands it be seen, understood, and accepted in the framework of God's love revealed in Christ. The law of God can be obeyed only within the framework of a radical Christ-centered way of life. The great tragedy of the Christian church and of our time lies in two extremes. The first is the result of the self-centeredness of man. Man is born loving himself alone. He makes the moral law of God an end in itself rather than an expression of a new relationship to God. In doing this he becomes guilty of legalism. This has been the besetting sin and failure of the Jews throughout their history. This is the rational treatment of God's law as applied to the natural man. The other extreme is that which swings the pendulum and believes that the Ten Commandments no longer has any claim upon the Christian. The word of our Lord is right to the point:

"Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.... Full well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Who so curses father or mother, let him die the death: but you say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou might be profited by me; he shall be free. And you suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which you have delivered (Mark 7:7, 9-13).

In pointing to the Ten Commandments nothing could be clearer than Christ's condemnation of the man who interprets even one of the commandments so as to make His law of none effect.

Seventh-day Adventists stand firm at this point. We reject both extremes. We refuse emphatically to reduce the law of God either to some vague feeling in the heart or to something outside of one's personal relationship to God. Seventh-day Adventists believe that man has no inherent worth by any system of morality. Our salvation is solely within the realm of God's race. As believers in salvation by grace alone, what life expression are we to give to the concept of being alive unto God? Is it not the expression of saying with Paul: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man," and with Christ: "I delight to do thy will, 0 my God: yea, thy law is within my heart"?

2. Views on the Law in the Creeds of Churches

(This list is presented to show that Seventh-day Adventists are not alone in their respect for God's law. They stand in the company of the great church creeds. While all of these views may not coincide in detail, they nevertheless reveal a basic respect for the perpetuity of the divine law.)

1. Church of England

"The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral."-Article 7 of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, quoted in Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, Vol. 3, pp. 491, 492.

Protestant Episcopal

Article 6 of the Thirty-nine Articles, revised. Same as article 7 of the Church of England Articles of Religion (Ibid., p. 816).

3. Lutheran

"Although they who truly believe in Christ, and are sincerely converted to God, are through Christ set free from the curse and constraint of the Law, they are not, nevertheless, on that account without Law, inasmuch as the Son of God redeemed them for the very reason that they might meditate on the Law of God day and night, and continually exercise themselves in the keeping thereof." - Article 6 of the Formula of Concord, Ibid., p. 131.

4. Reformed

"We teach that the will of God is set down unto us in the law of God; to wit, what he would have us to do, or not to do, what is good and just, or what is evil and unjust. We therefore confess that 'The law is good and holy' (Romans vii. 12); and that this law is, by the finger of God, either 'written in the hearts of men' (Romans ii. 15), and so is called the law of nature, or engraved in the two tables of stone, and more largely expounded in the books of Moses (Exodus xx. 1-17; Deuteronomy v. 22).

"We teach that this law was not given to men, that we should be justified by keeping it; but that, by the knowledge thereof, we might rather acknowledge our infirmity, sin, and condemnation; and so, despairing of our strength, might turn unto Christ by faith. "-Chapter 12 of the Second Helvetic Confession, Ibid., p. 854, 855.

5. Methodist

Article 6 of the Articles of Religion. Same as article 7 of the Church of England Articles of Religion (Ibid., p. 808).

6. Presbyterian

"V. The moral law does forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof; and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it. Neither does Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen, this obligation....

"VII. Neither are the fore mentioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the gospel, but do sweetly comply with it: the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely and cheerfully which the will of God, revealed in the law, requires to be done." - Chapter XIX of the Westminster Confession of Faith, Ibid., pp. 641-643.

"The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law.... All which were common also to believers under the law; but under the New Testament the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected." -Chapter XX, of the Westminster Confession of Faith, Ibid., pp. 643, 644.

7. Congregational

Savoy Declaration. Same as the above quotations from the Westminster Confession (Ibid., p. 718).

8. Baptist

Philadelphia Confession. Same as the above (Ibid., p. 738).

9. Baptist

"We believe that the Law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy Law, is one great end of the Gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible Church. "-Article 12 of the New Hampshire Confession, Ibid., page 746.

Law, and Gospel, Functions of

Source: Alan Redpath, “Law and Gospel,” The New Century Leader, 59 (July, 1958), 13.

The law shows me what God demands of me, but what I cannot do by myself. It shows me what I am and that I am lost. it points me to Christ in order that by grace I can be what 1 cannot be under law (Romans 8:3).

Yes, the whole purpose of grace-of the gospel-is to enable us to fulfill the law. Holiness, sanctification, is more than an experience; it is a life to be lived.

If we claim to have received grace, and we still don’t have what it takes to live a righteous life-then it wasn’t God’s grace that we received. We may have had a psychological experience. Christianity gives earth victories as well as a passport to heaven.

LAW, and Gospel, Harmony of

SOURCE: 0. C. S. Wallace, What Baptists Believe, pp. 80-84. Copyright 1934 by The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville. (Explanation of art. 12 of N.H. Confession; see No. 986i.)

[p. 80] 1. GOD ACTING BY RULE

1. In the moral government of the universe God acts in harmony with a rule. . . .

[p. 811]. . . . Not only is it unchangeable with respect to places and races, to days and seasons, to conditions and circumstances, but also to ages. It has been unchangeable. It will be unchangeable.

This rule is unchangeable because it is in harmony with the unchangeable nature of God. It is a rule based on his holiness. It is of the nature of God to be holy; because he is eternal his holiness is eternal. The rule of God among men is an expression of his holiness. It must be eternally what it has ever been.... We cannot conceive of an age when the moral government of the universe shall be changed, because we cannot conceive of God becoming different morally from what he is now and ever has been....

[p. 821]. THE NATURE OF THIS LAW

1. This Law of God is holy as he himself is holy.... It is a universal law....

2. The Law of God is just and cannot be unjust-Its justice is universal....

3. . . . It is more than just; it is gracious.... It results in welfare, in happiness, in blessedness. It is more than negative, prohibiting wrong-doing. It is more than positive, requiring right-doing. It is linked with all the outgoing of [p. 831 God’s life towards man; and this means that it is linked with his great compassionate love. The Law of God is full of the love of God....

III. GOD HELPS MEN TO KEEP THIS LAW

1. God has not left men enmeshed in their own disobedience-He has provided a way of restoration. This is not by pulling the heavenly standard down to the level of our guiltiness and weakness, but by lifting men up to the level of the eternal standard of his holiness. The gospel is not simply a glad story of heavenly gates ajar; it is the story of moral restoration.

2. This restoration is restoration to a state of obedience to the Law.... Not an outward obedience, simply, but inward....

3. . . . We must here take into account the atonement of Jesus Christ by his sacrifice consummated on the cross. This bears an eternal relation to [p. 84] the Law of God, the Law which is holy, just and good... [The believer is] delivered by the work of Christ from the penalty of a broken law, and given a new heart by the Holy Spirit, by which he loves the way of obedience that once he shunned, the Law and the gospel are seen working in glorious harmony for the blessing of the redeemed man.

4. To achieve this is the one great purpose of the proclamation of the gospel.

LAW, and Gospel, Inseparable

SOURCE: Matthew Simpson, Lectures on Preaching (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1906), Lecture 4, p. 129.

Law of God, WHEN THE PULPIT IGNORES IT. There are many preachers who love to dwell on the Gospel alone. They talk sweetly and beautifully of the fatherhood of God. This is well. It is more than well, it is essential. But sometimes they go beyond this, and declaim against the preaching of the law intimate that it belongs to a past age, a less civilized society.... Such a Gospel may rear a beautiful structure; but its foundation is on the sand. No true edifice can be raised without its foundations being dug deep by repentance toward God, and then shall the rock be reached, and the building shall be through faith in Jesus Christ. The law without Gospel is dark and hopeless; the Gospel without the law is inefficient and powerless.

LAW, and Gospel-Necessity of Preaching Both

SOURCE: John A. Mackay, The Presbyterian Way of Life, p. 153.

There were some ministers who specialized as "Law" preachers. They felt called of God to stab the hearts of their hearers with sharp arrows of truth which were barbed with divine imperatives. Their design was to awake the slumbering lost to their peril and responsibility, and to wound their consciences that they might become aware of their need. Others were known as specialists in "Gospel" preaching. Their words came as a balsam for spirits that had been wounded by the Law. There were others, and they have constituted the majority in Presbyterian pulpits, in whose preaching arrows have sped from the bow and oil has been poured from the cruse.

This is the true ideal for all Christian preaching. Apart from the Law, the Gospel cannot be understood or be more than mere sentimentalism. Apart from the Gospel the Law cannot escape becoming pure moralism.

LAW and Grace-A Presbyterian's Definition

SOURCE: Stewart M. Robinson, "Sabbath-School Lesson" for August 7, 1932, in The Presbyterian, 102 (July 28, 1932), 10.

The Law is a paragraph in a Covenant of Grace.

LAW, Binding as a Revelation of God's Will

SOURCE: World Council of Churches. First Assembly, Amsterdam, 1948, Man's Disorder and God's Design (New York: Harper, 1948), pp. 23, 24.

[p. 23] The Word of God does not appear only as Gospel. It appears also as Law. They both pertain to the Church, but in different ways. The Law of God is the Law of creation, of the Creator. It would lead to misunderstandings if we were to describe this Law as a "natural" Law. But certainly it is a universal Law. It expresses the claim of God on mankind: the claim of Love, that at the same time is the foundation of justice. It is manifested not only in "commandments," but also in the wrath of God, "that is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth- (Romans 1, 18).

The Law has been in force since "the beginning." The Gospel on the other hand has its foundation in the promises of God. Because of these promises the Church existed in a preparatory way even under the Old Covenant. But until the fullness of the Gospel appeared in Christ, the Church did not appear as a living reality. The Gospel is building the Church on earth. The Gospel gives the Church her life. Through the Gospel the Church is what she is. However, that does not mean that the Law should have no place in the Church, or that it should be only a matter of secondary importance....

Through the Law, God has declared His will as regards our human relationships. It may here especially be emphasized that the Law of God functions also outside the Church as a dynamo for promoting justice and crushing injustice. However, it is the responsibility of the Church as regards all human relationships to keep watch over the sanctity of the Law of God. It is also the duty of the Church, in the ever changing situations, to interpret the divine Law according to the revelation of God given to the Church.

LAW, Binding, Eternally (John Calvin on)

SOURCE: John Calvin, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, trans. by William Pringle (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1949), Volume 1, p. 277, comment on Matthew 5:17. Used by permission.

We must not imagine that the coming of Christ has freed us from the authority of the law: for it is the eternal rule of a devout and holy life, and must, therefore, be as unchangeable, as the justice of God, which it embraced, is constant and uniform.

LAW, Binding, Hence to Be Venerated (John Calvin on)

SOURCE: John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, bk. 2, chap. 7, sec. 15, trans. by John Allen (7th Am. ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 1, p. 392.

The law has sustained no diminution of its authority, but ought always to receive from us the same veneration and obedience.

LAW, Binding on Christians

SOURCE: Martin Luther, Wider die Antinomer in Siimmtliche Schriften, ed. by Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1890), cols. 1613, 1614, 1616, 1617.

[col. 16131 7. 1 have indeed taught, and still teach, that sinners should be roused to repentance by the sermon or by meditating on the sufferings of Christ, so that they may see how great is God's wrath against sin, and that there is no help unless God's Son die for it. This teaching is not mine but St. Bernard's. Not St. Bernard's; it belongs to all Christendom; it is the preaching of all prophets and apostles. But how does it follow from this that on this account the law [col. 1614] should be done away? Such a conclusion I cannot find in my dialectics; besides, I should like to see and hear the master who could prove it.

8. When Isaiah 53:8 says, "I struck him for the transgression of my people," tell me then, beloved, for here Christ's sufferings are preached that He was stricken for our sin-is the law thereby discarded? What does it mean, "for the transgression of my people"? Does it not mean that My people have sinned against My law and have not kept My law? Or can anyone suppose that sin exists where there is no law? Whoever puts away the law must also put away sin. If he wants to let sin stand, he must much more let the law stand, for Romans 5:13 [chap. 4:15] says: "Where no law is, there is no transgression." If there is no sin, Christ is nothing, for why does He die if there is no law or sin for which He would have to die? From this we can see that the devil, through machinations does not mean to take away the law, but Christ the fulfiller of the law [Matthew 5:17].

9. For he knows well that Christ can be taken away all too soon and easily. But the law is written deep into the heart so that it cannot be taken away, as is plainly evident in the lamentation psalms where the beloved saints cannot bear God's wrath [Psalm 38, 143, etc.]. This can be nothing else than the law's sensitive sermon in the conscience. And the devil also knows well that it is impossible to take the law out of the heart, as St. Paul testifies, Romans 2:14, 15, that the heathen who did not receive the law through Moses, and hence have no law, yet are a law unto themselves, as they must testify that the work of the law is written in their hearts, etc. However, he attempts to make people feel secure and teaches them to disregard both law and sin, so that one day when overtaken by death or by an evil conscience, being used to nothing but security, they would sink into hell without any counsel, since they had learned nothing in Christ but sweet security....

[col. 1616] 13. . . . But how do we know what sin is if there is no law nor conscience? [Romans 7:7; 3:20]. And where will we learn what Christ is, or what He has done for us, if we are not to know what the law is (which He fulfilled for us), or what sin is, for which He has done enough? And even if we should not need the law for ourselves and could tear it out of the heart-which is impossible-we still would have to preach it for Christ's sake (as it is done and must be done) in order to know what He did and suffered for us. For who could know what and why Christ suffered for us if no one should know what sin or law is? Therefore the law must be preached where one [col. 1617] desires to preach Christ. Even though one does not want to mention the word law, nevertheless the conscience is alarmed through the law when the sermon says that Christ had to fulfill the law for us at such cost [Matthew 5:17; Galatians 3:131. Then why does one want to put away what cannot be put away-yes, by removal it is all the more strongly enforced? For the law alarms more terribly if 1 hear that Christ, God's Son, had to bear it for me, than if it is preached to me without Christ and without such great torture of God's Son.

LAW (Moral), Binding Upon All (Presbyterian View)

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 21 (originally 19), "Of the Law of God," sections 5, 6, in A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards, ed. by James Benjamin Green (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 112, 113, col. 1.

[p. 1121 5. The moral law does forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof; and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it. Neither does Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen, this obligation.

[p. 1131 6. Although true believers be not under the law as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified or condemned. Yet is it of great use to them, as well as to others; in that, as a rule of life, informing them of the will of God and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly; discovering also the sinful pollutions of their nature, hearts, and lives. So as, examining themselves thereby, they may come to further conviction of, humiliation for, and hatred against sin; together with a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ, and the perfection of his obedience.

LAw (Moral), Binding Upon Christians (Methodist View)

SOURCE: The Articles of Religion, art. 6, Of the Old Testament, in Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Church, 1956 (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1957), sec. 66, pp. 28, 29.

[p. 28] Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites does not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. [EDITORS' Note: This is article 7 of the Church of England Articles of Religion.]

LAW, Freedom Dependent on

SOURCE: The New Century Leader, 59 (May, 1958), 20.

Many present-day Christians have earned the reputation of lawlessness. Some Christians have too often emphasized their liberty to the detriment of the total work of Christ.... While redemption never comes from law, life must still be lived by the rules God makes. The necessity of law to mold the freed slaves into the Israelite nation is obvious. It is sometimes less obvious to us today, living in our era of plenty, that continued freedom depends on living by God's laws.

LAW, Freedom Only in Obedience by Faith

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, The Ten Commandments (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 23.

There is a sense in which Christians are not "free from the law." It is only when grace enables men to keep the law, that they are free from it; just as a moral man who lives according to the laws of the country is free from arrest. God has not set aside law, but He has found a way by which man can fulfil law, and so be free from it.

LAW, Jesus' Attitude Toward

SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, "Jesus, and the Ten Commandments," The New Century Leader, 57 (October, 1956), 15.

Jesus said nothing which he intended as an attack upon the authority, validity, and revelation of the Old Testament; and of course, the laws of the Old Testament he specifically upheld.

Jesus to be sure, brought in higher laws that would express God's purpose more fully, and we see this particularly in the series of statements in the Sermon on the Mount beginning: "You have heard that it was said by them of old time ... But 1 say unto you . . ."

However, when we interpret the Bible we must always set the point or passage we are dealing with into its full context in order to understand it. And here we observe first of all that this series to which we have just referred is directly preceded by a declaration in which the following points are emphatically made:

(1) Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

(2) Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle (small marks in the written language of the time) shall in no wise pass from the law . . .

(3) 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 (Matthew 5:17-19).

In the balance of Matthew 5, Jesus cannot mean to deny the validity of the commandments of the Old Testament. In the main, he simply goes beyond them; he deepens, enlarges, or spiritualizes what is required-and in keeping with what appears characteristic of his teaching, here as elsewhere he tends always to set the demands for the good life, the life of the kingdom of God, in positive terms.

LAW, Jesus Did Not Abrogate

SOURCE: Charles H. Spurgeon, The Gospel of the Kingdom, comment on Matthew 5:17-20 (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1893), pp. 47,48.

[p. 47] He [Christ] took care to revise and reform the laws of men; but the law of God he established and confirmed. . . . [p. 481 [Verse 19 quoted.]

Our King has not come to abrogate the law, but to confirm and reassert it. His commands are eternal; and if any of the teachers of it should through error break his law, and teach that its least command is nullified, they will lose rank, and subside into the lowest place. The peerage of his kingdom is ordered according to obedience.... The Lord Jesus does not set up a milder law, nor will he allow any one of his servants to presume to do so. Our King fulfils the ancient law, and his Spirit works in us to will and to do of God's good pleasure as set forth in the immutable statutes of righteousness.

Law-Jesus Gave No New Code

SOURCE: J. Philip Hyatt, "God's Decrees for Moral Living," The Teacher, 57 (October, 1943), 5.

Jesus did not give a new moral code. He was not a second lawgiver like Moses. He was far greater, and his moral teachings stand on a far higher plane than those of Moses. He was not so much concerned with laying down detailed rules for the regulation of the moral life as with enunciating eternal principles by which men should live under God and with talking about motives and purposes which should rule all our actions.

Jesus did not give a new code, but he also did not say that the moral teachings of the Old Testament were suspended. The ceremonial and ritualistic laws of the Old Testament are abrogated for the Christian, but not the Ten Commandments.

LAW, Jesus' Relation to (John Wesley on)

SOURCE: John Wesley, Works, Sermon 25 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan [reprint of 1872 ed.1), Vol. 5, pp. 317, 318.

[p. 3171 7.... In the highest rank of the enemies of the gospel of Christ, are they who openly and explicitly -judge the law" itself, and "speak evil of the law;" who teach men to break (to dissolve, to loose, to untie, the obligation of) not one only, whether of the least, or of the greatest, but all the commandments at a stroke; who teach, without any cover, in so many words,-"What did our Lord do with the law? He abolished it. There is but one duty, which is that of believing. . . .-

This is, indeed, carrying matters with a high hand; this is withstanding our Lord to the face, and telling him that he understood not how to deliver the message on which he was sent. 0 Lord, lay not this sin to their charge! Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!

8. The most surprising of all the circumstances that attend this strong delusion, is, that they who are given up to it, really believe that they honor Christ by overthrowing his law, and that they are magnifying his office, while they are destroying his doctrine! Yea, they honor him just as Judas did, when he said, "Hail, Master! and kissed him." And he may as justly say to every one of them, "Betrays thou the

Son of Man with a kiss?" It is no other than betraying him with a kiss, to talk of his blood, and take away his crown; to set light by any part of his law, under pretence of advancing his gospel. Nor, indeed, can any one escape this charge, who preaches faith in any such a manner as either directly or indirectly tends to set aside any branch of obedience; who preaches Christ so as to [p. 318] disannul, or weaken in anywise, the least of the commandments of God.

LAW, Moral and Ceremonial

SOURCE: Editorial, "Are Christians, 'Under Grace,' to Keep the Law?" The Sunday School Times, 56 (Jan. 3, 1914), 2, 16. Copyright 1914 by The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 2] While God remains God, his moral law will be binding upon all who would have any part in his life. God's moral law is eternal; it is an expression of his very being. As such it can no more be abrogated than can God himself....

[p. 16] We must, of course, distinguish clearly between the ceremonial law of the Old Testament and the moral law. The eternal requirements of the moral law are always binding upon God's people; but the details of ceremonial law which typified Christ's atoning and cleansing work were done away with when Christ, their great antitype, completed the work which he came to do and which they foreshadowed. The believing Old Testament saint, saved by grace, was under the obligation of a ceremonial law from which we have been freed because Christ fulfilled and finished all that the ceremonial pointed to.

But, while we are freed from the ceremonial law, the obligation to keep the moral law rests even more heavily upon us who live in the enlightened age of grace than upon those who were living, by men's own choice, under law. We have in fulfillment in Christ that which they had at the best only in prophecy. Their belief may have given them, through Christ, the same divine power to obey the law that we now have in him; but we live in the noonday light of the revelation of his consummated work; they moved in the twilight of yet unfulfilled hope.

Law, Moral and Ceremonial, Distinguished

SOURCE: Charles Buck, A Theological Dictionary (New American ed., rev. from the latest London ed.; Philadelphia: Published by J. J. Woodward, 1836), art. "Law," p. 230.

Ceremonial - law is that which prescribed the rites of worship used under the Old Testament. These rites were typical of Christ, and were obligatory only till Christ had finished his work, and began to erect his Gospel church. Hebrews vii. 9, 11;
x. I; Ephesians ii. 16; Colossians ii. 14; Galatians v. 2, 3....

Moral law is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai. . . . It is denominated perfect, Psalm xix. 7; perpetual, Matthew v. 17, 18; holy, Romans vii. 12; good, Romans vii. 12; spiritual, Romans vii. 14; exceeding broad, Psalm cxix. 96.

Law, Moral and Ceremonial-Latter Designed to Restore Obedience to the Former

SOURCE: Ferdinand S. Schenck, The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1902), p. 11.

The ceremonial law taught of the holiness of God and of a coming Savior, and was designed to provide for restored obedience to the moral law.

Law, Moral and Ceremonial, Wesley on Difference Between

SOURCE: John Wesley, Sermon XXV, "Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount," Sermons on Several Occasions, Vol. 1 (New York: B. Waugh and T. Mason, 1836), pp. 221, 222.

[p. 221] The ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the temple, our Lord did indeed come to destroy, to dissolve, and utterly abolish. To this bear all the apostles witness.... This "hand

writing of ordinances our Lord did blot out, take away, and nail to his cross." . . .

But the moral law contained in the Ten Commandments, and enforced by the prophets, he did not take away. It was not the design of his coming to revoke any part of this. This is a law which never can be broken, which "stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven." The moral stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law. . . . [p. 2221 Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind, and in all ages; as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstance liable to change, but on the nature of God, and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.

Law, Moral, Ceremonial, and Jewish National

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 21 (originally 19), "Of the Law of God," secs. 1-4, in A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards, ed. by James Benjamin Green (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 110, Ill, Colossians 1.

[p. 1101 1. God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience; promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it; and endued him with power and ability to keep it.

[p. 111] 2. This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness; and, as such, was delivered by God upon mount Sinai in Ten Commandments, and written in two tables; the first four commandments containing our duty toward God, and the other six our duty to man.

3. Besides this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.

4. To them also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people, not obliging any other, now, further than the general equity thereof may require.

LAW, Moral, Ceremonial, and judicial

SOURCE: Samuel Mather, The Gospel of the Old Testament (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834), Vol. 1, p. 210.

The laws . . . delivered by Moses, were of three kinds, moral, ceremonial, and judicial. . . . The first, or moral law, being the law of universal or unalterable right, is binding upon all men, and is still in force.

3. The Investigative Judgment

W. E. READ
Editor, "Israelite" Magazine

THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST view of the investigative judgment has come in for a good deal of criticism during the years. The author of the book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism maintains that there is no Biblical basis for such a concept, and others have even declared that the teaching is "fantastic" and a "Face-saving device." Furthermore, some affirm that even the term "investigative- is an alien term, not being found in the Scriptures. Others maintain that the child of God will not come into judgment in any case.

The Use of the Term "Investigative" in Connection With the judgment

The use of this term has been challenged on the ground that it is not once mentioned in the Bible. That the term is not used in the Sacred Word, we readily concede; but does that mean that it could not be used if it expresses what we feel is a Biblical truth? Would we make the same charge against the word "incarnation" because it is not found in the Scriptures? The same can be said of such expressions as the "virgin birth," the "Trinity," the "millennium." We fully believe these doctrines, but the terms by which we express them are not found in the Divine Word. Many other Christians speak of "rapture," or "secret

rapture," yet these words are not found in the Bible.

Two Theological Camps in the Christian Church

There are two main theological camps in the Christian church. As to what one believes on such doctrines as the sovereignty of God, the eternal security of the believer, whether one can lose his status as a born-again Christian and be lost, whether there is a difference between the forgiveness of sin and the blotting out of sin, and other matters will, to a large degree, be determined by the camp with which he is associated. If he is in the Calvinistic group, then he favors one concept. If he is in the Arminian group, another concept. Seventh-day Adventists, from their beginning, have held quite largely to the Arminian concept, as have many other Christian bodies, such as the Methodists. John Wesley was for twenty years the editor of the Arminian Journal.

Three Schools of Prophetic Interpretation

Still another important item is the interpretation of passages from the books of Daniel and Revelation. The interpretation will be determined according to the school of prophetic interpretation to which one belongs. There are three such schools-the Praeterist, believing that these prophecies have already largely been fulfilled; the Futurist, maintaining that in the main, their fulfillment is yet in the future; and the Historicist, believing that they are being progressively unfolded and fulfilled. We belong to this last-mentioned group, and our concepts are naturally in harmony with this school of prophetic interpretation.

1. IS SUCH A DOCTRINE AS THE "INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT" TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES?

The Term "Investigative"

Now, take the term investigative, as used in this connection. Why should exception be taken to it? It is true we do not often use such an expression in referring to the work of our earthly courts of justice, but do we not in principle do the very thing this term implies before a decision is rendered? Do we not aim at a thorough consideration of all the factors involved, whether they be for or against the accused? As to whether one calls such a procedure an investigation or an examination matters not, the principle is the same. No decision is given unless such a procedure is followed.
. In our earthly courts there is the "investigation" of the case. Then comes the "Pronouncement" of the verdict. The accused is either condemned or acquitted. If condemned, as in the case of a murderer, then comes the carrying out of the sentence, which might be life imprisonment or execution.

Is not this what takes place in the judgment of the great day of God? Let us see-

a. There is to be a judgment (Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14; Hebrews 9:27).

b. There is to be a judgment of all men (Romans 14: 10).

c. There is to be a judgment of the righteous and the wicked (Ecclesiastes 3:17).

d. There will be an "investigation" of all cases, for the books of record are to be opened for an investigation, after which the redeemed ones will be "accounted worthy- (Daniel 7:10; Luke 20:35; 21:36; 2 Thessalonians 1:5).

e. There will be a pronouncement of the verdict (Revelation 22:11, 12).

f. There will be an "execution" of the judgment on the wicked (Revelation 20:11-15).

g. There will be the clearing of all the cases of the righteous (Daniel 12:1; Luke 10:20; Hebrews 12:23).

The Significance of the Second Advent

In the second place, think of what takes place at the second advent of our Lord:

a. There will be the resurrection of the righteous dead (1 Corinthians 15:50-54).

b. There will be the translation of the righteous living (1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17).

c. The resurrection of the righteous is called the "first" resurrection (Revelation 20:5, last part, and

6). The “rest of the dead” (the wicked) are not raised until the end of the 1000year period (Revelation 20:5). Now, think of what the foregoing considerations postulate.

The wicked dead are not raised at the second advent of our Lord, but the righteous dead are raised, and not only so, they are raised to immortality and to be forever with their Lord.

This being so, the cases of all, both righteous and wicked, must have been determined before the Second Advent. Remember that what happens at the second appearing of our Lord is done “in the twinkling of an eye” (1 Corinthians 15:52). Therefore, the cases of all have been determined before that event. That this is so is seen from the following:

a. There is an “accounting worthy- of the righteous before the Second Advent. Luke 20:35; 21:36; 2 Thessalonians 1:5.

Note that the righteous are accounted:

Worthy to obtain that world	(Luke 20:35)
Worthy to obtain that resurrection	
Worthy to escape all these things	(Luke 21:36)
Worthy to stand before the Son of man	
Worthy of the kingdom of God	(2 Thessalonians 1:5)

It is interesting to note that the Greek word for “to account worthy” is kataxio6 and according to Moulton and Milligan means not ‘to make worthy,” but “to count worthy.” This could refer then, not to the result of the judgment work, but to a process or investigation before the result is known and declared.

b. Prior to the Second Advent a special preparatory message goes forth to the whole world, which among other things declares that the hour of God’s judgment is come. Paul in his day could announce the judgment “to come” (Acts 24:25), but near the time of the Second Advent it can be said with assurance that the hour of the judgment is come (lit., came). That this message is to be heralded to the whole world before Christ returns in glory is, we believe, set forth in the sequence of events as outlined in Revelation 14.

The message of the judgment hour is given in verse 6 and onward; the character of the people who accept it is outlined in verse 12, and the Second Advent for which they are prepared is described in verse 14. Hence it would seem clear that the message is given to the world during this phase of the judgment to prepare a people to stand in the great day of God.

c. We believe that the prophecies of the Word of God foretell an aspect of the judgment before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. We read in Daniel 7:9, 10 the following:

1 beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.

A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.

Note two expressions in the above scriptures. Mention is made that the thrones were “cast down.” The RSV and many others say “were placed.” For “the judgment was set” the RSV gives “the court sat in judgment.” Again we read:

1 saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him (Daniel 7:13).

This scene presented to the prophet is part of a larger vision dealing with the four beasts of Daniel M. These are interpreted by the angel to represent four consecutive kingdoms, or dominions, that were to rule the earth until the God of heaven sets up a kingdom peopled exclusively with His saints. “These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom- (verses 17, 18). Since these four world kingdoms parallel the vision of Daniel 2, where the first kingdom is said to be Babylon, this vision of Daniel 7 must reach from the time of the prophet to the second coming of Christ, at which time the everlasting kingdom of righteousness will be set up. This is important to observe, for the judgment pictured in verses 9-14 takes place before the second coming of Christ. Some of its decisions regarding the beast are executed while world affairs are in progress, and the taking away of the dominion of the beast is a progressive work that continues “unto the end” (verse 26).

We should observe that in the seventh chapter of Daniel we have an over-all picture of the conflict between the saints of the Most High and the little horn, the papacy. It wages fiercely through the years until

the time when "one like the Son of man came . . . to the Ancient of days," to the Father (verse 13), at which time a session of the judgment began in heaven. This judgment issues in a condemnation of the little horn, and a verdict in favor of the saints (verses 21, 22). The papacy claimed the right to decide cases, the power to forg ive sins and to determine who belongs to the church of God. Daniel in this chapter declares that there is only one court that has this power, the one meeting in the heavenly sanctuary shortly after the close of the 1260-day prophecy (verses 25, 26). God alone knows the hearts of men. He alone has the records of the lives of men. And John declares: "The Father ... hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (John 5:22). Who else could distinguish between the true and the false? Who else has that right? Thus before Christ comes the heavenly assize will declare in favor of the saints and against the enemies of God. This judgment, when completed, will result in the rewards to the people of God; "and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom" (Daniel 7:22).

As noted above, one of the acts of judgment is to give to the "Son of man" "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him" (verses 13, 14). This takes place before the second coming of Christ, for when He returns it is as "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Revelation 19: 1 P 16).

We agree with T. Robinson that the judgment here predicted precedes the second coming of Christ:

We have before us a passage of overwhelming grandeur and sublimity; the description of a scene of awful solemnity.... The passage exhibits the judgment-seat of God, with myriads of attendant angels, and the infliction of pronounced doom on a large portion of the human race. The judgment is not indeed, like that in Revelation 20, the general judgment. . . . As already observed, this is not the general judgment at the termination of Christ's reign on earth, or, as the phrase is commonly understood, the end of the world. It appears rather to be an invisible judgment carried on within the veil and revealed by its effects and the execution of its sentence. . . . It may be sitting now. – "Daniel," The Preacher's Homiletic Commentary, pp. 136, 139.

Thomas Scott, in his commentary, remarks also that: "The fulfillment of this prophecy will precede the introduction of the millennium; the final judgment will succeed to consummation of all things here on earth." We quote these writers to show that certain scholars have referred to a judgment prior to the Second Coming.

In this prophecy Daniel refers particularly to one group, symbolized by the "little horn" which came in for examination, for sentence, and for condemnation. He does not aim to list all whose cases are to be considered: he mentions only the "little horn" which had persecuted and wasted the people of God. The fact that "the books were opened" would seem to imply the judgment of others. This could be so, and the writer quoted above mentions this:

Whatever may be the case in regard to the judgment we have been considering, and whatever share we may or may not have in it, it is certain that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ to receive according to the things done in the body, whether good or bad.... Each [man] must then give account of himself to God, for all these things God will bring thee into judgment. . . . Am 1 pardoned and accepted now in the surety, the Lord our righteousness? A place in the New Jerusalem or the Gehenna of fire depends on the question-Ibid., p. 140.

With this conclusion Ellen G. White is in full harmony, for we read:

Thus was presented to the prophet's vision the great and solemn day when the characters and the lives of men should pass in review before the judge of all the earth, and to every man should be rendered "according to his works."-Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 479.

The work of the investigative judgment and the blotting out of sins is to be accomplished before the second advent of the Lord. Since the dead are to be judged out of the things written in the books, it is impossible that the sins of men should be blotted out until after the judgment at which their cases are to be investigated-Ibid., p. 485.

When the investigative judgment doses, Christ will come, and His reward will be with Him to give to every man as his work shall be.-Ibid.

Another text to which our attention might be directed is Revelation 11:18:

And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou should give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and should destroy them which destroy the earth.

There might be a question in the minds of some as to when this passage has its application. There is one clause, however, that might give us an answer, and that is "that thou should give reward unto thy

servants ... and to the saints." This act of our Lord in bestowing these special gifts upon His children is located at His second advent:

Behold, 1 come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be (Revelation 22:12).

Behold thy Savior reveals himself; behold the reward of them that perform his word is with him (Isaiah 62: 11, Targum).

Granting that this is so, and that rewards are given at our Lord's appearing, then "the time of the dead, that they should be judge" must, of course, precede His return from heaven.

So in the light of these considerations, we feel there is ample evidence that the "investigation" aspect of the judgment takes place during the hours of time just prior to and up to the coming of Christ in power and great glory.

II. IS IT A BIBLICAL CONCEPT THAT THE CHILDREN OF GOD COME WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE JUDGMENT?

This question can be answered in the affirmative by reference to the following scriptures:

"God shall judge (LXX Gr. krin6) the righteous and the wicked" (Ecclesiastes 3:17).

"We shall all stand (Gr. paristimi) before the judgment seat of Christ" (Romans 14: 10).

In the first place, the Old Testament passage asserts that both righteous and wicked will have their cases reviewed, and that undoubtedly means at the heavenly tribunal. In the second place, specific reference is made to church members, for Paul's letter is to the churches at Rome and Corinth. But, doubtless, his words included others, those who were not believers in Christ. This is seen in his use of the word "all," which in the Greek is in a position of emphasis. It is seen also in the effect of such a judgment for that which is meted out to all men is for the things that are "good" and those that are "bad" (2 Corinthians 5: 10).

Some students have said that the saints appear before the judgment seat of Christ to receive their rewards, and by this they mean rewards for service, but the language of these texts means that they are there for the determination of character rather than for the bestowal of rewards.

It is true, of course, that the children of God are to receive rewards. These rewards are variously described as:

A "crown of life"
"A crown of glory"
"A crown of righteousness"
"An incorruptible" crown

James 1: 12
1 Peter 5:4
2 Timothy 4:8
1 Corinthians 9:25

But as we have already seen, these rewards will be bestowed at the time of the Savior's second advent:

.,And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be" (Revelation 22:12).

We repeat, the texts in Romans and Corinthians do not refer to this. Notice the apostle's words "We must all appear." This includes members of the church. Then he states why we must all appear. It is that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Romans 14:12), to "receive the things done in his body. . . . whether it be good or bad" (2 Corinthians 5: 10).

Again we mention, this is not determination of rewards but the determination of character.

Matthew Henry's comment is much to the point in this connection:

Christ will be the judge, and He has both authority and ability to determine men's eternal state according to their works, and before Him we shall stand as persons to be tried, and to give an account-Commentary on Romans 14:10.

John Calvin also has an interesting comment on this point:

An account must one day be rendered before the judgment seat of Christ; for the man who

seriously considers this must of necessity be touched with fear, and shake off all negligence. He declares, therefore, that he discharges his responsibility faithfully and with pure conscience (2 Timothy 1:3). He is one who walks in the fear of the Lord (Acts 9:31), thinking of the account to be rendered by him-Commentary on 2 Corinthians 5:10.

This is all in full harmony with what we have observed above, that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked (Ecclesiastes 3:17).

We are not unmindful of the fact that the Savior remarked in John 5:24:

He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life (RSV).

It must be remembered, however, that many versions give "condemnation" rather than "judgment." See the K.J.V. and others. While the two words come from the same Greek word krisis, the word does not always mean the judgment as a tribunal, but as an act of that tribunal in the condemnation of judgment. This dual aspect of krisis is reflected in the following excerpt from Liddell and Scott:

Krima is an act of judgment, Krisis partakes of both concepts, that of trial and also of the sentence of the court. In such a case the meaning of the word in a given text must be determined by the context.-Greek English Lexicon.

That condemnation is the idea in John 5:24 is evident from the words "but is passed from death unto life." Those who have rejected light and do not have eternal life are under -condemnation" (James 5:12), and the condemnation is "that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil" (John 3:19). Christians who walk in the light are not under condemnation; they live in the assurance of acceptance with God through Jesus Christ our Lord, as beautifully expressed by the apostle Paul:

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (Romans 8:1).

In the next article we shall discuss the question: "Does the Bible Reveal the Time for the Beginning of the Investigative Judgment?"

4. Does the Bible Reveal the Time for This to Begin?

W. E. READ
Editor, "Israelite" Magazine

IN THE FOREGOING chapter there were reviewed some of the Biblical evidences for a pre-Advent, or investigative, phase of God's great judgment work. In these presentations scriptural reasons for our Adventist position on the judgment are being set forth. Consideration will now be given to the time when this judgment begins. If the Holy Scriptures declare that such a judgment is to take place, could we not expect that God would also reveal the time for this phase of the judgment to begin?

I. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Year-Day Principle

Through the years Adventists have used two periods of time in dealing with the question of when this pre-Advent judgment begins-that of the 2300 days (Daniel 8:14) and that of the 70 weeks (Daniel 9:25). The 2300-day period is connected with the symbolic prophecy of Daniel 8. This prophecy is in the form of four symbols-the ram, the he-goat, the little horn, and the 2300 days. If "day" is a symbol in prophecy, and the 70-week period is to be understood as a key to the understanding of the 2300-day prophecy, we should expect the 70-week period to be in literal language. In the light of this, it is interesting to note that a more correct translation of the Hebrew word shabu'a, rendered in the King James Version as "seventy weeks," would be "seventy weeks of years," as we find in the translations of Goodspeed, Rotherham, Moffatt, and the Revised Standard Version.

2. The Wide Range of Daniel's Prophecies

The far-sweeping view of Daniel's prophecies carry us beyond Daniel's day. In fact, in some aspects of chapters 7 to 12 we are brought down to the time of the end and the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God.

The progressive nature of these unfoldings is seen in the succession of four great empires of Daniel 7, i.e., Babylon to Rome. Daniel knew of these things by revelation and could see some developments in his day by the eye of faith, yet he certainly did not live to see the full developments among the nations.

a. Daniel's reference to "understanding" the prophecies

There were some things Daniel did understand. These had a local application: "I ... understood by books the number of the years" (Daniel 9:2) and he "had understanding of the vision" (Daniel 10:1).

There were some things he did not understand. These had a future application: "And I heard, but I understood not." (Daniel 12:8); "Understand, 0 son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision" (Daniel 8:17).

b. Daniel's reference to "the time of the enC

"At the time of the end shall be the vision" (Daniel 8:17); "Understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days" (Daniel 10:14); "For yet the end shall be at the time appointeC (Daniel 11:27); "till the time of the end- (Daniel 12:9); "go thou [Daniel] thy way till the end be: for thou shall rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Daniel 12:13).

c. Daniel's reference to the kingdom of God

The culminating point of these prophecies is the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God. Here are some examples:

Daniel 2:44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: ... it shall stand for ever."

Daniel 7:18: "The saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever."

Daniel 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

d. Daniel's reference to the time prophecies

(1) The 31/2 times, or 1260 days (Daniel 7:25; 12:7). See also Revelation 12:14; 13:5.
(2) The 2300 days (Daniel 8:14).
(3) The 70 weeks (Daniel 9:24).
(4) The 1290 days (Daniel 12: 11).
(5) The 1335 days (Daniel 12:12).

Recognizing in general the application of the year-day principle in the interpretation of these time periods, we find that they all reach into the future, and in most cases to the "time of the end." The period of the 70 weeks of years was of short duration compared with the others, but even this was largely future in Daniel's day, for it had reference to the coming of Messiah, to His baptism, to the length of His ministry, and to His death on Calvary's cross. Other prophecies, such as the 1260-day period, which had reference to the persecuting power already referred to, cover activities during the centuries 533-538 to 1793-1798. The same principle applies to the 1290day prophecy and particularly to the 2300-day prophecy. As the others reach into the future, it would be but natural that this 2300-day prophecy find its fulfillment in the closing days of earth's history.

e. Daniel's reference to the "abomination of desolation"

This expression may have had a minor and very restricted application in the days of Daniel. It certainly had a wider and much fuller application following the ministry of our Lord on earth. He Himself called attention to this prophecy, which was undoubtedly fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. (See Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14)

We might go even further than the application to the destruction of Jerusalem. This prophecy of the "abomination of desolation" also has wider application, even to the "last days."

Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, on Matthew 24:15, remarks:

But the reference to Daniel made by our Lord in this His prophecy concerning Judaea and the world, shows that Daniel's prediction was not yet exhausted, but was to have a further accomplishment in Jerusalem and also in the church at large. - Commentary, p. 86.

In the Christian Church the prophecy of our Lord concerning the setting up of an Abomination of Desolation in the Holy Place, appears to have been in part fulfilled by the setting up of the Bishop of Rome upon the altar of God in St. Peter's [at Rome]-Ibid., p. 87.

Ellen G. White writes:

Jesus did not answer His disciples by taking up separately the destruction of Jerusalem and the great day of His coming. He mingled the description of these two events. . . . In mercy to them He blended the description of the two great crises, leaving the disciples to study out the meaning for themselves. When He referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, His prophetic words reached beyond that event to the final conflagration in that day when the Lord shall rise out of His place.... This entire discourse was given, not for the disciples only, but for those who should live in the last scenes of this earth's history.-The Desire of Ages, p. 628.

f. Daniel's reference to the nature and the work of the "little horn-

More mention is made of this aspect of Daniel's prophecy than of any other symbol. A number of verses in the different lines of prophecy are taken up with its description. In Daniel 7 there are five verses; in Daniel 8 there are eight verses; in Daniel 11 there are twenty verses.

In Daniel 7 the "little horn" of verses 20-25 is described as having "eyes," "a mouth that spoke very great things," and "whose look was more stout than his fellows" (verse 20). Further, we read that he "made war with the saints" (verse 21) and "shall wear out the saints of the most High" (verse 25). He did "think to change times and laws" and did continue for "a time and times and the dividing of time" (verse 25).

In Daniel 8 the 9ittle horn" as applied to pagan and papal Rome is described differently. The emphasis in this chapter is on its relation to the sanctuary, to the worship of God, and to the redemptive work of the Messiah. This is seen in the fact that he "magnified himself even to the prince of the host" (Daniel 8:11). In verse 25 this is interpreted to mean "against the Prince of princes," who is none other than the Messiah, our blessed Lord.

In Daniel 11 the 9ittle horn" is further described, and what was given in Daniel 7 and 8 is enlarged upon. Further details are given, but the prophet is assured that "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him- (Daniel 11:45).

g. Daniel's reference to the "daily"

The expression "daily sacrifice" is to be found five times in the prophecies of Daniel: 8:11, 12, and 13; 11:31; and 12:11.

It will be recognized that the word "sacrifice" is in italics and represents a word supplied by the translators to give what they thought was the sense of the original word, tamid. Tamid is variously rendered in the King James Version, and by such words as continual, always, daily, perpetual, continually, ever, and for ever. A careful study of the use of this Hebrew word indicates that tamid is frequently applied to the morning and evening sacrificial offerings, and some of the English words just mentioned are used with reference to these offerings. For example, the word perpetual in the two occasions of its use; daily in the seven occasions of its use; continual in 23 out of 26 times of its use; continually about twelve times.

This being so in its reference to the morning and evening services in the typical sanctuary, one would gather that it would be so in the antitypical service in the heavenly sanctuary. There it would evidently represent the continuous ministry of the Lord as our great High Priest. The book of Hebrews picks up this thought, as can be seen in the statement that Christ "continues ever" (Hebrews 7:24). Our Lord "abides a priest continually" (Hebrews 7:3).

This daily service of the earthly sanctuary, involving the morning and the evening sacrifice-the tamid (Hebrew), or "continual"-fitly foreshadowed the continual efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ our Lord, accomplished on Calvary's cross. The risen Christ, our ministering high priest, "ever lives to make intercession" (Hebrews 7:25) for us. Hence we understand His heavenly ministry to he the mediation of His complete and ever-efficacious atonement, which He made and completed on the cross for man, applying that atonement to the individual sinner as he accepts Christ as his personal Savior-Questions on Doctrine, p.

264.

These considerations emphasize that, in the main, Daniel's prophecies had their fulfillment after his day, and in fact a long way into the future, even to the "time of the end." One Bible (The Holy Scriptures, Jewish Publishing Society) renders Daniel 8:17 "the vision belongs to the time of the end," and Rotherham renders it "to the time of the end belongs the vision."

2. THE UNIQUENESS OF THE VISION OF DANIEL 8 AND 9

There is something unique about the vision of Daniel 8 and 9. It is different from the visions of Daniel 2 and 7. In Daniel 2 the kingdoms of the world are portrayed to Nebuchadnezzar as valuable metals-gold, silver, brass, and iron; and later to Daniel as wild, ravenous beasts.

In Daniel 8, however, while reference is made to two kingdoms under the symbols of animals, those chosen are not wild beasts but domestic animals, and the significant fact is that the ram and the he-goat were animals used in the sacrificial service in the sanctuary of Israel.

The uniqueness of this prophecy is that it deals pre-eminently with the sanctuary. This can be seen in the following references: To the "daily," Daniel 8:11-13; to the sanctuary, 8:11-14; to the defilement of the sanctuary, 8:11, 13; 9:17; to the evening oblation, 9:21; to the cleansing of the sanctuary, 8:14; to the termination of the sacrificial service, 9:27.

The reference to worldly kingdoms is merely to give the setting for the main theme, that of God's plan to redeem man from iniquity. The seventy-week period reveals the cross, the redemptive, sacrificial act of our blessed Lord, the Messiah, and the time when He begins His Priestly ministry in the sanctuary above. The 2300-day period reveals the time when He enters upon the closing work of His ministry as our great High Priest.

As just mentioned, in Daniel's day fulfillment of the prophecy in the main was a long way in the future, but God did give to the prophet something to comfort his soul, and in part at least, answered the great burden on his heart. His earnest prayer, "How long," did have a local fulfillment. He lived during the days of Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of both the Temple and city of Jerusalem (Daniel 1: 1). He was about eighteen years old at that time (Testimonies, Volume 4, p. 570). Then we read that Daniel lived until the third year of Cyrus, 537 BC (Daniel 10:4).

So Daniel lived long enough to see the morning and evening sacrifices restored. In this Daniel's heart was cheered and comforted, even though he could not have understood the far reaching implications of his prophecies.

3. THE TIE BETWEEN DANIEL 8 AND DANIEL 9

We have also observed that the features of Daniel's prophecy in chapters two and seven were quite fully explained, and that in the main, the features of Daniel 8 were also explained. Only one symbol was not explained, and that symbol was the 2300 year-day period.

We maintain that this aspect of the Daniel 8 vision was dealt with in Daniel 9, and we will now consider certain aspects of this question.

1. The Significance of the Mention of the Angel Gabriel (Daniel 9:21)

The mention of Gabriel we believe is an indication of the tie between chapters 8 and 9. In Daniel 9:21 Gabriel, who comes to make Daniel understand the vision, was the angel Daniel saw in the beginning of the vision as recorded in chapter 8. There Gabriel is counseled by someone of higher authority to give understanding of the vision to Daniel (Daniel 8:16). It was the same angel that was with Daniel when he fainted, and who comforted and assured him that the vision was true. In the seventh chapter there is no mention of Gabriel and no evidence that Gabriel gave that vision to Daniel.

2. The Significance of the Expression "consider the vision" (Daniel 9:23)

Gabriel had previously explained to Daniel all but the time portion of the symbolic vision of chapter 8. Now he reappears to continue the explanation in literal terms (Daniel 9:21, 22) and to clarify the remaining part. The angel uses the arresting words "consider the vision." This expression provides the key to the explanation, for the term "vision" appears ten times in chapter 8. But it is to be noted that in Daniel 8 and 9 two Hebrew words, chazon and mareh, not exact synonyms, are used in the original Hebrew text. In the majority of English translations only one word, "vision," has been used to express these slightly variant thoughts, and as a result, the exact intent of the original has rarely been perceived.

Could we not regard the Hebrew words as having some significance? It is possible that when the word chazin is used, the reference seems to be to the over-all vision. On the other hand, where the word mareh is employed, the reference could be to the particular things seen and heard in the chazon. One feature seen in the over-all vision, the chazin, was the "two thousand and three hundred days- of Daniel 8:14. But the special scene referred to here is "the vision" (mareh) of the evening and morning (verse 26).

When the angel Gabriel, "whom 1 [Daniel] had seen in the vision (chazon) at the beginning" (Daniel 9:21), returned to complete his explanation of the vision (chazon), he directed Daniel's attention specifically to the vision (mareh) when he said, "consider the vision [mareh]" (verse 23). The very thing, the mareh, that was unexplained in Daniel 8 is what Gabriel referred to when he said to consider the mareh.

"There can be no mistake as to this identification of 'the vision.' S. R. Driver, the noted critic (The Book of Daniel, 1936, p. 133), recognized this, and wrote concerning 'the vision at the beginning' (Daniel 9:21) that it refers to 'viii.16.' The chapter 8 usage and the chapter 9 tie-in appears inescapable, and the identical theme of the two chapters becomes self-evident. What follows in chapter 9 is therefore not a new and independent vision, but is the continuing literal explanation of the symbolic 'vision' of chapter 8."-Questions on Doctrine, p. 271.

3. The Significance of the Expression "to anoint the most Holy" (Daniel 9:24)

The expression "most holy" is sometimes used of the sanctuary as a whole. It is, of course, used most frequently of the Most Holy Place, the inner room of the earthly sanctuary, while the larger section of the sanctuary was called "the holy place" (Ex. 26:33). There are instances, however, where the term is used of the sanctuary as a whole, irrespective of its various divisions.

Referring to the sacrifice that was to be eaten by the priests, Numbers 18: 10 says, "in the most holy place shall thou eat it." But according to Leviticus 6:16 such offerings were to be eaten in the [literally, a] holy place, which is defined as the court of the sanctuary. No one could enter the Most Holy Place except the high priest, and then only on the Day of Atonement at the close of the sacrificial year. The Most Holy Place is mentioned in Ezekiel 45:1

The term "most holy" is used exclusively of things and places, and never of persons. Thus Dean Farrar, in The Book of Daniel, 1895, page 278 says: " 'Holy of Holies' is never once used of a person, though it occurs forty-four times." A marginal reading in the King James Version is "most holy place." The rendering in the American Revised Version margin is "a most holy place." Keil says this is a "new temple," a "most holy place," the "establishment of the new holy of holies," where God's presence will be manifest. The Jewish translation reads "to anoint the most holy place" (Daniel 9:24, The Holy Scriptures, the Jewish Publication Society).

And since Christ's ministry is in the heavenly sanctuary, not in the earthly, we take this to be an obvious reference to the anointing, or consecration, of the heavenly sanctuary preparatory to, or in connection with, Christ's coronation and inauguration as priest-king (Hebrews 8:2; 9:23, 24).

4. The Significance of the Expression "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people"

The problem with the word "determined" is that it is variously rendered in the different English translations. Several translations, such as the King James Version, give "determined." The Revised Standard Version, Jewish Publication Society, and Moulton give "decreed." Others give "destined" or "fixed" or "ordained." Some even give "divided" or "shortened." The Hebrew word is chathak, and this is the only place of its use in the Hebrew Bible. We should take cognizance of this fact in our interpretation of this word. We have been charged with recognizing only one meaning, namely, "cut off," and the idea in the criticism is that this has been a convenient way for us to make a connection between Daniel 9 and Daniel 8. We should investigate this criticism fairly and adequately, to see what justification we have for using the expression "cut off." The fact is that the Hebrew lexicons differ as to which English translation really has priority, but generally they give "cut" or "cut off- first mention.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs, in their Hebrew and English Lexicon, give "to divide, to determine, to cut, cut off, to decide." Kohler and Baurngartner, in their Lexicon in Veretis Testamenti Libros, give "to cut, to decide." Gesenius gives "to determine, to destine." The Students' Hebrew Lexicon gives "cut ... .. sever," "decide." The Harkavy Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary gives "cut," "decide."

In the light of this, it can be seen that the term "cut off" has considerable basis for its use. In a matter of this kind, however, why not recognize the various aspects of the meaning of the Hebrew word chathak. Is it not true that the 70-week period was "allotted" to the Jewish people to accomplish the things mentioned in the prophecy (Daniel 9:24)? Was not this period appointed by the Lord for this very purpose?

Seeing that it is a specific period, can we not also recognize that God "determined" this period of time for His people? The word also means "cut off," as we have just seen, but why not recognize all facets of the meaning of the word in our interpretation? By so doing we gain rather than lose.

5. The Significance of the Fact That Daniel Did Not Understand the Fourth Scene in the Vision [mareh] (Daniel 8:26,27)

The fact that the vision of Daniel 8 closes without explanation of the fourth symbol-that of the 2300 evenings and mornings-indicates that it was God's purpose to reveal this matter to His servant Daniel. Because there are points that tie this ninth chapter with the eighth chapter, it seems reasonable to conclude that when Gabriel came to Daniel he took up the thread of the prophecy from Daniel 8. Gabriel then told Daniel he was come to give him skill and understanding, and that now he was to understand the matter and consider the vision [mareh].

6. The Significance of the Fact That Many Bible Expositors Have Recognized This Tie

For more complete data the reader is referred to The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, by L. E. Froom. We will give but one relevant quotation:

This chronological prophecy [Daniel 9] was evidently designed to explain the foregoing [chapter 81 vision, especially in its chronological part of the 2300 days. William Hales in A New Analysis of Chronology, 1833, Volume II, p. 517.

The following excerpts from the Ellen G. White writings should also be carefully noted:

Earnestly he [Daniel] sought for the meaning of the vision. He could not understand the relation sustained by the seventy years' captivity, as foretold through Jeremiah, to the twenty-three hundred years that in vision he heard the heavenly visitant declare should elapse before the cleansing of God's sanctuary. The angel Gabriel gave him a partial interpretation; yet when the prophet heard the words, "The vision ... shall be for many days," he fainted away. "I Daniel fainted," he records of his experience, "and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and 1 was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." - Prophets and Kings, p. 554.

Yet God had bidden His messenger, "Make this man to understand the vision." That commission must be fulfilled. In obedience to it, the angel, some time afterward, returned to Daniel, saying, "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding;" "therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision!' There was one important point in the vision of chapter eight which had been left unexplained, namely, that relating to time,-the period of the 2300 days; therefore the angel, in resuming his explanation, dwells chiefly upon the subject of time. . . .

The angel had been sent to Daniel for the express purpose of explaining to him the point which he had failed to understand in the vision of the eighth chapter, the statement relative to time, - "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." - The Great Controversy, pp. 325, 326.

We believe these considerations give us fair, logical, and sound reasons for our belief, not only on the pre-Advent aspect of the judgment but also as to the time when that phase of the judgment began its work; namely, in 1844, at the close of the 2300 year-day prophecy.

For historic data on the accuracy of the beginning date of the 2300 days, that is 457 BC, see The Chronology of Ezra 7, by Siegfried Horn and L. H. Wood.

5. The Sabbath and the Lord's Day

RICHARD HAMMILL
Associate Secretary, Department of Education, General Conference

IN HIS BOOK The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism Walter R. Martin attempts to show that the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church concerning the binding obligation upon Christians to observe the seventh-day Sabbath are without Biblical foundation. It is our purpose here to examine the arguments that he puts forth in chapter six. For easy comparison we will use the same headings that are found in his book.

Apocalyptic Illusions

Walter Martin begins his argument by asserting that "Adventists base their interpretations largely upon purely apocalyptic and prophetic passages in the books of Daniel and Revelation- (page 142), and that we interpret these passages in a faulty manner. He does not show wherein these interpretations are faulty, but says concerning these Biblical passages, they are "symbols whose meaning the Holy Spirit has not been pleased to reveal," and "in my opinion, it cannot be denied that the chief source of these apocalyptic speculations is a failure to consider the fact that God has deliberately hidden some things from human understanding- (page 143).

It is evident that Mr. Martin is attempting to brush aside significant scriptural teaching and evidence on the important question of the Sabbath day merely with a sweeping assertion that the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation cannot be understood. We ask, Why did God send His Holy Spirit to indite these messages through the prophets? And why did God see fit to place these prophetic materials in the Bible if it were not that they are for our admonition and guidance? When the apostle Paul commended the Ephesian brethren "to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified" (Acts 20:32), he did not exclude the prophetic writings of Daniel or of John. Undoubtedly, Mr. Martin would agree that the books of Daniel and Revelation belong to the Biblical canon. Yet in reality one's canon of scripture consists only in that which one is willing to use for doctrine and as a guide for one's life.

It is further asserted: "There is no grammatical or contextual foundation in the Word of God for teaching that (a) the Papacy is the power spoken of in Daniel 7:2Y' (page 143). This judgment is surprising, inasmuch as our whole argument concerning Daniel 7:25 is based on the context. We are very careful to trace in this outline prophecy the development of great powers on the earth, beginning with Medo-Persia, followed by Greece, Rome, and then the great political and spiritual power that arose out of the Roman Empire, the little horn. This certainly is using the context. Furthermore, we do not know what Mr. Martin could possibly have had in mind when he says that there is no grammatical foundation for our teaching on this prophecy. He does not show where we violate the grammar of Daniel 7:25. What purpose does language serve except to convey meaning? Our interpretation is based on a searching examination of the meaning of the phrases in the twenty-fifth verse. We do no violence to the grammar of this passage at all.

Next, it is asserted that we hold to our interpretation of Daniel 7:25 because it has been "confirmed" in the writings of Ellen G. White. We have never based our interpretation of this passage on the statements of Ellen G. White, nor do we now. We go directly to the Bible and to its clear delineations of the little-horn power through the entire context of the seventh chapter of Daniel. Concerning the book of Daniel our Savior said, "Who so reads, let him understand" (Matthew 24:15). Jesus endorsed the book of Daniel and commended it for our study. We wonder, therefore, why Mr. Martin attempts to nullify the effect of a great prophecy merely by saying that it cannot be understood. We are amazed that he insists our interpretations are wrong without even attempting to show wherein they are in error, or what the scripture does mean. We would hardly want to think that our friend merely tries to dismiss an important portion of God's Word by mere denials and airy, lofty generalizations. Obviously, we will not change our views on Daniel 7:25 on the basis of such arguments.

Ellen G. White on the Fourth Commandment

Mr. Martin next quotes a statement of Ellen G. White from The Great Controversy, pages 452, 453, to the effect that the fourth commandment is the seal of the law of God. The seal consists in these two things-that the fourth commandment alone contains the name of God together with His title, the latter showing God's authority as the Creator for giving the law. Mr. Martin attempts to show that the statement of Mrs. White is not supported in the Bible. He comments that her error is due to her unfamiliarity with the Hebrew, and asserts that the name and title of God occur elsewhere in the Ten Commandments. He fails in this attempt, for in no place else in the Ten Commandments, except in the fourth, is the title of God as the Creator, the one who made heaven and earth, mentioned. No matter how well one might know Hebrew, he could not find substantiation for Mr. Martin's claim. Mr. Martin attempts to build his case on the fact that the name of God, Elohim, does appear elsewhere in the Ten Commandments, and that this name, he says, carries with it the connotation of Creator because it is used in Genesis 1:1, where we are told that God created the earth. This certainly is forced reasoning, and really consists of a form of hedging. Mrs. White

did not say that the name of God occurs only in the fourth commandment, but that God's name coupled with His designation as Creator of the heavens and the earth occurs there alone. Mr. Martin's assertion that because he has shown how the name of God occurs in Exodus 20:1, 2, 5, 7, he "disposes" of Mrs. White's claim, is really ludicrous. Yet after mentioning the fact that the name of God occurs elsewhere in the Ten Commandments, and that wherever it occurs we should understand that it means "Creator", Mr. Martin says this is "an unanswerable linguistic argument." We fail to see that this is even a linguistic argument, let alone that it is unanswerable. The fact that in Genesis 1: 1 God is described as the Creator does not mean that wherever the name "God" is used we are immediately to supply the words Creator of the heavens and the earth. The Hebrew word Elohim used alone carries absolutely no connotation of "Creator." We are astounded even more when Mr. Martin says that if the entire fourth commandment were removed, the title of Creator would remain in the other commandments simply because the name of God appears there. Is it not Martin who is straining and stretching the scripture, and not Ellen G. White, despite the fact that several times in this passage he asserts that her interpretation is "neither grammatically, nor contextually tenable" and that it is "seriously deficient in the all important areas of language and syntactical usage"? Not once did Mr. Martin show that Mrs. White's use of the Bible is contrary to grammatical or contextual or syntactical usage. In fact, his extreme position that the mere mention of the name of God must be understood to include His title as Creator shows that it is Mr. Martin who is not observing the laws of grammar and linguistics. Mrs. White's statement is in harmony with the language and syntactical usage of Exodus 20, while Mr. Martin's statement is not. Moreover, he attempts to becloud the issue by stating that although God hallowed the Sabbath day, scholars from the Church Fathers on down have debated the meaning of the word hallowed. The Hebrew makes perfectly clear that God hallowed the Sabbath by resting on it and by setting it apart for His own use. Because we might not know all the connotations of the word hallow is no excuse whatsoever for men not to rest and worship on the Sabbath as God commanded them.

Mr. Martin next quotes a statement of Ellen G. White in which she stated that the Papacy brought about the change of worship from the seventh day to the first day of the week. He attempts to dispose of this claim by asking to which pope she referred. He says we agree that there was no such office as the Papacy until the elevation of Gregory the Great in AD 590, and since we admit that a great body of Christians were keeping Sunday before that time, we contradict ourselves. In the first place, we do not admit that there was no such institution as the Papacy before Gregory. This matter rests entirely on the definition given of the word papacy, and in a case like this the only fair procedure is to ascertain what the word meant to Ellen G. White at the end of the nineteenth century, and not what it means to Mr. Martin today.

We do agree that the primacy of the Bishop of Rome over the Christian church came about through an evolutionary process. After the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 and of Jerusalem in AD 132, the church in Rome rapidly came to the forefront of Christendom. Although there were other great churches that were founded by the apostles, yet the fact that both Peter and Paul met their death in Rome, and the fact that Rome was the capital of the empire, caused the early Christians to regard highly the opinions of the leaders of the Christian community in Rome. As the decades passed, this eminence was steadily augmented. Irenaeus of Lyons (France) represented the general feeling of the churches of his time (about AD 185) when he drew attention to the fact that the Roman Church was founded by Peter and Paul, and declared, "For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority."-Heresies 3:3. Further evidence of this primacy of the Roman Church and the Roman Bishop is seen about AD 198, when the problem of the date of Easter became so acute that a number of synods were convened in Rome, Palestine, Alexandria, and other places. These synods all decided in favor of the Roman practice of holding Easter on a Sunday instead of on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan.

BY AD 200 Rome was the eminent and influential center of Christianity, and the Roman bishops were not slow to make the most of this eminence. As time passed, the influence of the Bishop of Rome was greatly extended, so that he was almost always selected as president and moderator of ecumenical assemblies, and there existed a general feeling that no decisions of a general nature could be made without his consent. In the Synod of Sardica in AD 343 we observe that the longstanding authority of the Roman Bishop was formulated ‘ and he was given appellate powers to settle disputes involving other bishops. A careful study of the experiences of the church of those times reveals that the bishops of Rome exercised their power in widespread church affairs, and often at the request of bishops and princes. Damasus, another strong pope elected in AD 366, obtained from Emperor Gratian the right to try other bishops.

The doctrinal controversies of the fourth century greatly enhanced the power of the Bishop of

Rome. Innocent I (AD 404) laid claim to the supreme right of adjudication in all the more grave and momentous cases of church disputes, and also claimed the right to issue obligatory regulations for the several districts of the Church. Leo I (AD 440-461) emphasized the primacy of Peter, and claimed that the bishops of Rome were Peter's successors. He so effectively made his claims that he was able to exercise authority in Gaul, Spain, and North Africa. In AD 445 he obtained an edict from Emperor Valentinian Ill, who ordered all Christians to obey the Roman Bishop as having "the primacy of St. Peter." Leo effectively exerted his control of the Church by interfering in this or that important concern of the whole Christian church.

As far back as the third century we find Irenaeus of Lyons listing the popes of Rome. He claimed that Peter was the first pope, and he listed twelve popes who had ruled in succession from his day. Regardless of what we think of this list, it is evident that great sections of the Christian church in the third and fourth centuries AD looked to the Roman bishop as the foremost "father" of Christendom. That is the meaning of the word, and it was in this sense that Mrs. White-as well as practically all writers of her time-used the word, referring to the institutions of the Papacy, the continuing line of spiritual leaders of the Church, and not to any one single Bishop of Rome.

Certainly the institution of the Papacy existed before the time of Gregory 1, and numerous statements from early church historians show that these popes were active in using their influence in downgrading the seventh-day Sabbath and in encouraging the Church to keep Sunday instead. In some cases this took the form of proclaiming Saturday as a fast day, which fast was not to be broken until the beginning of the first day of the week. Another instance, occurring much earlier, is the indefatigable efforts put forth by the bishops of Rome to establish throughout Christendom the practice of observing the anniversary of Christ's resurrection on Sunday, instead of on different days of the week year by year. The Jewish Passover season, during which Christ was crucified and resurrected, was determined according to the rising of the full moon in the Jewish month Nisan. Accordingly, the Passover and the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread wandered among the various days of the week. When the early Christians very early began to honor the yearly anniversary of Christ's resurrection, they used the Jewish reckoning, and honored it, one year on Tuesday, another on Wednesday, et cetera. This method of fixing the anniversary of Christ's resurrection was used throughout the Christian church at one time, and especially so in Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor.

When the Jewish people fell into great disfavor in the early Christian centuries, the leaders of the church in the West (Italy, Gaul, etcetera) felt irked at having to use Jewish reckoning to set the date of a church celebration. They began agitation to tie the anniversary of His resurrection to a fixed day of the week, namely, Sunday, inasmuch as when Christ was resurrected, that feast day had fallen on Sunday. This helped strengthen their contention that Christians should also observe the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection, rather than observe the seventh-day Sabbath as the Bible commands. Thus they used the fledgling Easter celebration as a means of establishing the observance of Sunday.

Victor, the bishop of Rome from approximately AD 189 to 200, tried to force this practice upon the church in Asia Minor. When the leaders of the church in the East protested, he attempted to excommunicate them all. The controversy raged during the third and fourth centuries, until eventually the bishops of Rome were able to enforce their will upon the entire Christian church. As the anniversary of the Lord's resurrection gradually became tied to Sunday, the esteem of the people for that day increased, and little by little they became willing to accept it as the weekly day of worship in place of the seventh day Sabbath. Certainly the bishops of Rome played a leading part in changing the practice of the Christian world from the observance of Sabbath to Sunday.

The leaders of the Church of Rome used their influence upon Emperor Constantine to bring about his Edict Of AD 321, in which people living in cities were forbidden to labor on Sunday. In the Council of Laodicea, held between AD 343 and 381, the church leaders made the following law: "Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ." - Canon 29, Hefele's Councils, Volume 2, bk. 6, sec. 93.

That the bishops of Rome, the "fathers," i.e. popes, of the most influential part of Christendom, surely were primary agents in creating the observance of Sunday, just as Ellen G. White wrote, is clearly evident.

Mr. Martin asks why Seventh-day Adventists cite the testimony of Roman Catholic authorities to the effect that they changed the Sabbath to Sunday when he can find other Roman Catholic authorities that do not agree. Our answer to this is that when some authorities acknowledge the fact that it was the Roman

Catholic Church who brought about the change in practice of Christendom of worshiping on the first day of the week instead of the seventh, are agreeing with that which actually happened, and with the statements of the prophecy of Daniel 7:25 concerning what would take place under the influence of the little-horn power.

On page 148 of his book, Walter Martin quotes the excellent statement of Peter Geiermman, acknowledging that Saturday is the Sabbath day and that the Catholic Church in the Council of Laodicea transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday. Mr. Martin quotes another statement of Mr. Geiermann which reiterates the same thing and emphasizes that 'I 'this change the church was authorized to make by the power conferred upon her by Jesus Christ' " (page 149). But he also mentions such texts as Revelation 1:10; Acts 20:7; and 1 Corinthians 16:2 as Biblical authority for the observance of the first day of the week. Not one of these texts state that Sunday is the Lord's day, nor do they cite a divine command that Christians should observe the first day of the week. We accept the second statement of Professor Geiermann too, for in it he also says that the Catholic Church had authority to decree that Christians should keep the first day of the week. We quoted him in the first instance because he so claimed. His assertion that this authority was theirs by virtue of the Scriptures, we reject, but doing so in no way weakens his testimony as to the part the Roman Catholic Church played in the attempt to change the Sabbath. We see nothing inconsistent in citing Geiermann as a witness.

Adventism Unmoved

Mr. Martin attempts to make a strong argument out of the fact that Arthur E. Lickey, an Adventist writer, in showing the relationship between the Sabbath and the cross, put his argument in the form of a statement by God and ended it by saying, "What I have joined together, let no man put asunder." Mr. Lickey was showing how Calvary did not abrogate the Sabbath, but rather strengthened its claim to be the Christian day of rest because it is a sign of God's creative, redeeming power, as is Calvary. Mr. Martin says he is shocked to find that Mr. Lickey quotes Matthew 19:6, which is speaking of marriage, and applies it to the Sabbath and Calvary. He claims that this is an illustration of the way we use scriptures out of context.

Actually, anyone reading Mr. Lickey's statement will recognize that he is using the words of Matthew 19:6 as a literary borrowing. It is a very common thing among many Christian writers to borrow the phrasing of a certain Biblical passage and to use it in an entirely different setting because of the apt phraseology. It is apparent that Mr. Lickey is not trying to use these phrases as Biblical support for his argument, nor is he exegeting Matthew 19:6. It would not be difficult to find many instances of this literary borrowing of phrases in practically any Christian book. To magnify this literary borrowing the way Mr. Martin has is evidence only that there has been much searching to try to find a little weakness to pick on. In this connection, however, we should say that neither Mr. Lickey nor any Seventh-day Adventist would attempt to make the Sabbath of equal importance with the cross. The cross is the most important event in Christian history, and nothing can equal it. On the other hand, it is certain that nothing happened at Calvary to change the fact that God said it is His desire and will that His children observe the seventh-day Sabbath, which is a memorial of His creative power just as the cross is an even greater sign of God's creative-redeeming power. After the cross, the seventh-day Sabbath was still the will of God for His people. Calvary ratified the new covenant, and after a covenant or testament has been ratified no one can make any changes in it. The institution of Sunday, or the observing of the first day of the week, came too late to be included in God's new covenant for His people. Sunday keeping is merely man's unilateral covenant, and God has nothing to do with it. Sunday has no part in God's gracious covenant with mankind, and is therefore only a human institution.

6. The Sabbath or the Lord's Day?

RICHARD HAMMILL
Associate Secretary, Department of Education, General Conference

THIS SECTION OF Mr. Martin's book begins as follows: "Seventh-day Adventists from the beginning have always attempted to equate the Sabbath with the Lord's Day. Their principal method for accomplishing this is arguments against their position, i.e., the Lord's Day as opposed to Sabbath observance." - Page 151. We do not comment on this, for we cannot understand the thought of the writer in

that second sentence. Let us try the author's next sentence to see if there is better logic in it. "They reason that since 'the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath' (Mark 2:27, 28), when John says he 'was in the Spirit on the Lord's day' (Revelation 1:10), the Sabbath and the Lord's Day must be the same!" We leave it to the reader to judge whether this reasoning deserves an exclamation point or not. It seems to us that if the Savior is Lord of the Sabbath day-by His own statement-it is only logical for us to conclude that the Lord's day is the Sabbath. There is one thing we can certainly say for sure, that is that in Revelation 1:10 John did not say he was in the Spirit on Sunday! Neither did Christ ever say that the first day of the week is "the Lord's day." No other passage of Scripture can be adduced to put with Revelation 1:10 that could by the remotest stretch of the imagination suggest that "the Lord's day" is Sunday.

Our friend Walter Martin makes a very meaningful admission when he says, "John did not mean that the Lord's Day was the Lord's possession, but rather that it was the day dedicated to Him by the early church, not in accordance with Mosaic law, but in obedience to our Lord's commandment of love." (Italics supplied.) We do not admit for a moment that the apostles specially dedicated the first day of the week to the worship of Christ, for we find Paul, after having kept the Sabbath with the believers, leaving late on Saturday night for an all-day walk to catch a ship (Acts 20:7-11), and commanding the Corinthian believers to arrange their financial matters on the first day and to store up at home some funds for the great offering for the poor in Jerusalem (1 Corinthians 16:2, ff.). But we do agree with the author that the first day of the week is merely a human institution. We marvel, however, how one can observe the first day of the week "in obedience to our Lord's commandment of love" but cannot observe the seventh day on the same basis!

Let us continue with Walter Martin's argument: "The weakness of their position is that they base their argument on an English translation instead of on the Greek original. When one reads the second chapter of Mark and the first chapter of Revelation in Greek, he sees that there is no such interpretation inherent in the grammatical structure. The Greek of Mark 2:28 clearly indicates that Christ did not mean that the Sabbath was His possession (which the Adventists would like to establish); rather, He was saying that as Lord of all He could do as He pleased on the Sabbath. The Greek is most explicit here.

"Nothing could be clearer from both the context and the grammar. In Revelation 1: 10 the Greek is not the genitive of possession, which it would have to be in order to make tj-kuriaki (the Lord's) agree with himera (day)." - Page 151.

We do not base our interpretation on the English alone. Let us examine these scriptures and Walter Martin's statements about them. First of all, Adventists do not desire to establish that in Mark 2:28 the phrase "of the Sabbath" is a genitive of possession, nor do we make any major point to the effect that "the Sabbath was His possession," as Mr. Martin states. He is putting arguments in our mouth. We do not state that Christ "possessed" the Sabbath any more than Sunday advocates speak of Christ as "possessing" Sunday. On the other hand, when Mr. Martin says the Greek is most explicit that "of the Sabbath" is not a genitive of possession, we are startled at his positiveness, for any first year Greek student knows that one cannot tell from the Greek what kind any genitive is. In the Greek language there are objective and subjective genitives, genitives of possession, source, relationship, description, time, place, reference, apposition, as well as others. They all look exactly the same, are spelled the same. On the basis of the Greek, despite what the author says, one cannot tell what kind of genitive Mark had in mind when he translated our Lord's words from Aramaic into Greek and left them for us to read. This can be determined only from the context, and then excellent scholars will often disagree with one another. The author is protesting too much, and we are sure that no one who understands Greek will accept his arguments.

Personally, we agree with Mr. Martin that this is not a genitive of possession. Who said it was? We think this is an objective genitive, meaning that "the noun in the genitive receives the action, being thus related as object to the verbal idea contained in the noun modified" (H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament, pp. 78, 79). This simply means that the Sabbath (which is in the genitive) receives the action of Christ's lordship. He created the Sabbath. He governs it. He says what should be done on it. He commanded men to keep it holy, and by His own example observed it as it ought to be observed (Luke 4:16). The Sabbath commandment is Christ's commandment, and to us He says, "If you love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15).

However, Mr. Martin says that "when one reads the second chapter of Mark and the first chapter of Revelation in Greek, he sees that there is no such interpretation inherent in the grammatical structure." Is he saying that inasmuch as "Lord also of the Sabbath" in Mark 2:28 is a genitive construction, and "the Lord's day" of Revelation 1:10 is an adjectival construction in a different case, that the two days cannot be the same? Is he implying that "on the Lord's day" (Revelation 1:10) would have to be a genitive in order for it to refer to the Sabbath? It appears that he would have the reader get this impression. Such is not true

by any means. In a Greek sentence the case of a phrase is determined by its usage in the sentence, and by the choice of the author. Whether the author used a genitive construction or an adjectival construction was purely a matter of choice. By this 1 mean that John could have said "on the day of the Lord- as well as "on the Lord's day," whichever he chose, and the meaning would not have been different. In both Greek and English, speakers and writers freely alternate adjectival and genitive construction, as for instance in such expressions as "God's church" or "the church of God."

Actually, many noted scholars say that Revelation 1: 10 refers neither to the Sabbath day nor to the first day, but that it might have been any day of the week. They think that John was saying "I was in the spirit on a Lordly day" or "on an imperial day," and it could perfectly well be so translated as far as the Greek phrase goes. It could mean that John was in vision on one of the holidays set aside in honor of the emperor's birthday or anniversary of his accession to the throne. We think, however, that the apostle John used this phrase of the seventh-day Sabbath, which God Himself, speaking through Isaiah, called "my holy day" (Isaiah 58:13). The phrase certainly was not used of the first day of the week, for it "is the recognized principle of historical method, that an allusion is to be interpreted only in terms of evidence that is previous to it in point of time or contemporary with it, and not by historical data from a later period. This principle has an important bearing on the problem of the meaning of the expression 'Lord's day' as it appears in the present passage. Although this term occurs frequently in the Church Fathers with the meaning of Sunday, the first conclusive evidence of such use does not appear until the latter part of the 2d century in the Apocryphal Gospel According to Peter (9, 12; ANF, Volume 9, p. 8), where the day of Christ's resurrection is termed the 'Lord's day.' Since this document was written at least three quarters of a century after John wrote the Revelation, it cannot be presented as a proof that the phrase 'Lord's day' in John's time refers to Sunday. Numerous examples might be cited to show the rapidity with which words can change their meanings. Therefore the meaning of 'Lord's day' here is better determined by reference to Scripture rather than to subsequent literature." The SDA Bible Commentary, on Revelation 1:10.

No one is able to show that the Scriptures anywhere state that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, but there are numerous Scripture passages indicating that the seventh day is the Lord's special day-Isaiah 58:13; Genesis 2:3; Exodus 20: 11; et cetera. Not the least is Mark 2:28, where an unprejudiced reader cannot but see that Jesus said the Sabbath is the Lord's day.

But let us get back to Mr. Martin's argument. He says, "In Revelation 1: 10 the Greek is not the genitive of possession. which it would have to be in order to make tj-kuriaki (the Lord's) agree with himera (day)." Again, we are at a loss to know how to comment on this statement, for tj-kuriaki does agree with himera. It agrees in gender, number, and case, which is all the ways a Greek adjective can agree with the noun it modifies. Evidently Martin has not made clear the thought that was in his mind, or he is not sufficiently acquainted with Greek to recognize that the grammatical agreement he says is necessary is actually there.

This is true also of his enigmatic closing paragraph for this section: "We may certainly assume that if the Sabbath had meant so much to the writers of the New Testament; and if, as Adventists insist, it was so widely observed during the early centuries of the Christian church, John and the other writers of Scripture would have equated it with the Lord's Day, the first day of the week."

We confess that we are unable to make any sense out of this sentence. Why, if the Sabbath were widely observed during the early centuries, would John and other writers of Scripture have equated it with the first day of the week? We cannot see any reason or logic whatsoever in this statement. As to the first part of the sentence, to the effect that if the Sabbath had meant so much to the writers of the New Testament, why didn't they say more about it, we answer this: simply that no one back there, at least no Christian, was keeping the first day of the week. All Christians at that time kept the seventh day Sabbath-the only Sabbath of which the Bible speaks. There was no problem, and therefore no cause for the writers of the New Testament to make any comment about the present Sabbath-Sunday question. The only difficulty was that certain Judaistic Christians looked upon the keeping of God's requirements from a legalistic viewpoint, as though they could ' earn their acceptance in God's sight by these observances. The New Testament writers dealt fully with this problem, but there was no need for them to deal with the matter of the observance of Sunday because such did not exist in their day.

Mr. Martin closes this section by stating that the Adventists have little scriptural justification for their Sabbatarianism. To this we reply that numerous passages in the New Testament indicate that the disciples and the followers of Christ kept the seventh-day Sabbath. We seek no other justification than this.

The Testimony of the Fathers

"The Church Fathers provide a mass of evidence that the first day of the week, not the seventh, is the Lord's Day," Mr. Martin writes. Let us state at the outset that we do not rest our case upon what the Church Fathers say, but upon what the Scriptures say.

The citations brought forth from the Church Fathers are those that have been explained many times, and we are particularly surprised that Walter Martin brought forth again the statement of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, which he cites as follows: "If, then, those who walk in the ancient practices attain to newness of hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's Day on which our life also arose through Him, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only teacher." It is an incontrovertible fact that in this passage the original Creek contains no word day. Rather, in the most reliable manuscript, the word following ZUQLUXA (Lord's) is the word life. An accurate, literal translation of the passage is, "If, therefore, those who walked in ancient customs came to a new hope, no longer sabbatizing, but living according to the Lord's life, in which also our life sprang up through him and his death . . ." The thought of Ignatius is that Christians were no longer to fashion their lives on the basis of Jewish legalism, but were to follow the life of Christ as their pattern; for it is by means of the example of the Lord's dedicated life and vicarious death, brought home to the mind by the working of the Holy Spirit, that man's spiritual nature may be revived and strengthened (see Ephesians 2:1-6). On this basis only can one successfully live a truly spiritual life.

Despite the clear intent of Ignatius, many keep trying to twist this passage to make it refer to Sunday keeping. It is indefensible to insert the word day into this early document on the basis that xulaxa (the Lord's) in later centuries was used as a technical term for Sunday. The fact that the word day is not present in any of the major manuscripts (the only manuscript that has it is an Armenian translation), but that the word life is coupled with "the Lord's- in the best manuscripts, ought to settle this matter. We may remark, however, that it is difficult to arrive at the exact Greek text as Ignatius wrote it. The Epistles of Ignatius in existence have been greatly conflated and interpolated. Scholars agree that parts of the Ignatian letters are forgeries. The short recension, which scholars agree most closely represents the true Ignatius, is nowhere extant in a pure form (The Apostolic Fathers, Volume 1, p. 168. The Loeb Classical Library). It behooves all careful scholars to refrain from using Ignatius as proof or support for any doctrine. The misinterpreted passage from the supposed Ignatian Epistle, widespread though it is, certainly adds no strength to Mr. Martin's position.

Mr. Martin cites also from the forged Epistle of Barnabas, which used the Jewish ceremonial requirement of circumcision that occurred once in the lifetime of the Jew, on the eighth day of his life, as an argument for the observance of Sunday, which would be the eighth day of the week. This Gnostic-flavored speculative argument certainly is a weak basis for the observance of Sunday. It is apparent, however, that anti-Semitism caused Christian people at a very early date to have a desire to dissociate themselves from the seventh-day Sabbath, and instead to worship on the first day of the week to avoid being classed as Jews. Those early Christian leaders who in order to avoid persecution favored this practice found in the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week a flimsy support for turning away from God's unequivocal commandment concerning the Sabbath. However, there is absolutely not one shred of Biblical support for the observance of Sunday. We Adventists dare not set the practice of some church leaders above the plain commands of the Holy Scriptures.

Authoritative Quotations

Mr. Martin states that we weaken our position by quoting scholars who, while they may state in their published works that there is no Biblical evidence for the change of the day from Saturday to Sunday, themselves keep the first day of the week and argue in other places in favor of observing it (page 155). It is not a weakness on our part when scholars are inconsistent with their own statements. Some scholars admit that the Bible does not support the first day of the week, but take the position that the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross and that therefore the seventh day of the week has no binding claim upon Christians. They assert that the Christian church possesses authority to teach Christians to keep the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection.

It is our contention that the cross of Christ did not change the will of God regarding the day that He would have His children keep. God made the Sabbath for man, and not only for the Jews. It was God's plan and will that His children observe the seventh day as the memorial of His creative power. Although it

was necessary for Christ to die on the cross in order for the transgressions of mankind to be forgiven and for man to receive the impetus and power to live a Christian life, yet this by no means meant the institution of a different day of worship. We Christians do not keep the law of God to earn our salvation. We trust in Christ for our righteousness as a free gift, but because He has said, "If you love me, keep my commandments," we gladly do His will; and we believe His will is expressed in the Ten Commandments as well as in other parts of the Holy Scriptures. It is our contention that the church does not possess authority to command Christians to observe the first day of the week, and for her to do so puts her in opposition to the plain teaching of God's Word.

Creation in the Sabbath

In his effort to show that Seventh-day Adventists are wrong in maintaining that the Christian church should observe the seventh-day Sabbath, Mr. Martin attacks our position on the Creation week. He says, "No doubt, one of the basic reasons for their tenacity is that their Sabbath theory would suffer a real setback if it could be shown Biblically and scientifically that the days of creation were actually eras or long periods of time during which the earth's great geological structures were formed."-Pa-e 157. In this Mr. Martin is correct. We believe that the seventh-day Sabbath exists as a memorial of God's creative power in fitting up the earth as an abode for man in six literal twenty-four-hour days, and by adding the seventh as a day for man to rest and worship, thereby constituting a weekly cycle by which He desired that mankind should live. We will not here go into the scientific evidence regarding the age of the earth. We would merely point out that the time clocks which the scientists use in showing the great age of the earth and of the organic materials upon it are based upon a theory of uniformity of which there is no scientific proof whatsoever.

Mr. Martin stands firmly with those who do not believe in a twenty-four-hour Creation day. He quotes with approval another author who says, "The question is, what do the Scriptures teach in regard to the length of the creative days described in Genesis chapters 1 and 2? This is primarily a question of hermeneutics and exegesis."- He is right; this is the question here, not the theories of scientists. Scientists have evidence, but they do not have absolute proof as to the age of the earth. Let us then confine our discussion here to the Bible. Mr. Martin holds that the word "day" used in Genesis 1 is figurative, and represents a period of time of undesignated length. We ask him, therefore, What is the meaning of the Biblical statements in Genesis 1: "And the evening and the morning were the first day," et cetera?

In the Bible record of the Creation week it is absolutely clear that the days referred to consisted of a period of darkness followed by a period of light. The fact that each of the six days is described in the terms, "the evening and the morning were the second day," and "the evening and the morning were the third day," et cetera, certainly gives evidence that these were days of the type that mankind has known since the dawn of history. To state that these were figurative days of undesignated length and yet claim that this view is based upon sound hermeneutics and exegesis leaves us amazed. The context and the grammar of Genesis 1 certainly point to days exactly like the days we know now. Furthermore, to appeal to Psalm 90:4 ("A thousand years in thy [God's] sight are but as yesterday when it is past") and to introduce this into a discussion of Genesis 1, in which we are told that the evening and the morning made up the day, is certainly questionable hermeneutics. Mr. Martin says, "It is hard to see how this fourth day could have been a literal 24-hour day," yet previously he had said, "Of course we know that God could have created the earth in six literal days." If we believe that God could have created the earth in six literal days, then it seems the part of the Christian to accept the obvious meaning of the record of Genesis 1 when it speaks in terms of days just like the type of days that we now know.

Our case does rest upon the literal twenty-four-hour-day Creation theory. Like all the rest of our teachings, our doctrine of the Sabbath is based on the Word of God, and not on the theories of scientists. While we recognize that Genesis 1 was not designed as a complete scientific account of Creation, yet at the same time we do not believe that the clear intent of Genesis 1 is untrue. It is our conviction that to attempt to make the days of the first chapter of Genesis into vague, indeterminate periods does violence to the Bible, and in effect such teaching places the assertions of scientists above the Word of God. The last word of science has yet to be given on the age of life upon the earth, and in the meantime we will stand by the clear intent of the Word of God and rest our case upon it.

We think that is far better than to be content with the vague allusions and innuendoes such as given in the following sentence of Mr. Martin: "In view of the evidence from natural science, and certain

accepted usage of the Hebrew of the Genesis account, the Adventist contention for a literal 24-hour Sabbath as the perpetual or eternal 'seal' of God's creative power rests upon a shaky foundation." We would certainly wish that instead of relying upon vague allusions to Hebrew or Greek grammatical or syntactical usage Mr. Martin would be more definite and come forth with one sound argument from Hebrew or Greek to support his theories. To us the appearance is given that, lacking familiarity with Biblical languages, resort is made to vague generalizations.

7. Primary Anti-Sabbath Texts

RICHARD HAMMILL
Associate Secretary, Department of Education, General Conference

AT THE BEGINNING Of the section "Primary Anti Sabbath Texts" in Walter Martin's book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism we are told, "In more than one place, the New Testament comments unfavorably upon the practice of any type of legalistic day keeping," and also that the apostle Paul "declared that the Sabbath as 'the law' was fulfilled at the cross and was not binding upon the Christian." (Page 161) We heartily agree that the New Testament does decry any form of legalism, which we define as a person seeking to earn salvation through his own efforts, or to become righteous by observing any set of rules or pattern of action. But we ask, Is it legalism willingly and gladly to shape our lives in harmony with the words of God in which He tells us how He wants His children to live? Or is it legalism to rest and worship on the day that God specifically in His Word has set apart for all mankind to keep holy?

It is significant to note that the Hebrew word for law, Torah, comes from the verb that means "to teach." In reality God's law is God's teaching; it is God's instruction to His people concerning His will for them and how He desires they should order their lives. The Ten Commandments is God's specific teaching and instruction for His people, setting forth the guiding principles that He wishes should govern their day-by-day living. Whatever there is in the Word of God that expresses God's teachings for the benefit of His people is in this sense law.

Parts of God's law expressed His will for His people for a specific age and under certain conditions. Some portions of God's teaching did lose their validity when the specific time for which God designed them had passed. After the cross some teachings (laws) of God's Word were no longer applicable because that which they were designed to foreshadow had come to fruition. Other portions of God's laws designed particularly for the Jewish nation became null and void when that nation existed no more as God's chosen people. However, the great, timeless principles of the Ten Commandments and of the rest of the Bible that set forth the behavior God desires of His people in all ages were not abrogated at the cross, for they still represent the will of God for mankind. This is why the apostle Paul says, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Romans 3:31).

Mr. Martin says that the Sabbath as law was fulfilled and is not binding upon the Christian. The apostle Paul says that through Christian faith we establish the law. Would this author ask us to believe that we are not to order our lives in harmony with the first commandment of the Ten Commandments, or the third, or the sixth, or the seventh? Surely he would say that Christians are to live in harmony with these enduring principles of the Ten Commandments. How inconsistent it is, then, to say that though the Christian should shape his life in harmony with nine of the commandments, the fourth one has no validity, and that Christians need not live by it! How can one say this when the fourth commandment is as much God's will as are the others? To keep the fourth commandment is not legalism any more than it is legalism to keep oneself pure, as we are instructed to do in the seventh commandment.

Colossians 2:13-17

In an endeavor to support his position he then reviews the major New Testament texts "which in context and in the light of syntactical analysis refute the Sabbath concept."

We have met these allusions to context and to syntactical analysis before, but when we have examined them we find very little reference made to the laws of grammar or to the context either. Let us look at his arguments and note specifically the grammar and the context. The first of the texts cited is Colossians 2:13-17 from the Revised Standard Version. Then we find this comment: "First we who were

dead have been made alive in Christ, and have been forgiven all trespasses and sins. We are free from the condemnation of the law in all its aspects, because Christ took our condemnation on the cross. As already observed, there are not two laws, moral and ceremonial, but one law containing many commandments, all perfectly fulfilled by the life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ." This passage of Scripture certainly does say that Christ has forgiven us our sins and that we are free from the condemnation of the law in all its aspects because Christ took our condemnation on the cross. To this we fully and heartily agree. But the bond that has been canceled, its debt paid and nailed to the cross, is our condemnation and guilt for having broken the law of God. This is far different from saying that the law was nailed to the cross. God's law was not against man; it was man's sin and violation of that law that was against him and that needed to be taken away. He then needs to receive an infusion of spiritual power, through union with Christ, to enable him to obey the will of God which is revealed in His Word and His law. Far from being contrary to us and against us, the apostle Paul says in Romans 7:12 that "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." In verse 14 he declares that the law is spiritual. God gave it as an aid to man, not as something to work against him.

Why should men try to make a dichotomy between Christ or God and the law? The law had its origin in God. Christ was the agent of the Godhead in the giving of the law. God's moral law is an expression of His own character. How can one say that the law is against man and needs to be taken away? The function of the law is to point out to erring man his sins and his shortcomings; it is a guide to him, indicating the way that God would have him live. If man does not live according to God's will as expressed in the law, he is a sinner, and comes under the condemnation of the law. It is not the law that makes a man a sinner; he is a sinner because of his own acts, and the law merely defines how God would have him act, and points out transgression.

Christians should always hold clearly in mind that Christ had to die on the cross because of the sins of mankind. When a person violates a law, the matter is not solved by repealing the law, but by making a change in the lawbreaker. The penalty for his violation must be paid and he must be brought to the place where he is willing to abide by the law. It seems an anomaly for Walter Martin to suggest that the way to handle sin is to do away with the law that points out the way God would have men live and that brings conviction of sin to the person who violates it. Why can he not see that Christ died to atone for our transgression of the law, and not to abolish the law?

Walter Martin states that all law is fulfilled by the life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is certain that Christ fulfilled the law, but this does not mean that the law was abrogated or made null and void; it means that Christ lived according to the law, fully. When John was reluctant to baptize Him, Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matthew 3:15). It is folly to say that fulfilling all righteousness means to do away with or abrogate righteousness. In the same way, when Jesus fulfilled the law He by no means abrogated it. He Himself said, "Think not that 1 am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: 1 am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matthew 5:17). It was Jesus' objective to observe the law and to keep it, and to teach men how they might observe it in the spirit that the heavenly Father intended.

As we have already mentioned, those portions of the law that had to do with the Jewish people as a nation ceased when the nation ceased, and those parts that dealt with ceremonial sacrifices, and meat offerings and drink offerings, and that pointed forward to Christ's sacrifice, had no further meaning after Christ had come. The ceremonial shadows met their substance in the person of Jesus. By dying on the cross, Christ wiped out the bond of man's debt for transgression of the law, and rendered inoperative, null and void, those aspects of the Torah that were ceremonial in nature, pointing forward as shadows to the actual person and ministry of Christ. These ordinances had served their function of helping people to realize that there was a way out of their dilemma, and that way was through the cross of Christ. Now that Christ had come, there was no need for these particular laws. Compare Early Writings, page 33; Patriarchs and Prophets, page 365; Selected Messages, volume 1, page 239.

The cross brought a complete transition from Judaism to Christianity. Judaisin with its involved system of sacrifices and commands concomitant with the sacrificial system was at an end. Moreover, the legal condemnation of the whole race was wiped away. The coming of Christ as the Savior to bear the sins of the people had been made absolutely necessary, not by the law but by the transgression of the law. Men and women, recognizing their inability to keep the law as they wanted to and ought to, had looked forward to the coming of a Deliverer by whose example and by the power of whose Spirit they would be able to live the way God desired them to live. Now that their bond of obligation was wiped away and nailed to the cross, and the special laws having to do with the Jewish nation and those foreshadowing the redeeming

work of the Messiah were at an end, they were to trust in Christ by faith not only for forgiveness of past sins but for strength to live a new life. In this new life they were to serve their Lord in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter; yet with the apostle Paul they could say, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Romans 3:3 1).

Christ by His death triumphed over Satan and his angels. I le provided a way of escape for men. In the new dispensation Christians were to resist false teachers who might insist that the Jewish ceremonial system was still binding upon them. The meat and drink offerings of the sacrificial system, the various holy days, such as the Passover. the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, the Day of Atonement, the Feast of Tabernacles, the new-moon feasts, and the yearly Sabbath days, all of which were shadows pointing forward to the coming of Christ, were no longer binding obligations upon Christians. Moreover, Christians were not to be misled by Gnostic teachers who were visiting the churches at Colossae, Ephesus, and many other places, urging upon the believers ascetic regulations concerning eating and drinking. Christians were forgiven men, and henceforth were to shape their lives after the example of Christ and in harmony with the clear teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

The key to Colossians 2:14-16 is the phrase "which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (verse 17). Martin's contention, however, is that the weekly seventh-day Sabbath is included in the shadow of things to come. Certainly he cannot point to any contextual or grammatical construction that would justify his contention. The seventh-day Sabbath was a memorial of God's creative power, pointing backward and not forward to Christ. Also the other nine commandments of the Ten Commandments by no manner or means have any function of "shadows" that point forward to Christ. They are enduring principles, statements of the way in which God asks His people to live. But in an effort to prove that the Sabbath of the Ten Commandments is included in the rites no longer binding upon Christians, Walter Martin cites various commentators who maintain that the word translated "Sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16 should be translated in the singular. The fact of the matter is that in the Greek this term is a plural, sabbaton, the nominative form of which is sabbata.

We recognize the fact that the Aramaic word for Sabbath in the singular was pronounced schabbatha and that many of the writers of the New Testament whose mother tongue was Aramaic used that form of the word when speaking of the Sabbath in the singular. We would not deny this, but we would merely reiterate the grammatical fact that in Colossians 2:16 the word is a plural and that Walter Martin can cite no grammatical reason why this word should not be translated as a plural ("Sabbath days") as it is translated in the King James, Version. This matter can only be decided by the context, and the immediate context, the basis upon which the whole interpretation of this passage hangs, is the phrase "which are a shadow of things to come." In the Greek the word which is a plural, agreeing with the plural "Sabbath days," as well as referring to the meat, drink, holy days, and new moons previously mentioned.

However, the ultimate decision rests upon this fact that the yearly Sabbath days of the Jewish system were shadows of things to come but that the weekly seventh-day Sabbath was not, by any manner or means, a shadow of things to come, and therefore cannot be included within Paul's statement. It is for this reason that we insist that the intention of the apostle was a plural "Sabbath days." Walter Martin states that "modern conservative scholarship establishes the singular rendering of 'Sabbath.' " The fact of the matter is that scholarship does not establish the singular rendering, but merely that it could have been singular as well as plural. However, the context shows that it could not be a singular.

Finally, Martin sums up his argument by stating that in Numbers 28 and 29, which lists the meat and drink offerings referred to in Colossians 2:16, 17, the seventh-day Sabbath is included. An examination of this passage discloses only that a description is included of the meat offerings and drink offerings that were made on the Sabbath day as well as the offerings on the annual Sabbaths or days of rest. This would be expected in a detailed listing of the meat offerings and drink offerings, but it would in no way indicate that the weekly Sabbath was a shadow pointing forward to the work of the coming Messiah, as did those numerous sacrifices and offerings that are being described in the two chapters.

The author concludes his argument with this statement: "Since these offerings and feasts have passed away as the shadow (skia), fulfilled in the substance (soma) of the cross of Christ, how can the seventh-day Sabbath be retained? In the light of this Scripture alone, this writer contends that the argument for Sabbath observance collapses, and the Christian stands under 'the perfect law of liberty' which enables him to fulfill 'the righteousness of the law' by the imperative of love." (Page 166)

We are at a loss to understand how our friend Walter Martin could seriously pen such a statement. In the first place, he has absolutely failed to show that the seventh-day Sabbath was a shadow of things to come, or that it in any way pointed forward to the coming of the Messiah. The Scriptures state emphatically

that the seventh-day Sabbath is a memorial of Creation, and that instead of pointing forward to the cross it points backward to God's creative act in making the earth in six days; and therefore God asked mankind to observe the seventh day as a day of rest and of worship, dedicated to the Creator of our lives and of all that we enjoy. We ask, What is there in the cross that would demand that the seventh day be put away?

The author asserts that the argument for Sabbath observance collapses and the Christian stands under the perfect law of liberty, which enables him to fulfill the righteousness of the law by the imperative of love. We fail to see any logic in this reasoning whatsoever. We also believe that the Sabbath keeper stands under the perfect law of liberty and that the grace of Christ enables him to fulfill the righteousness of the law, not by any effort to earn heaven by his own works, but by the full imperative of love. There is no value at all in the statement that the imperative of love would demand the doing away of the Sabbath any more than the imperative of love would demand that a person need no longer honor his father or mother or that the imperative of love gives men the liberty to steal, or to lie, or to commit adultery. God wants all His people to regard His law as the law of liberty, and to realize that they are not under a yoke of bondage in keeping it, but that they are to fulfill the righteous way of living described in the law out of love for their Creator. We stand amazed that anyone could seriously state that the imperative of love or the law of liberty would demand that we keep nine of the commandments but that the fourth commandment, embodied in the heart of the Ten Commandments, should be discarded.

We think it would have been well had Walter Martin here studied the context of this passage as he so often admonishes Adventists to do. Even a cursory reading of the book of Galatians shows that the apostle Paul wrote this book because the people of the churches of Galatia, under the influence of certain Judaizing teachers, were thinking that they could earn acceptance and justification before God by fulfilling all the various works and minutiae of Judaism (Galatians 2:16; 3:1-3). The apostle explicitly states that no one can be justified and saved by his own deeds, but that salvation comes as a free gift from Christ. Many of the Jews had come to feel that they could by their own efforts keep the laws of God, and their entire religion consisted of legalistic observances. Paul says that man's violations of the law had placed him under condemnation and that it was necessary for Christ to die in order that the debt for our transgressions be paid. One of the functions of the law is to point out to men their own shortcomings and convince them that they have not lived as God would have them live. In that sense the law makes men aware of their need of a Savior, to pay the debt of their sins and to help them live as God would have them live (Galatians 3:23-25).

Moreover, and this is the crux of the argument for the particular passage under discussion, the apostle shows that certain parts of the law itself pointed forward to Christ and to His vicarious death to pay for the transgressions of those who since the sin of Adam had rebelled against God. Paul points out that since Christ has come, those portions of God's law that were designed as teaching instruments to turn the attention of men to the coming of Christ, having completed their function now, have no part whatsoever in the Christian dispensation. The apostle emphasizes that lie had taught all these things to the Galatians. And he wonders why it is that they have allowed themselves to be bewitched, so that after having begun their spiritual pilgrimage by faith in Christ, and by trusting to the power of the Holy Spirit, they would now accept the teachings of Jewish legalists to the effect that men could earn acceptance with God by their observances of the law, and that every single element of the sacrificial system was still in force.

Within this context the apostle asks the Galatians: "But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto you desire again to be in bondage? You observe days, and months, and times, and years. 1 am afraid of you, lest 1 have bestowed upon you labor in vain." In other words, he says, "Now that Christ has come, are you still going to insist on keeping the Jewish holidays such as the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, et cetera, the function of which was to point forward to Christ? Christ has come, and these indicators and foreshadowers of the Messiah that served a function for people in bygone centuries have absolutely no further meaning or relevance to the Christian!" Ours is a life of faith, in which we trust in Christ for forgiveness of our sins as our divine Substitute, and in whom also we trust to find strength and power through His Holy Spirit to help us observe His enduring moral laws. We observe these perpetual moral laws not by any means to earn our salvation but because, being saved by grace alone, we love our Lord and want to live in harmony with His will for our lives. This, Paul says, is the liberty of the Christian faith. And we dare not become entangled in bondage to an outworn system, but rather we "stand fast . . . in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Galatians 5: 1).

In spite of this clear intent of the book of Galatians, Walter Martin again attempts to show that Christian people have no need to observe the seventh-day Sabbath even though they do observe the other nine commandments. After having ignored the full intent of the book of Galatians, he accuses us, as he

discusses this passage, of ignoring the "grammar, context, and comparative textual analysis." Furthermore, he says, "To substantiate their interpretation of Paul's statements they do not practice exegesis (taking out of), but eisegesis (reading into) the texts."' We have already examined Paul's statements in Galatians and find that the Adventist position is in full harmony with the context and textual analysis of the book of Galatians.

It is further asserted that the Septuagint translation of Numbers 28 and 29 refutes our doctrine of the Sabbath. We have examined these chapters in the Septuagint very carefully, and we wonder why it is that our friend Martin did not point out in these chapters what it was to which he had reference. He resorts again to his broad, sweeping statements without using proof, and attempts to convince his reader by his forthright assertions that he is right. A careful examination of Numbers 28 and 29 in either the Hebrew or the Septuagint shows that Moses is presenting at length the various sacrifices that were to be offered in the sanctuary at different times during the year. First are described the daily burnt offerings that are offered every day of the year, and the statement is made that on the seventh day the daily offering of lambs was doubled. This was part of the sanctuary regulations and has nothing whatsoever to do with the question as to whether Christians should observe the weekly Sabbath. The seventh day Sabbath was given at Creation and was observed for centuries before the sanctuary service was instituted as a temporary provision pointing the people forward to the coming of the Lamb of God to die to make atonement for their sins. It is completely irrelevant to introduce this argument as Mr. Martin does, saying that we ignore the grammar and the comparative textual analysis. As we search the remainder of these two chapters we find further descriptions of the offerings that were to be made at the time of the new moon, on the yearly Sabbaths, and on the various ceremonial feasts. No other mention is made of the seventh-day Sabbath.

Apparently Mr. Martin thought there are other references to the seventh-day Sabbath in these two chapters, such as in Numbers 28:25 and Numbers 29:32. If he will look at the context he will see that the reference to the "seventh day" in these passages refers to the seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and to the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles. These were both yearly Sabbaths and could fall on any day of the week. The holy convocations held on those days have nothing whatsoever to do with the seventh-day Sabbath. They were exactly the days, months, times, and years to which the apostle referred in Galatians 4:10. A study of these feast days will show that their function was to point forward to the coming of Christ, and that after Christ had come they had no use whatsoever. They were temporary laws designed for a teaching function to those people who lived before the Messiah had come. Now they are no part of the will of God for His people.

Thus the charge that our exegesis is an error falls completely to the ground. We have ignored neither grammar, context, nor comparative textual analysis. We would point out kindly but emphatically that it is Mr. Martin who has ignored the context and comparative textual analysis. In effect, he makes the apostle Paul contradict himself in 1 Corinthians 7:19, where the apostle states that circumcision, too, was part of Judaism and has no relevance for the Christian as far as religion is concerned. The apostle says, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.--- The great apostle saw absolutely no contradiction in fulfilling God's commandments through love and devotion for God. He assiduously taught the people that now that Jesus had come they should abandon, as outworn forms that had served their function, those ceremonial laws of the Old Testament. But he insisted that God's laws, describing the way God desires His children to live, were established and strengthened by the faith that we have in Christ (Romans 3:31). When he told the Corinthian believers that circumcision was nothing, but that the thing of real value was the keeping of the commandments of God, he agreed fully with our Savior, who told His hearers: "Think not that 1 am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: 1 am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom." Our position is consistent in that it agrees with other statements of the apostle Paul and with the teachings of our Lord.

Martin concludes his discussion of Galatians 4 with the statement that Seventh-day Adventists "fail to realize that by trying to enjoin Sabbath observance upon other members of the body of Christ, they are in serious danger of transgressing the gospel of grace." We would like to ask our friend Walter Martin if when we urge people not to commit adultery, which is the seventh commandment of the Ten Commandments, and when we urge them not to steal, which is the eighth commandment, we are also transgressing the gospel of grace and making legalists out of them? Undoubtedly he would answer No. Then we fail to understand how in teaching the fourth commandment we are transgressing the gospel of grace or making legalists out of those we teach.

Walter Martin says we should bear in mind that the law in its larger connotation includes the Pentateuch. This is true; in its larger connotations it also includes the entire Old Testament, for Paul himself quoted the book of Isaiah and referred to it as the law. (See 1 Corinthians 14:21 and Isaiah 28:11.) Martin goes on to say that one is "under the law" when he attempts to observe any part of the Pentateuch, because the Christian has been freed from the law. Does he mean to say that no part of the Pentateuch represents the will of God for His people today? Are we not to love God with all our hearts and our neighbor as ourselves? Or should we discard this command because it is in the Pentateuch? If a person is free to violate the seventh-day Sabbath, why is he not free to violate the other nine commandments of the Ten Commandments?

8. Anti-Sabbath Texts Continued

RICHARD HAMMILL
Associate Secretary, Department of Education, General Conference

Romans 13:8-10

IN A DISCUSSION of Romans 13:8-10 the author under review says in the present passage the Holy Spirit twice declares that love fulfills the law. They [Seventh-day Adventists] cannot exempt the Sabbath from this context without destroying the unity of the 'Eternal Ten,' hence their dilemma." He continues, "How any student of New Testament Greek could read the unmistakable language of the apostle and then exclude the Sabbath commandment from his argument, passes my understanding." Mr. Martin builds up a straw man and feels good about having demolished it. Seventh day Adventists are the people who down through the years have valiantly stood for the unity of the "Eternal Ten." It is Mr. Martin and men like him who would say that a Christian should live in harmony with nine of the commandments but that he is free to violate the fourth. Seventh-day Adventists are not in any dilemma, but those who would try to remove from the Ten Commandments the fourth commandment are. We do not exclude the Sabbath commandment from the great commandment of love.

In discussing this passage, however, Mr. Martin has apparently forgotten the words of Jesus: "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (Matthew 22:37-40). The law of love was fully enunciated in the Old Testament (Deuteronomy 6:4, 5; Leviticus 19:18). Love fulfilled the law in Old Testament times, even at the time the Ten Commandments were given, just as well as it does now. The basic principle back of the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments is "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." These first four commandments help people to understand that the principle of love to God means that they shall not have any other god besides the Lord, that they shall not worship images of other gods, that they shall not take the name of God in vain, and that they shall remember God's Sabbath day to keep it holy. Jesus said that this great commandment to love the Lord is the greatest of all the commandments, and the first four of the Ten Commandments merely spell out more fully what is included in it.

The commandment to love one's neighbor as oneself is described by Jesus as the "second" commandment. The last six commandments of the Ten Commandments spell out more fully the principle of loving one's neighbor as oneself. A person who loves his neighbor in this way certainly will first of all honor his parents; he will not kill anyone, but respect his neighbor's life. He will not commit adultery, respecting his neighbor's person; he will not steal, respecting his neighbor's property; neither will he bear false witness nor covet that which is his neighbor's, because he is to love his neighbor as himself. In other words, the "second" commandment, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself," does not abrogate any of the last six commandments of the Ten Commandments. It merely comprehends them and is the over-all principle concerning the application of which these six commandments give us further instruction. By the same principle the first commandment to love God with all the heart does not abrogate any one of the first four commandments, for they are included in its over-all principle. We do not see that Adventists face any dilemma here.

One who examines the context of Romans 13:8-10 will note that in this section of the book of

Romans the apostle Paul is dealing with the relationships that should obtain between men. In the first part of the book of Romans the apostle discussed in a magnificent way man's relationship with God, showing that one is saved by his faith in God and in the atonement provided for him. In the last part of the book the apostle seeks to show how one who has been saved by faith will relate himself to his fellows. It is for this reason that in the thirteenth chapter the apostle did not introduce what Jesus called the first great commandment of loving God with all the heart and including the more specific spelling out of this in the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments. Inasmuch as he was discussing strictly the relationship of man to man, he cited only the second great principle-love to one's neighbor-and in particular those specifications that show that an individual who loves his neighbor will not commit adultery with him, will not kill him, will not steal from him, or bear false witness against him, or covet anything that is his. Paul is by no stretch of the imagination saying that when a person loves his neighbor as himself he need not observe these last six commandments; he is saying that the over-all principle of love to one's neighbor includes all of these. And to keep them out of love is the only effectual way, for love fills in all the gaps between the commandments; it reaches over them and underneath and around them; but it does not go contrary to any one of them.

As we have said, from chapter twelve of Romans onward Paul is discussing man's relationship with man. Certainly the apostle Paul would have been shocked had he known that Christian men in later times would use his words as if the first great commandment of loving God with all the heart, embracing the first four of the specific commandments of the Ten Commandments, had no relevance for Christians. It really amazes us that Romans 13:8-10 could be advanced as an argument for not keeping the seventh-day Sabbath. It could just as well be advanced as an argument that it is all right to worship idols or to take the name of God in vain. Seventh-day Adventists stand for the unity of the "Eternal Ten," and with the Lord's help we will seek to fulfill these ten, not out of legalistic observance, but because we want to love God with all our hearts and want to love our neighbors as ourselves.

Romans 14:5-7

We agree with our friend Walter Martin that the fourteenth chapter of Romans calls upon Christians not to engage in judging one another. God is the judge of all mankind, and it is He who decides on the moral worth of individuals. A human being cannot know for sure the reasoning and the convictions of another person, and is in no position therefore to judge whether that person is violating his basic convictions of right and wrong. Christians are, however, obligated to bear witness of their faith in Christ and to preach the Word in season and out of season. Informed, enlightened Seventh-day Adventists do not try to take over God's prerogative of judging His servants, but we do feel it is our duty to preach the Word of God as we understand it. We do not consider that we are "passing judgment" on those who observe the first day of the week when we set forth what we consider to be the Biblical teaching on the necessity of Christians to shape their lives in harmony with all the Ten Commandments, as well as with the other teachings of the Word of God. We would leave the Bible itself to do its own cutting and convicting.

Before we discuss the teaching of the fourteenth chapter of Romans, we would make reference to several statements of Walter Martin in this section of his book. He intimates that Seventh-day Adventists keep the seventh-day Sabbath because we believe the Spirit of Prophecy was manifested through Mrs. White and that she confirmed the teaching of Joseph Bates regarding the seventh-day Sabbath. Seventh-day Adventists have never based the doctrine of the Sabbath on anything but the Bible. It is the supreme court of appeal and the only authority to us in matters of doctrine. We do not believe that the verdict of that court invalidates our teachings. We feel that our friend Martin and others have dealt very loosely with many passages of the Bible. For instance, on page 172 this author says, "The early Christian church met upon the first day of the week (1 Corinthians 16:2). He has many times charged that Adventists do not consider the context of Scripture passages nor the grammatical construction. We ask, How is it possible to claim 1 Corinthians 16:2 in support of his contention that the early church met on the first day of the week?

Even a cursory examination of the Greek text of 1 Corinthians 16:2 shows that the apostle Paul is counseling the Corinthian believers to store up in their homes freewill gifts for the great offering that he was assembling on behalf of the needy Christian believers in Jerusalem. The Greek phrase can be translated in no other way than "at one's home" or "by himself." The phrase is an almost exact equivalent of the French chez lui, "at one's home." It is clear that the apostle is telling the people to lay these funds aside so that when he comes they will have them stored up and can merely turn them over to him, and he will not

have to make an extended appeal for funds. Second Corinthians, chapters 8 and 9, give full details of this great offering that the apostle Paul is assembling, and in 1 Corinthians 16:2 he is encouraging the believers to lay money aside for that purpose. Despite the clear intent of this passage, from its context and linguistic analysis, some, Martin included, grasp at it like a drowning person at a straw for support of their theory that the early church met upon the first day of the week. This type of interpretation certainly is insufficient to establish any such doctrine.

Now let us look at Romans 14, in which Paul describes two groups in the church-the "strong" and the "weak." The apostle says that the weak eat vegetables, but another thinks that he can eat all things. In using a comparable passage of Scripture, 1 Corinthians 8 and 9, we discern immediately that Paul is not speaking of the matter of clean and unclean foods, but rather is discussing a problem that was tremendously acute for the early Christians living in Greek cities. This problem arose primarily because pagan priests and others frequently sold in the market place for food, animals that had previously been offered in the temples as sacrifices to the gods. Some Christians maintained that if a believer ate food, even of a clean animal, that had been offered before these heathen gods, it would be acknowledging the existence of such a god, and having communion with him. Since they could not tell for sure whether meat purchased in the market place had been offered before idols, some of the Christians maintained that they would not eat any meat at all, but to be sure, would eat only vegetables. Other Christians believed that there was no other god except the Lord, and therefore they didn't care whether animals had been offered before the heathen idols or not. They would eat them anyway. Over such a matter as this the apostle urged the believers not to judge one another or engage in extended acrimonious debates about it, but each was to honor the convictions of the other on this matter concerning which God had not spoken.

In the same way the apostle said, verse 5: "One man esteems one day above another: another esteems every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Here again, to understand this passage we must place ourselves in the position of the early Christian believers. Many of them had come out of Judaism and had been used to observing the annual Jewish feasts and the accompanying ceremonial rites. It was very difficult for such people to abandon their religious practices of long standing. In the New Testament we read that many of the people in the church at Jerusalem continued to take part in certain of these Jewish rites, and they even urged the apostle Paul to take part in them also. Acts 21:21-27. Paul often attended these great annual feasts after his conversion (Acts 18:21, etc.), not because he felt any religious obligation to do so, but because it afforded wonderful opportunities to witness for Christ to the multitudes who congregated there.

Under such circumstances it seemed best to allow these various long-ingrained practices to disappear gradually rather than to insist that, inasmuch as these ceremonial requirements pointing forward to Christ had no more validity after Christ had come, Christians must abandon them at once. In view of these facts, it becomes apparent that the apostle Paul was not teaching the Romans that they should not live in harmony with the provisions of the Ten Commandments, and its weekly Sabbath, but that he was telling them they were free to use their own judgment as to whether they would have any part in the Jewish festivals and ceremonial requirements. The fact that he said the strong had laid them aside shows that he himself considered that Christian believers would be wiser to abandon these things, but that it was wrong for them to judge the person who out of long habit and convictions would like to go on with them.

The Jews hated the apostle Paul because he taught that the requirements of Judaism that had pointed forward to the Messiah had no more validity now that the Messiah had come. They rejected the idea that the Messiah had come, and so they hated Paul for teaching the people that they could abandon those parts of the Jewish law that foreshadowed the coming of the Messiah. However, not once do we find the Jews accusing Paul of being a breaker of the Sabbath day. They were anxious to find every fault with him that they could, and had the apostle been teaching that the seventh-day Sabbath-which God had given at Creation and which antedated the ceremonial practices in connection with the sanctuary services-had been abrogated, they would immediately have brought charges against him for Sabbath breaking. However, in no place do they accuse the apostle Paul of this. Rather, the apostle himself when on trial before Agrippa spoke of his manner of life as follows: "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts 26:22). Paul did not appeal to his apostolic authority for teaching that the seventh-day Sabbath had been abolished and that the Christian church was now keeping the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection. He stoutly asserted that he taught nothing except that which the prophets and Moses did say should come. Certainly the prophets and Moses did not prophesy of the abolishing of the seventh-day Sabbath and the setting up of the first day of the week as the Lord's day.

The efforts of some of our Christian brethren to discredit the great moral law of God, which God gave to show men the way in which He desires them to live, brings discouragement to us who are trying to follow in the footsteps of Christ and are trying to abide by the Word of God. We shudder when efforts are made to show that the law of God is contrary to the best interests of men, that it is against us and contrary to us. Anciently the Lord told His people: "And now, Israel, what does the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of the Lord, and his statutes, which 1 command thee this day for thy good?" (Deuteronomy 10:12,13). God said He had given the commandments for our good. We Adventists thank God for His law, in which we discern the way that He would have us live. And we are grateful to it when it points out errors in our lives, for then, instead of being insensitive to our danger, we turn to Christ for forgiveness and seek Him for strength to live according to His law. We ask Him to help us love Him with all our hearts and love our neighbors as ourselves, that we might fulfill His will for us. We feel that Satan, the great archenemy of God and man, is trying to bring discredit upon the law of God because it is that law that brought conviction of sin to him, and because it convicts mankind of sin, and leads them to turn to their Savior and to escape from sin's grasp.

As a people we want to take our stand firmly upon the Bible and under the banner of Jesus Christ. We heed His counsel that the two great commandments are to love God with all our hearts and our neighbor as ourselves; and we understand that these two embody in principle all the teachings and provisions of the Word of God. We repeat that if we love our neighbor as ourselves, we will not steal from him or bear false witness against him. Also, if we love God with all our hearts, we will not violate His holy Sabbath day any more than we would bow before idols. We reverence the words of our Savior, "If you love me, keep my commandments. And 1 will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth- (John 14:15-17). We feel that it would be presumptuous for us to seek the great blessing of the presence of the Spirit of truth if we are willfully violating His Word. We cannot ignore such scriptural admonitions as "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous" (1 John 5:3).

To sum it up, Seventh-day Adventists believe that Christ is our Savior and also our Lord. We do not believe that our Lord who forgives us our sins leaves us wallowing in our sins. Such reasoning does despite to the grace of God. We believe our Lord and Savior has a program of living for those who are His sons and daughters. We do not believe that Christians can contribute in the least degree to their own salvation, for salvation is a free gift from God through faith as we accept Christ as our Savior. At the same time we believe that one who accepts Christ as Savior is willing to renounce all sin. With the apostle Paul we say, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid" (Romans 6:1, 2).

The good news of salvation reached us when we were lost, like the prodigal in the far country. By faith we accept Christ's forgiveness, but we are not content to stay in the far country. We feel that we owe an allegiance to the One who loved us with an everlasting love and who gave His life that we might have forgiveness. We believe in "obedience to the faith" (Romans 1:5). We accept the forgiveness and the rest that Christ offers us; we are ready also to take up His yoke. We agree with John R. Stott, rector of All Soul's Church in London, who wrote in the magazine Eternity, September, 1959, page 17: "In saying that saving faith includes obedience, I mean that in true faith there is an element of submission. Faith is directed towards a Person. It is in fact a complete commitment to this Person involving not only an acceptance of what is offered but a humble surrender to what is or may be demanded."

We believe that God has called His sons and daughters unto holiness, but that it is impossible to maintain the forgiveness of our Lord and receive His free justification and sanctification if we willingly continue to violate a program of life which He has outlined for us, and part of this outline is in the Ten Commandments, including the Sabbath commandment. We would heed the words of the apostle James, "But be you doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholds himself, and goes his way, and straightway forgets what manner of man he was. But who so looks into the perfect law of liberty, and continues therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed" (James 1:22-25). We look into the mirror of God's Word and we find there a picture of ourselves as those needing the grace of Christ. We accept that grace. We find in God's mirror the image of our Savior in whose footsteps we are to follow. We see in this mirror the revealed will of God, and we see that to please Him we should fashion our lives according to His revealed will. It is for this reason that we gladly and willingly keep the seventh day of the week, the day that God has called "My holy day," and the only true Lord's day. Governor Mark Hatfield, writing in the same issue of Eternity, said:

But the man who looks into the perfect mirror of God's law, the law of liberty, and makes a habit of doing so is not the man who sees and forgets. He puts the law into practice and lie wins true happiness.

If a man is seeking a practical faith, he must turn to the knowledge and truth found in the great textbook of our faith, the Holy Bible. And when he finds this truth, then he applies it, he lives it, he practices it. With this principle we are in perfect agreement, and it is this type of practice that we are seeking for ourselves.

9. Life Only in Christ

R. ALLAN ANDERSON
Secretary, Ministerial Association, General Conference

ARE WE DEAD or alive, asleep or awake, when the breath of life leaves the body? That is the question, and Christian theologians have been sharply divided on this issue for fifteen hundred years. Because Seventh-day Adventists teach that man is not immortal by nature, that he has life only in Christ, we are charged with holding a belief that is not supported by Scripture. This charge we shall examine in the light of God's Word. But first, let us view the problem in its historic setting. Long before the rise of Christianity, ancient religions taught that the soul was immortal. This is one of the basic tenets of Hinduism. It is also written in Egypt's ancient Book of the Dead and carved on statuary in that land.

When God called His people Israel out of Egypt and separated them from the corruption of the religions around them, it was His purpose to make of them "a special people" through whom the knowledge of salvation would be given to the world. This purpose was first made known to Abraham when God called him and said that in him all the nations (goyinz – "Gentiles") of the earth would be blessed (Genesis 18:18). Through Isaiah, God particularly emphasized this missionary program. "You are my witnesses, said the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen- (Isaiah 43:10). "This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise" (verse 21). In chapter 49, verse 6, God said, "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou may be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Then in chapter 43, verses 11 and 12, after declaring that He alone was their Savior, He said, "There was no strange god among you: therefore you are my witnesses, said the Lord, that 1 am God."

Surrounded as they were by nations who worshiped strange gods and held false philosophies, it was imperative that they be separated from all such evil environment in order to be fitted for their high calling. Among the many delusive ideas was the belief in survival after death, for this was the very foundation of the spiritualist cults of that day-the necromancy, wizardry, witchcraft, black magic, and all the other soul-destroying teachings of paganism. So concerned was God to uproot these ideas from Israel that He commanded that any among them found practicing these things was to be put to death.

Those teachings, however, persisted. The origin of it all was the devil's statement to Eve. The Lord had said, "In the day that thou eats thereof thou shall surely die." But the devil said, "You shall not surely die." That little word "not" was added willfully and deliberately. It was a lie, and the first lie ever told in this world. It was told by him whom Jesus called the father of lies, who "abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him" (John 8:44). His lie in various forms was handed on from one nation to another, and from one civilization to another. While the meaning of the word die is involved and will be discussed later, yet theologians generally agree that it was Satan who deceived the woman and brought sin and death into the world.

Greek Philosophy Influences World

The Greeks who later succeeded to world empire built a whole philosophy upon the age-old belief that the soul does not die but lives on independently of the body. Among the great teachers of Greece, Plato was perhaps their leading philosophic writer, and basic in both his and Socrates' teachings was this belief that the soul of man could never die. They claimed that it was "immortal" and "indestructible." "Beyond question the soul is immortal and imperishable and our souls will truly exist in another world." "When death attacks a man, the mortal portion of him may be supposed to die, but the immortal retires at the approach of death and is preserved safe and sound. "-PHAEDO, Dialogues of Plato, p. 246.

After the Babylonian captivity and the re-establishment of the Jews in their homeland, Greece

soon began her conquest of the world. Her false philosophy was a challenge to the truth of God, and to meet it God would make His people a spiritual arsenal in the warfare against sin. Listen to His charge as expressed through Zechariah: "For I have bent Judah as my bow; I have made Ephraim its arrow. I will brandish your sons, 0 Zion, over your sons, 0 Greece, and wield you like a warrior's sword" (chap. 9:13, RSV). Yes, God's people, His church of the ages, was to wage a war against the corrupting beliefs of paganism.

Truth Corrupted by Pagan Philosophy

While the Jews in those immediate pre-Christian centuries prided themselves in preserving the truths committed to them, yet certain heathen ideas crept into their teachings, one of which was the age-old belief in the immortality of the soul, as we learn from Philo and Josephus. But with the rise of the Christian church, truth was again freed from the contamination of heathen concepts and went forth in power "conquering, and to conquer."

So subtle, however, was the influence of mystical philosophy that the church itself soon began to lose the purity of the gospel and became contaminated with worldly ideologies. Instead of holding to the emphatic message of her Founder and the apostles, that everlasting life is a gift from God to be received through Christ alone, and that only those raised from the dead or changed into His likeness at His second coming will have the gift of immortality bestowed upon them, certain teachers arose within the church who early introduced heathen ideas into their doctrines, one of the most prominent being that man by nature is immortal.

The apostle Paul speaks of some who endeavored to mix truth with unrighteousness. He says, They "changed the truth of God into a lie" (Romans 1:25). The word translated "changed" is metallasso and really means "exchanged." Men cannot actually change God's truth, but they can exchange it. Other translations emphasize this important point. The Twentieth Century Translation reads, "They had substituted a lie for the truth." Phillips renders it, "These men deliberately forfeited the Truth of God and accepted a lie." The foundational "lie" that gave rise to all heathen practices and beliefs is the devil's statement made to Eve in Eden, i.e., that man does not need God, but has life in himself, and that by disobeying his Creator man does not die but enters into a more wonderful life on a higher plane. And that same lie is the basis of modern spiritualism.

Not until we see the issue in this light can we understand the confusion found not only in the world but also in the church. The great apostle urged believers to be alert lest, 11 through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men- (Colossians 2:8), we lose sight of the truth. He also warned against "science [gn6sis, "knowledge"] falsely so called- (1 Timothy 6:20). Gnosticism, which was beginning even in Paul's day, was a combination of Greek and Oriental philosophy with certain Christian beliefs. It came to its peak near the end of the second century. Shortly after, a new school of thought arose in Alexandria known as Neoplatonism, of which Origen was one of the most influential figures. Under his teaching, which was largely allegory and mysticism, such doctrines as the second advent of Christ and the literal resurrection were submerged. Thus the light of the "blessed hope" was well nigh extinguished.

In his recent book, The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, Walter Martin reviews our position on this important doctrine, and in so doing declares that his purpose is twofold: (1) "to review the historic position of the Christian church from the days of the apostles to the present," and (2) "to examine the teaching of the Scriptures" (page 117). And in our reply we would say that that is precisely what we seek to do. We appreciate the author's friendly attitude and his clear statement that although Adventists differ on this and some other doctrines, yet as believers in Christ our fellow Christians should recognize us as blood-bought souls, constituting part of the church of Jesus Christ, which is His body. Concerning the doctrine of conditional immortality, Martin plainly declares that our differences of interpretation "should cause no serious division between Christians since it does not affect the foundational doctrines of the Christian faith, or the salvation of the soul.... The ground of fellowship is not the condition of man in death but faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love He commanded us to have one for another" (page 130). To this we would reply that the only reason we hold this doctrine, which makes us differ from so many of our fellow Christians, is that we find no other position in the clear Word of God.

The Case in the Light of Scripture

Life only in Christ is, we believe, more than a theological divergence, for it affects one's whole concept of God and salvation. The Word of God declares plainly that "God bath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that bath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John 5:11, 12). Only as we have Him do we have life. Apart from "Christ, who is our life" we have no life. It is as simple as that. Our Lord's statements need no clarification. He says: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent" (John 17:3). And again, "Whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). The "unbelieving . . . shall have their part in the . . . second death" (Revelation 21:8). And John plainly declares that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (1 John 3:15).

At may be claimed that the term "eternal life" specifies a quality of life rather than the duration of life. But even so, eternal life is nevertheless that which will endure throughout eternity, and this life is the possession of those only who have accepted Christ. The wicked will not have life, either of eternal quality or of eternal duration. By their refusal to accept salvation they cut themselves off from enduring life. Their "end is destruction" (Philippians 3:19). They "shall utterly perish" (2 Peter 2:12). "They shall be as though they had not been" (Obadiah 16). "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more" (Psalm 104:35). And forecasting the doom of the devil, God says, "Never shall thou be any more" (Ezekiel 28:19).

The Scripture, from Genesis to Revelation, teaches that death is the antithesis of life. Through Moses, God said to Israel, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deuteronomy 30:19). He does not say, "I have set before you life in a state of bliss and life in a state of misery." No! the contrast is clear-life and death-because death is the cessation, the antithesis, of life. Death is not life prolonged in agony. Death is not existence under torture. Death is not life at all. Death is death, simply a cessation of life. The apostle James declares that "sin, when it is finished, brings forth death." Why? Because death is its wages-the payment or punishment for sin.

The Sovereignty of God

Sin is followed by death. Nowhere is there any variation from this sequence. God laid down this sequence from the very beginning. This is an eternal principle. This follows from the very nature of the sovereignty of God Himself. Sin is egoism. It is a life that seeks to live apart from God, to be like God and independent of God. Hence sin is a spiritual thing, a religious fact. The consequence of sin is separation from God. Death is a spiritual experience, as well as a physical event. The entire being is cut off from God, from life. To be cut off from God means death to the entire being. And if this sequence does not take place, if death does not follow sin, then it means that God is actually making place for sin and sinners in a universe where God claims sovereignty, and where God promises that there will be no more sin or death. And Jesus, speaking of the destiny of both the saved and the unsaved, the righteous and the wicked, declares plainly that the wicked "shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (Matthew 25:46).

As we live our lives from day to day we can know that we have passed from spiritual death to spiritual life. Then when this mortal life, which is transitory and subject to death, goes to the grave, the spirit of life (that is, the power by which we live) returns to God. The power to live is not ours but God's. Mankind is not built on the principle of a battery, possessing the power of life within itself, but rather on the principle of the trolley car, which depends on a power outside itself. When the electric connection is broken, the trolley car remains with all the possibilities of activity, but it is useless because it is severed from the source of its power. An inadequate illustration to be sure, but it emphasizes an important truth. Only as we have a living connection with the Source of all power can we live at all. That connection is broken at death and will not be renewed until the resurrection.

When Jesus taught the truth concerning the rewards of the righteous and the wicked, it was always related to His second coming, and never to the time of a person's death. For example: "Behold, 1 come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be" (Revelation 22:12). And again: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats" (Matthew 25:31, 32). "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (verse 46). The righteous and the

wicked both receive their rewards when our Savior returns, and not before. The Scripture declares it is then, and not till then, that we are "changed" - mortal bodies are then given immortality and corruptible bodies incorruptibility. Only thus will the righteous be able to experience the realities of that life eternal which in this mortal life they received by faith. The righteous, having "put on immortality," are no longer subject to death; "they are equal unto the angels" (Luke 20:36).

Martin is right when he says that 1ife has been bestowed upon the believer at the moment of regeneration by faith in Jesus Christ- (page 122). The "life" he refers to is a quality of life-eternal life, but " this life is in his Son" (1 John 5: 11). "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life" (1 John 2:25). Paul says we have the "promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Timothy 4:8). Like all men, believers can die, and do die; they fall "asleep in Christ." The Scripture says, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Corinthians 15:22). They are not alive when dead, but they "shall all be made alive." When? "afterward they that are Christ's at his coming" (verse 23). "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised.... Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (verses 16-18). They are not living in heaven now; they are perished unless they are raised from the dead. The Christian hope centers in Paul's teaching on the resurrection, not in Plato's teaching of innate immortality. But the day is coming when they "that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake" (Daniel 12:2). Summoned by the Life-giver, they will be raised incorruptible and never "can they die any more being the children of the resurrection" (Luke 20:36).

The Wicked Not Immortal

The righteous are raised immortal and incorruptible beings; the wicked are not changed into immortal beings. They were never immortal, and they never will be. While they too will be raised to life, it will not be to everlasting life; they are raised to meet their judgment (Revelation 20:13). For once all that have ever lived on this earth meet face to face, the righteous having "put on immortality" will be inside the Holy City, while the wicked, in the company of the devil and his angels, are outside the city. It is then that fire comes down from God out of heaven and devours them; this is the "second death." In this great conflagration God's "Judgments are made manifest" (Revelation 15:4). Concerning both the first and the second resurrections, Jesus said, "The hour is coming" when "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth. They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation," or judgment (John 5:28, 29). The word here is krisis, which is translated "judgment" forty-one times in the King James Version. This harmonizes exactly with the prophetic picture in Matthew 25:31-45. The rewards are either "life eternal" or "everlasting punishment."

Persistent Sin Reaps Its Reward

"Everlasting punishment" is the reward of the unrepentant sinner, because he has despised the grace of God and refused salvation. His sin has therefore met its reward-death, everlasting death, from which there will be no resurrection. Not only will the wicked reap their reward-everlasting death-but the righteous also will reap their reward-everlasting life.

Christ's words could not be plainer. At that time one group goes "into life eternal," and the other "into everlasting punishment." And this "punishment 11 is equated with the "everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (verse 41). But note particularly: this fire was not prepared for men, but "for the devil and his angels." If human beings choose to join their rebellion and refuse salvation, they will have to perish with them.

How Long Will Hell-fire Last?

The nature and effect of that punishment is illustrated in the destruction of "Sodom and Gomorra, and the cities about them." They "are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" (Jude 7). Those wicked cities of the plain came to their end under the direct judgment of God. So will these evil angels come to their end in "the judgment of the great day" (verse 6), which is still future. Those wicked cities and their inhabitants were destroyed by fire – "eternal fire." But are they still burning? We know where they once stood, but today their ashes lie under the salty waters of the Dead Sea. Even the sea

that covers the spot cannot be drained, for it is 1,300 feet below sea level. The fire that destroyed them was "eternal fire," unquenchable fire; no one could put it out, for this was the judgment of God. But that fire finally ceased burning when the destruction was complete. Those cities will not be, and cannot be, rebuilt.

So it will be with those who have despised the grace of Christ. Having set themselves against the living God, they will be utterly destroyed, consumed like a field of stubble. "They shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away" (Psalm 37: 20). But more, "They shall be as though they had not been" (Obadiah 16). Paul, speaking of those "that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," says they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord" (2 Thessalonians 1: 8, 9).

Everlasting Destruction

Christ speaks of "everlasting punishment"; Paul speaks of "everlasting destruction." Now what is the nature of this destruction that makes it everlasting? Before noting what the Scripture says about it, let us note just what it does not say. Certainly, it does not say, nor does it even infer, that the unregenerate are everlastingly being destroyed, that the process is a continuing experience. It simply says that the destruction, or as Martin calls it, the "ruination," is everlasting, and this ruination will endure throughout eternity. It is the effect that is everlasting. We emphasize it is not a continuing process but a continuing result-everlasting, we repeat, in its effect.

Martin's attempt to refute the plain teaching of Scripture by referring to the Greek word basaniz6 is another evidence of poor contextual analysis. While basanizo definitely means "to torment" or "test," Martin certainly cannot get "never-ceasing" out of the word. His reference to the centurion's servant in Matthew 8:6, who was "grievously tormented," is of no help to his thesis. In fact, it destroys his argument, for in verse 13 we read the "servant was healed in the selfsame hour"! And his contention is groundless that the Greek word ai6nion ("everlasting"), used in connection with the punishment of the wicked, means punishment without cessation. For ai6nion to carry such a connotation as "unending," it must be related to an eternal object, such as to God; otherwise it simply means "age-lasting." Both Koine and classical Greek bear this out. When Paul wrote about Onesimus, asking his friend to "receive him for ever," ai6nion (Philemon 15), that certainly did not mean "unending."

"No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" says John (1 John 3:15). In fact, no willful sinner of any kind has eternal life in him, and that reveals both the mercy and the justice of God. Sin will be brought to an end, and it is self-evident that if the wicked do not have eternal life in themselves, such life would have to be conferred on them. Now let us reverently ask, Where do the Scriptures reveal that our God, the God of love, confers eternal life on wicked beings in order that He might torture them through the endless days of eternity?

The Bible writers of both the Old and New Testaments not only teach the very opposite of this but seem to vie with one another in picturing the utter destruction (not annihilation) of the wicked. We are sometimes charged with being "annihilationists." This expression we never use. We teach the "destruction" of the wicked, for that is scriptural.

A number of texts have already been referred to, but many others could be cited. In Revelation 20:9 we read that "fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." The Greek is from the verb katesthi6, "to eat down." The same word is found in Luke 8:5, "the fowls of the air devoured it." When the birds eat seed, would anyone contend that the seed still exists as seed? Then how could it be argued that rebellious angels and wicked men, having been "devoured" (most translations read "consumed") by the fires of God, still remain as conscious, individual beings?

Scripture Declares Wicked Will Be No More

God's Word is explicit. "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it" (Proverbs 2:22). "The seed of the wicked shall be cut off" (Psalm 37:28). "Cut off," karath in Hebrew, is translated "cut down," "destroyed," "chewed," et cetera. It is an intensive word. The Septuagint uses the Greek exolothreuo, which means "to destroy utterly." This word is used only once in the New Testament (Acts 3:23). In the King James Version it is translated "destroyed." The Amplified New Testament reads "utterly exterminated." Again we read: "For, behold, the day comes, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that comes shall bum them up, said the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root [Satan] nor branch [his followers]"

(Mal. 4:1). “For evildoers shall be cut off: ... the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shall diligently consider his place, and it shall not be” (Psalm 37:9, 10). When God declares that “the wicked shall not be,” then why not believe Him?

We do not reject the teaching of the Bible on hell-fire and eternal punishment, but we do reject the pagan concepts so often woven into the Scriptures that deal with the subject. For example, when Martin speaks of Gehenna, he claims it “symbolizes eternal separation and conscious punishment for the spiritual nature of the unregenerate man” (page 135). We simply ask again, Where can such a definition be found? Geenna is one of three Greek words translated “hell” in the King James Version. The other two are hadis and the verb relating to tartaros. The fact that three different words, each with a different meaning, are translated with the one word “hell” in English has caused a great deal of confusion. Hadis occurs ten times, gehenna twelve times, and the verb form tartaroo once.

Authorities agree on the definition of these words. Hadis means “the grave”; gehenna signifies “a place of destruction”; and tartaros, “a place of outer darkness.” Peter used the word hadis in his Pentecost sermon when he spoke of the resurrection of Christ, saying “that his soul was not left in hell [Hades]” (Acts 2:31). Christ used the word gehenna in His statement, “Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell [gehenna]” (Matthew 10:28). Peter afterward wrote of the wicked angels being cast “down to hell [tartaros](2 Peter 2:4). Gehenna, Greek for the Valley of Hinnom (Jeremiah 19:2), was, as Martin says, “a garbage dump which smoldered perpetually outside Jerusalem” (page 135). Refuse deposited there was destroyed either by fire or decomposition. What the fire did not destroy, worms or decay did. It therefore became an impressive illustration of the final end of sin and sinners. Gehenna was certainly not a place of preservation, but a place of destruction. The fires burned just as long as there was anything to burn. Then, having done their work, they at last went out. Now Martin reads into this word the gruesome imagery of an Oriental hell and then concludes his argument by quoting Isaiah 66:24 about the worm never dying and the fire never being quenched. This statement of Isaiah must of necessity be a metaphor, for how could there be a living worm in the midst of unquenchable fire?

Recently we passed through the Valley of Hinnom near Mount Zion. It is no longer a city dump, but a fertile valley covered with homes and well-kept gardens. Nineteen centuries ago it was a pertinent illustration of the final end of sin and rebellion, but times have changed. The fires have long since ceased. Today it might provide a limited illustration of God’s ultimate plan for this world. When the devil and all his hosts are destroyed in the hot fires of hell, as fire comes down from God out of heaven and devours them (Revelation 20:9), the place of destruction will be this earth. God says of the devil, “Therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and 1 will bring thee to ashes upon the earth-(Ezekiel 28:18). And again: “The elements shall melt with fervent heat [possibly atomic power], the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up” (2 Peter 3: 10). That is total destruction. Then we read: “Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwells righteousness” (2 Peter 3:13). That new earth will be the eternal home of the saved, and Christ will be our everlasting King.

Gehenna was once a place of horror and death; today it is a place of beauty and life. No trace of burning is left. With nothing left to bum, the fire went out. So it will be when the wicked come to their end in the fires of God in the last great judgment. To claim that hell-fire will never go out reveals a lack of understanding of both the power and purpose of God, “for our God is a consuming fire” (Hebrews 12:29). The Bible teaches that hell-fire will be so hot and destructive that it will leave “neither root nor branch.” just how long it will burn we are not told, but the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha is the Biblical illustration of this final conflagration.

It is also important to notice that this destruction will take place not somewhere out on the periphery of the universe, but “in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb” (Revelation 14: 10). The Scripture says that “death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death” (Revelation 20:14). The first death is the common lot of all men by nature. We die because the breath of life leaves the body. “Thou takes away their breath [ruach], they die, and return to their dust. Thou sends forth thy spirit [ruach], they are created” (Psalm 104:29, 30).

But the Scriptures declare that all who die will be resurrected. Jesus said, “All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation judgment!” (John 5:28, 29). When man dies the first death, or the natural death, it is occasioned by the power of life being withdrawn from the body. The second death is not a natural death, but a judgment death, caused by fire coming “down from God out of heaven,” which devours them. That judgment death will be the second death, the eternal death

from which there will be no resurrection. All sinners will suffer punishment, some with few stripes and others with many (Luke 12:47, 48); the instigator of sin, the devil, will suffer the most.

This second death is really the only everlasting punishment that could be inflicted on mortal man. To illustrate: If a judge punishes a man by giving him a ten-year sentence, his imprisonment means that his loss of freedom lasts for ten years. If that same man could be put to death for ten years and then be brought to life again, that too would be ten years' punishment, for as long as he is deprived of freedom and the privilege of life, he is enduring punishment. But God is not going to deprive the wicked of their life and freedom for ten years, nor a hundred years, nor even a million years, but for eternity, for they are to suffer the vengeance of "eternal fire." This will indeed be "everlasting punishment," for it ends in "everlasting destruction."

The souls of men, not being immortal, can and will be destroyed. The word soul is mentioned 859 times in the Bible, but never once is it spoken of as "an immortal soul." God "only hath immortality" (1 Timothy 6:16), and this He gives to all who will turn from their sins and receive His grace, but we are not changed from mortality to immortality until our Lord's return in glory.

Eternal life is a gift from God that we receive by faith now. We read, "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." His gift of eternal life is ours now, but it is still "in his Son." Only as He lives in us, that is, in our mortal flesh, do we have that gift of life. When our mortal flesh dies, or falls asleep, that spiritual life is "hid with Christ in God" and remains with Him until He returns for His people. Paul says, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear [that is, His second coming], then shall you also appear with him in glory" (Colossians 3:4). In that glad day the righteous dead will be raised from the tomb, and the righteous who are alive to see Him come will be translated. But whether we are living or dead when He appears, "We shall all be changed." Paul's clear message was largely an amplification of our Lord's statement to Martha concerning "the resurrection at the last day" (John 11:24). It was in that setting that Jesus said, "He that believes in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live [be resurrected]: and whosoever lives and believes in me [that is, will be alive to see me come] shall never die [will be translated]" (verses 25 and 26).

On page 130 Martin says that " 'immortality' refers only to the resurrection body of the saints and to the nature of God Himself and that the saints "do not now possess 'immortality." True! But we could wish that the author were more consistent. If immortality refers only to, and is "a future gift to be bestowed upon, the believer's body at the second advent of our Lord," as he says, page 122, then why quote Dr. Charles Hodge? In so doing, our brother completely reverses himself, for Dr. Hodge claims "the human soul" has "unending existence" and is immortal. (Page 132). Martin certainly has not helped his case by appealing to this theologian of a past generation. But having quoted this scholar, we would simply ask both Hodge and Martin, When did the human soul become "immortal"? Was it created immortal, or does it put on immortality when the body dies? or is it some separate entity floating around waiting for a body in which to make its home, as the pagans teach?

Having stated that the human soul is immortal, Hodge then seeks to substantiate his claim by this argument:

If the Bible says that the sufferings of the lost are to be everlasting, they are to endure forever unless it can be shown either that the soul is not immortal or that Scriptures elsewhere teach that those sufferings will come to an end. (Italics supplied.)

Now let us face the Scripture squarely, for on those two important points the Bible is clear and emphatic-first, the soul is not immortal; and second, the sufferings of the wicked will come to an end. Jesus said, "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28). If it can be destroyed, then the soul is certainly not eternal, as our friend declares. For him to state that the "Bible emphatically teaches that it is," page 132, must mean that he either has not discerned or is not willing to accept the clear implications of our Lord's statement. God says: "The soul that sins, it shall die" (Ezekiel 18:20), and again, "The wages of sin is death." And because "all have sinned" (Romans 3:23), therefore all should die, and die eternally. But while "the wages of sin is death ... the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6:23). Our blessed Lord "Poured out his soul unto death" in order to save our souls from eternal death.

We have searched in vain for a single Biblical text in Martin's critique that says the soul is either immortal or eternal. He has tried to build up a case by reference to a few Greek and Hebrew words, but even these have failed to support his claims. We wonder why he, as well as many others of our fellow Christians, seem unable to accept the clear statement of Jesus, who shows conclusively that it is when He "shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." It

is at that time, and not before, that the righteous "enter into life eternal." During our mortal existence it is ours by faith only, but at His coming we enter into the full experience of "life eternal." The wicked, on the other hand, go into "everlasting punishment," or destruction. Now, these are not our words; neither is it merely Adventist doctrine. These are the words of our Lord, and it is His doctrine.

Eternal Fire

Someone may ask, What is the meaning of "eternal" in such expressions as "eternal fire"? Let the Bible speak for itself. We read of Christ being "the author of eternal salvation," and also of His "having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Hebrews 5:9; 9:12). We do not need to ask how and when was our "eternal salvation- obtained, or secured (RSV). It was when He died on the cross. We were redeemed "with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Peter 1:18, 19). And although every true Christian rejoices in that truth, yet none would contend that this "eternal redemption" that Christ obtained for us on the cross is something still in process, something continually being worked out but never completed. No! a thousand times no! That shout from the cross, "It is finished!" told the universe that man's redemption was accomplished for all eternity. He died unto sin once (Romans 6:10). But the redemption is eternal in its result.

While obtaining that redemption for us our Redeemer was "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded ["tormented," margin] for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities" (Isaiah 53:4, 5). It was for us that He died. He "suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" (1 Peter 3:18), but now, thank God, He has entered into His glory. He "poured out his soul unto death" once; He is not dying now. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Hebrews 9:28), and "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Hebrews 10:10). Our Savior met the penalty of sin by dying once, not by continually dying, as the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation teaches, but by dying "once for all." The authentic trumpet note of the New Testament is that our redemption is settled. It was accomplished by our Lord's death and resurrection. The victory at Calvary was decisive. The devil was defeated by Christ's death on the cross and completely outmaneuvered by His resurrection. All we await now is V-Day, and that will be when our Lord returns in power to raise the dead, to destroy His foes, and to reign forever as Lord of all.

10. The Immortality of the Soul

R. ALLAN ANDERSON
Secretary, Ministerial Association, General Conference

IN THE STUDY of God's Word and especially in analyzing the great doctrines of the Christian faith, it is always helpful to appeal to the original languages of Scripture. But to appeal for support to the Hebrew and Greek and then to misread or misapply the words is tragic. But that is just what our friend Martin, in his book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, has done in a number of places in his effort to refute the scriptural teaching of life only in Christ. This we have already mentioned in the previous chapter. We would not be unkindly critical, but his misuse of the original languages is all too evident, and in several places even the words he uses are misspelled. These are probably typographical errors, but he also reveals an inability to be completely objective in his study. It may be difficult to be completely objective, especially where theology is concerned, but when one, critical of the beliefs of others, tries to defend his case by the aid of Hebrew and Greek, and then misunderstands and consequently misapplies the very scriptures he uses, the result cannot be other than confusion.

To cite one simple example: He uses "soul" and "spirit" as though they were exact synonyms. That certainly is not the case. Then, too, his strict adherence to the K.J.V. in certain places, while appearing perhaps to prove his point, leads him at times far from the clear meaning of the original. To illustrate: In support of his claims that the soul departs at death, he quotes Genesis 35:18 about Rachel, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died) that she called his name Benoni." Now the word translated "soul" in this text is nephesh in Hebrew. It is translated 428 times "soul" in the K.J.V., and 119 times 1ife. Comparing the different usage of this word nephesh and applying them to Martin's theory makes interesting reading. Take, for example, David's prayer for protection from his persecutors. He says, "Deliver me: lest he tear my soul [nephesh] like a lion, rending it in pieces" (Psalm 7:1, 2). Would anyone

contend that the “soul” here mentioned is something “immaterial” and “indestructible”? Some ethereal vapor that leaves the body at death? If so, how could it be torn by a lion? One does not have to be a scholar to know that David is here talking about his body, his person, and not about some “immaterial” or “immortal” soul.

And again the Hebrew poet sings, -Behold, the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him . . . to deliver their soul from death- (Psalm 33:18, 19). This would be meaningless if at death the soul soared away to some place of bliss. Some other translations simply render nephesh as “life” or “the person.” Moffatt’s reading is, “That he may rescue them from death.” Fenton: “from death to deliver their life.” Many other passages could be cited showing the folly of trying to establish a doctrine by a loose use of texts.

As far as Rachel’s “departing soul” is concerned, it simply means that she was dying. Other translations make it clear, for nephesh is sometimes translated life “breath,” “person,” et cetera. The Berkeley Version (a new, conservative but scholarly translation) renders it, “With her last breath-for she expired-she named him Benoni.” The Moffatt t translation reads, “As her life went from her (for she died), she called the child Benoni.” Fenton says, “But she breathing out her life-for she was dying-named him Son-of-my-anguish.” The Hebrew merely states that Rachel was breathing her last, and her soul, nephesh (that is, her life, her person), instead of being wafted into Paradise, was soon to be laid away in the sepulcher, where she remains to this day.

It may be said that these references are from the Old Testament, to which we reply that it was Martin who introduced Rachel’s experience. All we are doing is showing the weakness of his argument, an argument that cannot be supported by either the New Testament or the Old. To build a doctrine on some particular translation while ignoring the original often leads to embarrassment.

Take another example of that Hebrew word nephesh. In Leviticus 17:14 we read, “The life of all flesh is the blood.” Here nephesh is translated “life,” one of the 119 times it is rendered “life” and not “soul.” It would therefore be as correct to translate it “the soul of the flesh is the blood.” Would our friend accept that translation? Yet he knows, as does every other student of Hebrew, that both are equally correct. But even more important, this is not referring to human blood, but to the blood of animals. Do animals have souls? If so, is the soul, nephesh, of the animal in the blood? Or is the soul of man in his blood? Certainly not if “the immaterial nature of man (soul or spirit) is separate from the body,” and if “it is independent of man’s material form, and departs from that form at death.” - Page 128.

Unscriptural Claims

But in an endeavor to further support his position he cites a number of scriptures from both the Old and New Testaments. Space forbids our reviewing all of them, but we will notice at least one. He quotes Revelation 16:3, “Every living soul died in the sea.” This, of course, is in the New Testament, and the word soul in Greek is psuchi. It is variously translated, 58 times “soul,” 40 times “life,” 3 times “mind,” as well as “heart,” etcetera. Any Greek authority will state simply that it means animal life, with no suggestion whatsoever of immortality. The irrelevance of this scripture is seen at once. It could not refer to men, for men do not live in the sea. The Berkeley Version reads, “And every living creature that was in the sea met its death.” The RSV reads, “Every living thing died.” We do not believe that even Martin would contend that fish have immaterial souls that depart from their bodies at death. It is not difficult to show that the very texts the author uses actually undermine his arguments. Could it be that the Hindu in his concept is actually more consistent than some Christians?

Martin declares: “To be dogmatic one must have a sound scholarly basis for his dogmatism.--- We agree; but it is this “sound scholarly basis” that we find so often lacking in this author’s review of the doctrine of conditional immortality. Instead of discovering the strong foundation of the Word of God, we find his claims are too often just carry-overs from the false philosophy of Plato. Only as we see this issue in its true perspective can we grasp the significance of the clash between conditional immortalists and innate immortalists.

More than once our friend appeals to “historic orthodoxy” and wonders why Adventists do not line up with “historical scholarship.- Seventh-day Adventists have only one court of appeal-the Bible. What is in the Word of God we gladly accept, for that is the only source of sound theological truth. But what does he mean by ‘1istoric orthodoxy”? If this includes the baptism of babies, then on this point at least we cannot line up with it, and for the same reason that Walter Martin, himself a Baptist clergyman, cannot, for

he knows that infant baptism is nowhere taught in the Scriptures. The fact that for nearly fourteen centuries Christians believed and practiced something that the apostles never taught is no reason for well informed students of God's Word to continue doing something we were never commanded to do, while neglecting to do what the New Testament distinctly enjoins.

But, we ask again, What is the teaching of "historic orthodoxy" on this question? Martin says "the historic position of the Christian Church." is that there is "conscious presence of the believer with Christ at the death of the body- (page 124). There is no doubt that following the great apostasy of the third and fourth centuries, the "falling away- of the church (2 Thessalonians 2:3), many accepted the pagan teachings on the immortality of the soul, as well as many other errors, but this definitely was not the teaching of the Bible writers.

Let us think of man as he was created. In Genesis 2:7 we are told God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The word "breath" is often translated "spirit." Jesus said, "God is a Spirit," or more correctly, "God is Spirit." As such He is the source of all power the author of life, in whom "we live, and move, and have our being." When the Creator breathed that spirit of life into man, he became a living soul, or a living being. Paul speaks of man as spirit (pneuma), soul (psuche), and body (soma). The word pneuma is found 388 times in the New Testament, but never once is it translated "soul." At death the pneuma returns to God who gave it, and then that person who for years had been a living organism, returns to the earth, his flesh decomposes, he goes back to the dust whence he came. It was the union of inanimate dust with the spirit of life that produced a living soul, that is, a living person. When that spirit of life or the power by which he lives, departs, as it does at death, then the body can no longer function; the person ceases to be a man in the full sense of the word. God did not breathe a soul into man; He gave to the form of dust the power to function, and the result was a living soul or a living man. Body and soul are not opposites. Platonism teaches that the body is the soul's prison and death is the soul's friend, because, that philosophy claimed, at death the soul is liberated. Paul declares death is an enemy. He says: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death- (1 Corinthians 15:26).

The Death of Christ and of Stephen

Death, according to the Biblical definition, is the yielding up of the spirit, or breath, of life. When our Lord died as one of the human family, He gave up the pneuma, the spirit of life. When Stephen died he did the same. After saying: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," we read "he fell asleep" (Acts 7:59, 60). To state, as Martin does, that only "his physical body took on the appearance of 'sleep,' " and that "he as a unit did not die; he merely experienced separation of the soul from the body" is, to use a theological term, plain eisegesis-reading into Scripture that which is not there. The Inspired Record does not quote Stephen as saying: "Lord Jesus, receive my soul," but "receive my spirit." That is vastly different. The psuchi, soul or life of man, is always set forth in Scripture as mortal and perishable. Greek philosophy, on the other hand, taught that man's psuchi, the soul, was immortal and imperishable, an entity resident or imprisoned in his body. When death occurred, this soul departed to some other sphere. And that is precisely what Martin and thousands of other good Christians believe. But whence comes this teaching? Not from the Word of God, we repeat, but from pagan philosophy.

The "historic" position of New Testament Christianity is definitely the doctrine of the resurrection and not the immortality of the soul, as Dr. Oscar Cullmann of Basel, Switzerland, so ably points out. In his recent book Immortality of the Soul, or Resurrection of the Dead, this outstanding scholar emphasizes how "Widespread is the mistake of attributing to primitive Christianity the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul." - Page 6. "1 Corinthians 15 has been sacrificed for the Phaedo." - Page 8. Then he says: "This inability to listen is equally surprising on the part of intelligent people committed to the principles of sound, scientific exegesis and on the part of believers who profess to rely on the revelation in Holy Scripture." - Page 6.

Our friend's inability to see the obvious on this question emphasizes the truth of Cullmann's observation. Martin speaks of "contextual analysis," 1inguistic exegesis," and "Biblical hermeneutics," and declares that they should guide us in our study of Scripture. This is true, but it surely is strange that he himself ignores these very principles. Take, for example, the word life which is translated from three distinct Greek words: psuchi, zoj, and bios. He refers to these but fails to distinguish clearly between them. Bios, he claims, "is the union or communion of body and soul." - Page 120. This is amazing. Where can such a definition be found? Lexicographers such as Liddell and Scott, and Parkhurst, as well as authorities

such as Young and Strong in their analytical concordances, all declare that bios simply means “natural life” or “living,” “the means of subsistence,” etcetera. It is found eleven times in the New Testament, five times translated “life,” five times “living,” and once “good.” In the parable of the Prodigal Son, the father “divided unto them his living [bios]” (Luke 15:12). He did not divide soul and body, nor did he unite soul and body, but simply divided the family fortune. Then, too, we read of the woman who spent all her living (her livelihood-bios) on physicians (Luke 8:43). And again in 1 Timothy 2:1, 2, we are admonished to pray “for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life [bios].” By what twist of linguist c exegesis can such texts be made to teach that bios means “union or communion of body and soul”?

This is just one of many unwarranted statements this author makes in his endeavor to support a crumbling case. Let us notice another on page 120. In reference to the experience of Lazarus, he states that “eternal life” is “unaffected by physical death,” a truly bold assertion for which he gives no scriptural evidence.

We agree with him that Christ “was able to give life, even though death had actually occurred.” Of course He was, for He is the Author of life, and He came to the tomb “to give life” to His friend who was in the sleep of death. Now if Lazarus was not really dead, then why did Jesus come to give him life? Concerning the actual state of Lazarus there was no question, for Jesus had said plainly, “Lazarus is dead.” But the Master who declared Himself to be the “resurrection and the life,” knowing what He was about to do, said to Martha, “He that believes in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live” (John 11:25).

Lazarus was certainly a believer in Christ, and as such had already received the hope of eternal life. But that life “is hid with Christ in God” (Colossians 3:3). In his mortal body he had been revealing that life, but through disease his body had ceased to function. He had simply “fallen asleep” in death.

A simple illustration of the abiding life of the Christian is that of a tree with its twigs and branches. In the growing season the inner life is revealed in leaves and fruit. When winter comes, the life, which is the basis of growth, disappears; the tree “dies back.” But where has the life gone? The answer, of course, is that it is in the trunk of the tree. So the Christian, in common with other men, lives his life in a mortal body, yet possesses at the same time the hope of eternal life. That eternal or everlasting life, while his by faith, is nevertheless in God’s Son (1 John 5:12). Only as he, like Paul, lives his life “by the faith of the Son of God” (Galatians 2:20) is he able to express that inner life in words, deeds, and attitudes. The teaching of Seventh-day Adventists on this is clearly expressed by Ellen G. White:

“Verily, verily, 1 say unto you, He that believes on Me bath everlasting life.” Through the beloved John, who listened to these words, the Holy Spirit declared to the churches, “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that bath the Son bath life.” 1 John 5:11, 12. And Jesus said, “I will raise him up at the last day.” Christ became one flesh with us, in order that we might become one spirit with Him. It is by virtue of this union that we are to come forth from the grave, not merely as a manifestation of the power of Christ, but because, through faith, His life has become ours. Those who see Christ in His true character, and receive Him into the heart, have everlasting life. It is through the Spirit that Christ dwells in us; and the Spirit of God, received into the heart by faith, is the beginning of the life eternal-The Desire of Ages, p. 388.

The Christian dies like other men, but when he does, the eternal life he possesses, having received it when he was “born again,” remains “hid with Christ in God” (Colossians 3:3). But, says the apostle, “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall you also appear with him in glory” (Colossians 3:4). We would re-emphasize that the eternal life which we receive now in Christ is entirely dependent upon these bodies of ours for expression, just as the tree’s life is dependent for expression upon its branches. When physical death occurs as it did in the case of Lazarus, the transitory life (psuchi) goes to sleep, but the everlasting life (the hoped-for zod aionion of Titus 3:7) is “hid with Christ in God.” Without a fully functioning individual body, no life of any kind can have individual conscious expression. That is why “sleep” is so expressive of death, because in sleep there is no consciousness.

Walter Martin claims that this word sleep is a “grammatical metaphor” and warns against developing “a doctrine from a figure of speech.” No student of God’s Word would attempt to build a doctrine on a figure of speech. But who gives Martin the authority to claim that a Biblical expression used by the prophets from Moses to Paul, and emphasized by Jesus Christ Himself, is nothing more than “a figure of speech”? This robs Christ and the Word of God of a great truth. Death is not only like sleep, it is sleep in that the individual is unconscious. Man’s condition in death is very clearly stated in the Word of God. “His breath goes forth, he returns to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish” (Psalm 146:4).

In case the author complains that this is taken from the Old Testament, we would simply remind

him that the Old Testament was the only Bible the apostles knew as they went forth to preach the truth of God and raise up churches. But the New Testament uses the same phraseology. Paul says: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep- (1 Thessalonians 4:13). And again: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed" (1 Corinthians 15:51). And that change does not come at death but "at the last trump" (verse 52). "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God" (1 Thessalonians 4:16).

Then, speaking of "the children of light," the apostle says: "For God bath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep we should live together with him" (1 Thessalonians 5:9, 10). The Amplified New Testament reads: "Whether we are still alive or are dead [at Christ's appearing] we might live together with Him and share His life." If we have died, that is, '1allen asleep," we shall be raised, that is, "be made alive" when Christ returns. "Whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" for "they also which are fallen asleep in Christ- have not perished, they are merely awaiting the day when they will be awakened out of sleep. Lazarus was just as dear to the Lord in death as he was in life, but he needed to be resurrected before he could function.

Describing death, the Word of God says: "So man lies down, and rises not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep.... All the days of my appointed time will 1 wait, till my change come" (Job 14:12-14). David said: "I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness" (Psalm 17:15). Paul said: "We look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body [-the body of our humiliation," A.R.V.], that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body" (Philippians 3:20, 21).

The Bible states emphatically in both Old and New Testaments that when a believer dies in the Lord, he is not out of the universe, he is simply "asleep." He is not praising God, for "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence" (Psalm 115:17). "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" (Psalm 6:5).

When Jesus came to give life to Lazarus, He did not call him from heaven or from any celestial place. He called him from the grave. He did not call some "immaterial" "indestructible," "never-dying" soul from a habitation of bliss. He called His friend from the tomb. And he who was asleep in death heard the voice of the Life-giver and came forth a whole man-body, soul, and spirit. If Lazarus were not dead but alive somewhere else, then why did Jesus say "yet shall he live"? He was not living when Jesus arrived at the tomb, but he was living when He left. Only birth and the resurrection are doorways to consciousness.

Martin's contention that when our Lord returns in glory the souls of the believers will come with Him to be reunited with their resurrected bodies is absolutely unsupported by Scripture. Moreover, this interpretation is out of harmony with the context. Paul is writing about "them which are asleep" (1 Thessalonians 4:13), "which sleep in Jesus- (verse 14), "the dead in Christ" (verse 16), who will rise, not descend. The emphasis is that the living saints "shall not precede those who have fallen asleep" (RSV) but all will be caught up "together . . . to meet the Lord in the air" (verses 15, 17). Whoever these are that our Lord brings, the Scripture emphatically states that they are or have been "asleep." Would our brother contend that there are sleeping souls in heaven?

The Greek word ago ("bring") is more correctly translated "lead," "1ead out of," or "lead away." In illustration of the resurrection of the righteous, Paul says that just as Jesus died and rose again, so it will be with His people. They too will rise, "Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Corinthians 15:23). Jesus said, "I will come again, and receive you unto myself." When our Savior returns He will not bring disembodied souls with Him from heaven, but will lead resurrected saints from this earth to their heavenly home.

A number of well-trained scholars, Adventists and others, have expressed deep disappointment over what they consider -a rather superficial treatment of this important question. We regret that this author has laid himself open to severe criticism, by reading into Greek words that for which he has no proof, for it is bound to mislead lay members and those who are unacquainted with the original languages of the Bible.

The Apostle Paul's Predicament

Before concluding our examination we should turn our attention to another statement of the great apostle in Philippians 1:21-23. Martin says, "We need to pay strict attention to what he says" for "this one [text] alone gives us Paul's mind on the subject." This statement is as amazing as it is erroneous. One wonders where this author's mind has been while reading the score of other references on life and death in

Paul's writings. Sound scholarship requires that a statement made by any author must be read and understood in the light of all the other statements made by the same author. Death and the resurrection was a favorite subject with Paul, for he deals with it in nearly every one of his Epistles.

In this letter he states his earnest expectation and hope that Christ shall be magnified in his body; or as the Berkeley Version gives it, the "honor of Christ may be enhanced in my body, either through living or through dying- (verse 20). Then he adds: "For on my part to live is Christ and to die is gain" (verse 21). He expresses his determination that come what may, "Christ shall be magnified in my body." But he finds himself in a "strait betwixt two." This "strait" (sune-chomai) means being pressured. The two alternatives are: to live, or to die. He clearly states that if his work is done and he could magnify his Lord by dying, that would be "gain" for him, for death would bring release from toil and pain. Yet, he says, "my being alive physically means for me fruitful service- (verse 22, Berkeley). He certainly can magnify Christ by his service, so he finds himself in a dilemma. If he were given the choice to live or to die, he does not know which it would be life or death. "I feel the pressure from both sides," he says Verse 23, Berkeley). As far as he personally is concerned, life and death are just about in balance. "For me to live is Christ," he says. And yet living means shackles and hardships. That is why death would be gain. He knows that death is only a sleep, and in sleep there is no awareness. As soon as he lost consciousness then, as far as he was concerned, the next instant he would hear the call of the Life-giver. His letter to the Thessalonians tells how the Lord Himself would descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God.

Our Savior's coming was very real to him. In his two short letters to the Thessalonians he refers to the Second Advent no less than twenty times. He pictures the translation of the saints who will be living to see their Lord return in glory; how they will be caught up with the resurrected ones to meet the Lord in the air (1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17). It is a thrilling prospect. If only this could happen to him, if only he could be caught away with his Lord as was Elijah who went to heaven without seeing death-that is Paul's real desire or yearning. He interjects this thought as a third alternative which, however, had not been offered him, as he says: "I have a yearning to take my leave and to be with Christ, for that is by far the better part (verse 23, Berkeley). It surely would be "far better." Yes, better than this earthly life with its hardships, and certainly better than a martyr's death. He does not long dwell on the thought, however, for he says: "Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you- (verse 24). It is somewhat of a soliloquy, unusual but beautiful.

Now Martin's interpretation of this is that Paul "desired to depart from his body." This seems a strange misconstruing of Paul's statement. But he goes even farther and says that "the context indicates that Paul expected death-and instantaneous re-union with Christ." That surely is amazing, because Paul clearly states the very opposite. He says: "I am confident of this, 1 know that 1 shall stay and keep near you all to promote your advancement" (verse 25, Berkeley). "That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ . . . by my coming to you again" (verse 26).

Nothing could be clearer than that Paul expected to live and visit them again. For Martin to read into this that "Paul expected death-and instantaneous re-union with Christ" is beyond comprehension. "Contextual analysis" and "hermeneutics" have certainly been no guide to him here. He charges Adventists with teaching doctrines that are not supported by the Word of God. But what shall we say to an attempt to make Paul say the very opposite of what he so clearly states? The old apostle certainly was not expecting death in the immediate future; much less was he desiring "to depart from his body," whatever that may mean.

We know our friend Walter Martin and have nothing but love for him in our hearts. We have enjoyed prayerful fellowship together with the Lord. But that does not blind our eyes to the truth of God's Word. We close this review with an appeal to him to be more objective in his study of the precious truth of God. David said: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple" (Psalm 27:4). Many who desire the Lord and rejoice in His love, fail to inquire of Him.

Earnest inquiry into the Word of God brings a rich reward in clearer understanding of our blessed Lord and Savior, through whom alone we have eternal life. How glorious is the thought that He "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel"!

Concluding his case against the doctrine of conditional immortality, our friend refers to Dr. Francis Pieper, a prominent Lutheran theologian. Then he says: "Seventh-day Adventists would do well to heed Dr. Pieper's observation." We simply reply that we do not rest our case with modern scholarship nor on the opinions of prominent theologians, past or present. While we do not discount scholarship, yet when the opinions of men clash with the clear statements of the Word of God, we stand by the Scriptures, which

alone are able to make us 11 wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

* The Bible texts in this chapter credited to Fenton are from The Holy Bible in Modern English by Ferrar Fenton (London: S. W. Partridge & Co., Ltd., 1925). The Bible texts in this chapter credited to Moffatt are from The Bible: A New Translation by James Moffatt. Copyright 1922, 1935. By Harper and Brothers. Used by permission.

11. Ellen G. White and the Spirit of Prophecy

H. W. LOWE
Field Secretary, General Conference

IN HIS RECENT and widely discussed book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, Walter R. Martin comments on Ellen G. White, and early introduces D. M. Canright, in whose writings are found "the inspiration for 90 per cent of the destructive personal criticisms leveled against Mrs. White" (p. 97) and whose two volumes The Life of Mrs. E. G. White and Seventh-day Adventism Renounced "laid the foundation for all future destructive criticism of Seventh-day Adventism" (p. 98).

Then follows a reference to the "carefully documented volume of almost 700 pages," Ellen G. White and Her Critics by Francis D. Nichol. This at once pits the work of Canright against that of Nichol, and produces a curious statement by Walter Martin:

Nichol has dug deep into early Adventist history-even beyond Canright's day, but after reading both Nichol and Canright, the writer concludes that there is much to be said on both sides. But Canright, we believe, has the edge because he can say, 'I was there," or "Mrs. White said . . ." and contradictory contemporary statements are not to be found where many of Canright's charges are concerned-Page 99.

We do not think that this statement was intended to suggest that a contemporary protagonist is necessarily a more reliable witness than the historian or the careful research student, to whom time so often gives a breadth of vision and a clear perspective denied to those who viewed things narrowly on the spot. Nevertheless, the implications of contemporary reliability are there, and should be answered.

The records of the Massachusetts Historical Society contain valuable information regarding the famous Salem witchcraft trials around 1690. In 1692 nineteen persons were executed for practicing witchcraft. Judge Samuel Sewell, who passed the terrible sentence, was wrong in his judgments in this shocking story-wrong even by the standards of his time. Sewell lived to acknowledge both his error and guilt. Others involved in the infamous affair never admitted their grave mistakes. Yet they were all able to say in the fierce debates of the ensuing years, "I was there!"

To get this grim episode in true focus we consider the facts that history presents to the careful student, and we place the hot zeal of contemporary witch-hunters on that background. Quite often we have to discount the testimony of on-the-spot zealots.

Canright and Plagiarism

Walter Martin admits that not "all of Canright's writing is to be trusted, for many of his criticisms of Mrs. White's activities have been neatly undercut by contemporary evidence unearthed by F. D. Nichol and others" (p. 100), and he admits that whereas Canright made much ado about alleged plagiarism by Mrs. White, he was himself flagrantly guilty of the same thing: "Canright himself plagiarized not only some of the content but even the title of a book written in 1863 by Moses Hull, also an Adventist and a predecessor of Canright in the ministry- (p. 103).

The conclusion reached by our author is that though both D. M. Canright and Mrs. White borrowed literary material, it was not for pecuniary profit, and the position of neither was affected by it. On this subject three well-reasoned chapters will be found in F. D. Nichol's Ellen G. White and Her Critics, beginning on page 403. We think they are an adequate answer to the plagiarism and kindred charges, and shall not attempt more here.

Early Difficulties

Years ago when we read D. M. Canright's two books we concluded that (1) he was a man of overweening ambition and was involved in personality clashes with other strong minded people; (2) he was admittedly faced with doctrinal differences among the early Adventists over the question of the nature of Christ, etcetera; (3) he finally became embittered and allotted himself to embark on a campaign of name calling and vilification of his erstwhile colleagues.

Relationships and doctrinal problems are common to all religious movements. We will take but one striking instance. It is coincidental that in the year in which Canright defected (1887) from the Adventists to the Baptists, Charles Haddon Spurgeon launched his famous "down-grade controversy." He left the Baptist Union of Great Britain, charging that the higher criticism was undermining Baptist faith in the Bible, the deity of Christ, et cetera, and he stated they were "going down-hill at breakneck speed." Now "the prince of preachers" -a Calvinistic Baptist, as also is Walter Martin-thereby created a very bitter and enduring controversy, and was called upon by the Baptist Union to name modernists among his colleagues in order to prove his charges. Spurgeon never returned to the Baptist Union. He kept up his campaign, but, being the great man that he was, he resolutely refused to call names, though he unquestionably could have done so. Canright, on the contrary, used names and recorded opinions that men used in private conversation, and that were never intended for publication or repetition. We do not know of any of his Adventist associates who escaped the bitter charges of ignorance, bigotry, stubbornness, et cetera, brought against them by D. M. Canright.

We think that in fairness Martin's "I was there!" philosophy should be applied to the personal testimonial of D. W. Reavis, an intimate friend of D. M. Canright, recorded by F. D. Nichol (op. cit., pp. 540-543, 663-665), which should be read by all our readers in evaluating Canright's character. We also think that if it is permissible for Walter Martin (pp. 175, 180, 181) to quote and claim validity for James White's earlier views to refute his later views on the investigative judgment, it must likewise be permissible for us to quote Canright's words during his Adventist days when we wish to evaluate either his views or his personality. (See Nichol, op. cit., p. 663) Such things do not establish finality of judgment, but they are balancing factors in a controversy which, we agree with Walter Martin, may never be settled.

Fortunately, the Arian views held by some of our pioneers on the nature of Christ have, with the passage of time, practically disappeared from our ranks. It is, of course, in this area that many untrue criticisms of Seventh-day Adventists have persisted, and Walter Martin on pages 86 to 89 of his book has an eminently fair statement which exonerates Adventism in his mind from teaching the sinful nature of Christ and the incomplete atonement on the cross. So much for Canright and his downgrading of early Adventist leaders.

Ellen G. White and the Tithe

On page 109 of Walter Martin's book the view is accepted that Mrs. White paid a tithe but she did not always follow her own counsel as to its proper use: "Let none feel at liberty to retain their tithe to use it according to their own judgment." The charge that there was a discrepancy between Ellen G. White's teachings and her practice in tithe paying has been used by certain dissident leaders to persuade people to pay the tithe to them, as is always the case sooner or later with offshoot movements.

The Bible system of tithe paying was from the early years acknowledged by the Sabbath keeping Adventists, and for about twenty years they included it in what they called "systematic benevolence." They estimated their property gain at about 10 per cent a year, and this was counted as increase, of which one tenth was the tithe. It was of this that Mrs. White wrote: "The plan of systematic benevolence is pleasing to God." Testimonies, Volume 1, p. 190.

In 1879 it was decided that the better and more Biblical plan would be to pay one dollar out of every ten earned, as "a tithe of all our income."

There were always certain fixed principles in the Adventist conception of tithe paying: (1) The tithe was reserved for support of the ministry. "It [tithe] is to be devoted solely to support the ministry of the gospel." – Counsels on Stewardship, p. 81. (2) The tithe was to be brought to "the storehouse" for disbursement. "He [God] claims the tithe as His own, and it should ever be regarded as a sacred reserve, to be placed in His treasury for the benefit of His cause." – Ellen G. White in The Review and Herald, Dec. 8, 1896. (See also Gospel Workers, page 370) (3) The tithe payer does not, as in the case of freewill offerings, decide where and how his tithe should be disbursed. "They [members] are not to use it for themselves in an

emergency, nor to apply it as they see fit, even in what they may regard as the Lord's work." - Testimonies, Volume 9, p. 247. (4) God's plan is the same in every age. "A tithe of all our increase is the Lord's. He has reserved it to Himself to be employed for religious purposes. It is holy. Nothing less than this has He accepted in any dispensation." - Ellen G. White in The Review and Herald, May 16, 1882.

Ellen G. White, not unaware of her own early years of struggle, felt commissioned of God to take special notice of the needs of neglected workers, for whom there was no sustentation fund until 1911. She was "charged not to neglect or pass by those who were being wronged." See full statement in Selected Messages, volume 1, pages 33, 34. There were often cases of necessitous workers, particularly in the neglected Southern States among the Negro people in the years 1900-1906. Before the Southern Union Conference was organized, several workers went at their own expense to begin work among the Negro people, their work being recognized by the later-formed Southern Missionary Society, and listed in the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1904-1908. Mission schools and evangelistic work were undertaken with a small and temporary appropriation from a conference organization, but it was inadequate for so great a need.

In 1904 a Southern Missionary Society representative, while visiting Colorado, received $400 from one church for the evangelistic work of the society among the destitute of the Southland.

Elder W. C. White, one of Mrs. E. G. White's sons, explaining the situation years later, said:

When the agent of the Southern Missionary Society asked the members of this Colorado church for a donation, they manifested a willingness to give, and some of them said that they were paying a large tithe, and some were not wholly pleased with the way in which it was used. Compared with the population of the state the conference was strong and it had a good income. Therefore, some said, "Let us send some of our tithe to be used in the good work for the neglected colored people in the Southern States."

Then the officers of the church and the agent of the Society did in an irregular way what has since become very popular as a wise and unselfish policy when done in an orderly and regular way. They transferred a portion of the tithe of a well-to-do conference to a very destitute and needy mission field.

The officers of the Southern Missionary Society did not use this money to pay their own wages. They did not use it in any way for their own personal benefit. Neither did they pay it to the support of men whom the conferences in the South thought to be unfitted or unworthy. Neither was it paid to men who were carrying on an unauthorized work of their own devising.

The money was placed in the treasury of the Southern Missionary Society and was paid out in a regular and economical way to approved laborers who were engaged in regular denominational work. - W. C. White Statement, 1934. White Publications Document File No. 384.

When this action became known to the Colorado Conference president, he and his officers took the attitude that the receiving agent and the church concerned had acted irregularly, that the money should be returned, and they evidently talked freely and in no uncertain terms.

But the money had been used to help underpaid preachers, the society could not repay it, and the matter came to the attention of Mrs. White, who wrote the following letter to the Colorado Conference president, only a portion of which is quoted on page 109 of Walter Martin's book:

Mountain View, California
January 22, 1905

Elder

My brother, 1 wish to say to you, Be careful how you move. You are not moving wisely. The least you have to speak about the tithe that has been appropriated to the most needy and the most discouraging field in the world, the more sensible you will be.

It has been presented to me for years that my tithe was to be appropriated by myself to aid the white and colored ministers who were neglected and did not receive sufficient, properly to support their families. When my attention was called to aged ministers, white or black, it was my special duty to investigate into their necessities and supply their needs. This was to be my special work, and 1 have done this in a number of cases. No man should give notoriety to the fact that in special cases the tithe is used in that way.

In regard to the colored work in the South, that field has been and is still being robbed of the means that should come to the workers in that field. If there have been cases where our sisters have appropriated their tithe to the support of the ministers working for the colored people in the South, let every man, if he is wise, hold his peace.

I have myself appropriated my tithe to the most needy cases brought to my notice. 1 have been instructed to do this; and as the money is not withheld from the Lord's treasury, it is not a matter that should be commented upon; for it will necessitate my making known these matters, which I do not desire to do, because it is not best.

Some cases have been kept before me for years, and 1 have supplied their needs from the tithe, as God has instructed me to do. And if any person shall say to me, Sister White, will you appropriate my tithe where you know it is most needed, 1 shall say, Yes, 1 will; and I have done so. 1 commend those sisters who have placed their tithe where it is most needed to help to do a work that is being left undone; and if this matter is given publicity, it will create a knowledge which would better be left as it is. I do not care to give publicity to this work which the Lord has appointed me to do, and others to do.

I send this matter to you so that you shall not make a mistake. Circumstances alter cases. 1 would not advise that anyone should make a practice of gathering up tithe money. But for years there have now and then been persons who have lost confidence in the appropriation of the tithe who have placed their tithe in my hands, and said that if 1 did not take it they would themselves appropriate it to the families of the most needy ministers they could find. I have taken the money, given a receipt for it, and told them how it was appropriated.

1 write this to you so that you shall keep cool and not become stirred up and give publicity to this matter, lest many more shall follow their example-Ellen G. White letter 267, 1905. **[1]**

Some Conclusions

1. The date of this letter is given erroneously as 1906 in Martin's book, page 109.

It is evident that (1) In 1905 the workers in the South were in a deplorable situation; (2) Mrs. White never used the tithe, either her own or that handed to her, for any but duly accredited Seventh-day Adventist ministers; (3) Mrs. White had strong convictions regarding the work in the South, for she said, "That field has been and is still being robbed of the means that should come to the workers in that field"; (4) this was an extraordinary experience under circumstances that do not exist today, and therefore it does not warrant any irregular use of tithe money now; (5) Mrs. White did not make a habit of accepting for disbursement the tithe of private persons.

We should add that Mrs. White's letter to the conference president, quoted in the preceding paragraph, was marked on certain copies "not to be published," obviously because it was material subject to misuse. However, because of someone's lack of judgment (Walter Martin attributes it to "conflict behind the scenes," p. 111) this letter (or excerpts from it) was quite widely used, sometimes in recent years by dissident persons seeking support for movements of their own. Some have even used statements as to how she used her income and offerings to prove that tithe may be used in any desired manner.

Walter Martin (pp. 109, 110) contends that because Mrs. White in 1896 urged that all tithe money "be placed in His treasury," and then ten years later used some of her tithe for unprecedented needs, there is "contradiction," and he explains this in part by quoting from a letter written in 1881 by James White to D. M. Canright, in which "influence" is said to be used by two other workers on Mrs. White. There is no mention of tithe in this 1881 letter and most of Mrs. White's help to necessitous workers was given between 1900 and 1906 in behalf of work in the Southern States.

An expanded statement concerning Mrs. White and the tithe has been prepared by Arthur L. White, secretary, White Publications, at the request of our research committee, and a limited number of copies is available to our readers on request.

We can only add that Mrs. White's unique position among us, coupled with her solicitude for workers under unusually hard conditions, led her to do what she did, and time and the whole Adventist Church have found no insurmountable problem here. We now have a fiscal system that alleviates the problem of poor conferences and needy ministers faced by Mrs. White in earlier days. Today our work has regularized many details that inevitably appeared in a growing work, and without boastfulness we thank God for its wide diffusion in harmony with the wise counsels of Mrs. White. The man who turned so bitterly against her, D. M. Canright, made one small venture into prophecy: "Adventism is founded on time, and time will kill it." - Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 34. The seventy-odd years since that prediction appeared have seen our work expand in every part of the world. We humbly believe that time has revealed Canright's devious error, and that the Advent Movement will lead faithful souls into the everlasting kingdom at the appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ in whom all our hopes for time and eternity are centered.

12. Alleged Outside Influence on Ellen G. Mite

H. W. LOWE
Field Secretary, General Conference

ON PAGE 105 of his book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism Walter Martin says: “The second and extremely serious charge against Mrs. White ... relates to her inspiration. The claim is that at times she was under influences other than the Spirit of God, which influences strongly affected some of her ‘Testimonies.’ ”

The “influences,” he said, were not demonic, but the human influence of certain strong-minded “older persons surrounding her.” He then takes the specific instance of the founding of the Battle Creek Health Reform Institute and seeks to show “her fallibility and the futility of Adventism attempting to defend everything she wrote as divinely inspired, as some have been prone to do” (page 108).

We may dismiss any implied claim of infallibility, partly because Martin himself admits that only “some” Adventists have made it, but mainly because this denomination has not claimed, and does not now claim, infallibility for Mrs. White. Walter Martin admits the falsity of the charge of infallibility (pp. 112, 113). For that matter, it would be easy to prove that the inspired prophets of the Bible were not infallible (see 2 Samuel 7:3-5; Galatians 2:11). However, supposed disproof of inspiration is now circulated, and we must examine it. Our readers would do well to read Nichol, “A Middle Position on Inspiration, Ellen G. White and Her Critics, pp. 459-467.

The events involved in this charge happened between 1865 and 1867. When we draw conclusions and make serious personal charges based on events that are almost a hundred years old we need to be sure that we understand as clearly as possible the background of events in which the persons involved lived their lives.

The Civil War Years

The tragic Civil War brought problems for the Adventists, especially in the winter of 1864-65. Numerous calls for men for the Army finally brought President Lincoln’s summons for another 300,000, with the stipulation that any deficiency in volunteers was to be made good by a draft in 1865.

Seventh-day Adventists had found Army life very difficult to harmonize with their religious convictions (see Testimonies, Volume 1, p. 361). And Elder James White was worn out with helping men in trouble and with raising money for compulsory bonus funds with which men were exempted from Army service, in addition to his other heavy duties. Heavy traveling under the arduous conditions of those times brought him to complete exhaustion, and on the morning of August 16, 1865, he suffered a paralytic stroke, and “attending physicians declared that unless a miracle were wrought in his behalf, lie would never regain either his physical or mental vigor.”-D. E. ROBINSON, The Story of Our Health Message, p. 134.

Two other stalwart leaders of the small Adventist community fell ill at this time-i. N. Loughborough and Uriah Smith. All three, with Mrs. White, moved as soon as they could to a private institution, “Our Home” in Dansville, New York, and placed themselves under the skillful care of a certain Dr. Jackson. This robbed the Adventists of their financial leader in the person of James White, their editor, Uriah Smith, and a vigorous promoter in J. N. Loughborough.

The Health Institute

On December 25, 1865, Mrs. White had a vision at Rochester, from which we take this apposite quotation:

“1 was shown that we should provide a home for the afflicted, and those who wish to learn how to take care of their bodies that they may prevent sickness.” - Testimonies, Volume 1, p. 489.

The whole vision is recorded in Testimonies, volume 1, pages 485-495. In general, it visualized the establishment of a health “institution of their own,” and the development of medical health work by Seventh-day Adventists as a regular part of their work. There can be no doubt that as a result of following

this and subsequent counsel on the subject, the medical and health work of this denomination has grown till today it operates 221 hospitals and clinics, employs 11,557 doctors, nurses, and other workers, not to mention scores of private institutions throughout the world.

No one could have foreseen, in that day of small things, to what large enterprises and endeavors the instruction given in the vision of December 25, 1865, would lead. The Story of Our Health Message, p. 142.

The Situation in 1865-66

In addition to the health breakdowns already referred to among the pitifully small ministerial working force, John Bostwick of Minnesota died, and D. T. Bourdeau, A. S. Hutchins, J. B. Frisbie, and John Byington were all incapacitated by ill health during the year ending in the spring of 1866.

The vision of 1865 was presented in substance to the third General Conference session in 1866 (four months after its reception), but it was not committed to writing till 1867. In September, 1866, five acres of land, with a good house on it, was purchased in Battle Creek, Michigan. A few weeks later two adjoining acres and another cottage were purchased, and some reconstructions completed. Great zeal was engendered and the institution was opened. Initially, everything looked prosperous, but soon it became evident to some that the financial situation of the institution was not sound.

Elder James White, indicated above as the business brain among the leaders, was sorely missed. In these circumstances the men on the spot greatly wished that Mrs. White's as-yet unpublished vision of 1865 might be used to encourage liberality toward the little institution.

Some of the leaders at Battle Creek urged Mrs. White to place in writing the revelation given to her on December 25, 1865, regarding a health reform institute. It was naturally felt that the publication of this vision without delay would greatly aid in raising money needed for the Institute. She responded by writing out part of that revelation, and this was included as a chapter for Testimony No. 11, bearing the title "The Health Reform." This was published in January, 1867 - F. D. NICHOL, Ellen G. White and Her Critics, p. 497.

It appears from subsequent events that Mrs. White issued this part of Testimony No. 11 reluctantly.

Mrs. White's testimony gave great impetus to the work, and soon E. S. Walker, the secretary, and some associates were promoting a new "large building," and the impression was created that Mrs. White endorsed ambitious enlargements. Actually in August, 1867, less than a year after the opening of the institution, funds were exhausted. James White, though out of Battle Creek during most of 1867, endorsed Mrs. White's testimony but saw no justification in it for inexperienced leadership to launch into enthusiastic but over ambitious expansion at that time when finances were inadequate.

Then Mrs. White issued Testimony No. 12 in September, 1867, in the course of which she said:

"I was shown ... that we should have such an institution, small at its commencement, and cautiously increased, as good physicians and helpers could be procured.... And as I have seen the large calculations hastily urged by those who have taken a leading part in the work, 1 have felt alarmed, and in many private conversations and in letters I have warned these brethren to move cautiously." - Testimonies, Volume 1, p. 558.

Mrs. White then spells out the reasons for caution-failure to obtain competent physicians and the lack of income and patients to fill a large institution, with resultant "general discouragement." There had been many failures of health institutions in the United States during the previous twenty five years.

In the above circumstances it is not surprising to learn that drastic action was undertaken, largely at Elder White's insistence. Building came to a halt, and certain structural work was torn down. The value of this work has been variously estimated to have been as low as $4,000, and by certain critics as high as $11,000. (See F. D. Nichol's Mrs. White and Her Critics, p. 498.)

Mrs. White's Confession

In reference to the reluctance of Mrs. White to write out part of Testimony No. 11, we here quote her own words:

This was a great trial to me, as 1 knew I could not write out all I had seen, for I was then speaking to the people six or eight times a week, visiting from house to house, and writing hundreds of pages of

personal testimonies and private letters. This amount of labor, with unnecessary burdens and trials thrown upon me, unfitted me for labor of any kind. My health was poor, and my mental sufferings were beyond description. Under these circumstances 1 yielded my judgment to that of others, and wrote what appeared in No. 11 in regard to the Health Institute, being unable then to give all I had seen. In this I did wrong-Testimonies, Volume 1, p. 563. (Italics supplied.)

In the light of later events, she admitted:

What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute, should not have been given until 1 was able to write out all 1 had seen in regard to it-Ibid.

This is a frank confession of human fallibility in actions which she did not claim were taken under direct orders from God. She candidly said that despite criticism of which she was aware on this subject-

"1 have no desire to withdraw one sentence that 1 have written or spoken." - Ibid., p. 559.

What Mrs. White meant when she said "all 1 had seen" was, as F. D. Nichol has clearly shown in Ellen G. White and Her Critics, the whole revelation of the plan to establish the health institution. What she meant by "I did wrong" appears surely to be her human action in writing out a part only of Testimony No. 11 instead of releasing the whole. Her basic presentation was not wrong, and she nowhere repudiates her original position.

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. (Italics supplied.)

As to whether the dominating influence in this health institute incident was the strong will of Elder James White, as Martin suggests, or the inspiration which Mrs. White claimed to have received from God, we have an Ellen G. White letter written in 1903 from which we quote these words:

"1 have been thinking of how, after we began sanitarium work in Battle Creek, sanitarium buildings all ready for occupation were shown to me in vision. The Lord instructed me as to the way in which the work in these buildings should be conducted in order for it to exert a saving influence on the patients."

"All this seemed very real to me, but when I awoke I found that the work was yet to be done, that there were no buildings erected."

"Another time I was shown a large building going up on the site on which the Battle Creek Sanitarium was afterward erected. The brethren were in great perplexity as to who should take charge of the work. 1 wept sorely. One of authority stood up among us, and said, "Not yet. You are not ready to invest means in that building, or to plan for its future management."

"At the time the foundation of the Sanitarium had been laid. But we needed to learn the lesson of waiting." - Messenger to the Remnant, pp. 10, 11.

This is Mrs. Mite's record made years afterward as to the source of her counsels on this question. Yet our friend Martin would ask us to reject her words, written toward the close of her days, and to believe that James White and "the Battle Creek clique" made "Mrs. White contradict herself in successive Testimonies" (page 110).

Inspiration and Fallibility

When the inspired apostle Paul preached "the gospel of the non circumcision" and the inspired apostle Peter preached "the gospel of the circumcision," one of them was right and one was wrong. Peter rightly associated with the heathen but wrongly withdrew when the Jerusalem leaders arrived (see Acts 10:28). When they eventually met in Antioch, Paul said: "I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Galatians 2:11). The RSV says, "He stood condemned," and Phillips, "He was then plainly in the wrong." J. B. Phillips, The New Testament in Modern English. Copyright 1958, by The Macmillan Company. Used by permission.

If we could with reverence put words into Peter's mouth, would they not be a candid confession in these words: "I did wrong"? This is not to compare Mrs. White with an apostle, but it is a plain acknowledgment that a God-chosen instrument may be inspired in writing, teaching, preaching, exhorting, but humanly fallible in the exercise of private judgment. Prophets, apostles, saints, messengers, need redemptive grace in their daily lives in exactly the same way as does every humble servant of God.

In 2 Corinthians 12:13 Paul asks: "What is it wherein you were inferior to other churches?" The context shows that if the Corinthians were made to feel subordinate to the other churches, it was because

they had not fulfilled the duty of entertaining the apostle, as did the other churches. Then, with delicate touch he adds: “Forgive me this wrong.” Surely this was a strong statement for so great a leader. This is another illustration of the fact that a man can be God’s inspired messenger to the church and yet be touched with human frailty and fallibility in certain details of daily conduct.

The same truth is seen in the Old Testament. For instance, in 2 Samuel 7:2, 3, it is apparent that David expressed to the prophet Nathan his intention to build a house of worship, whereupon “Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in your heart; for the Lord is with thee.” That night, however, “the word of the Lord came unto Nathan” with a command to go to David with a message which plainly contradicted the prophet’s previous word. Not David, but his son should build God’s house (verses 5-13). Nathan’s mistake did not invalidate his prophetic office.

The truth is seen again that God’s prophets, holy men, apostles, teachers, and special messengers all through the ages have not possessed divine prescience, except in the special area of supernatural revelation. Elsewhere they were fallible human subjects of redeeming grace. We must not make inspiration what has been called an “overloaded doctrine” which requires a mechanical infallibility in both word and life, or we shall find ourselves in a worse position than when Athenagoras, the second-century apologist, claimed that the inspired writers of Holy Writ were used by the Holy Spirit “as a flute player breathes into a flute.” - A Plea for the Christians, chap. ix.

We agree with Walter Martin that “no one can dispute the fact that her writings conform to the basic principles of the historic Gospel.” (page 113), and that “Mrs. White was truly a regenerate Christian woman who loved the Lord Jesus Christ and dedicated herself unstintingly to the task of bearing witness for Him as she felt led” (page 112). Furthermore “We believe that her writings will offer their own testimony to those who are willing to read and to consider the fruitage produced by them over a hundred years of time” (Ellen G. White and Her Critics, p. 85). That she was inspired to exalt God’s Word before her hearers and readers, and to guide earnest souls into the way everlasting.

13. The Hour of God's judgment Is Come

EDWARD HEPPENSTALL
Professor of Systematic Theology, Andrews University

I. Importance of the Heavenly Sanctuary

WHEN SCRIPTURE PORTRAYS either in fact or in symbol the progress of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, between the genuine and the counterfeit, the heavenly sanctuary and Christ’s ministration therein occupy a central place. As the controversy draws to its climax, the sanctuary and its ministration hold the spotlight. In Satan’s endeavor to overthrow God, the point of attack is upon God’s sanctuary and His throne.

As one studies the controversy between good and evil forces in the eighth chapter of Daniel, two things relative to the sanctuary and its ministration are indicated.

First, up until the close of the 2300-year prophecy, 1844, men’s understanding of Christ’s priestly ministration in the heavenly sanctuary had been seriously impaired in its effectiveness on the earth at the hands of Satan’s counterfeit priestly system. Describing the nefarious work of the little horn against the sanctuary of God, the Scripture declares, “by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down” (verse 11).

Second, the Scripture further declares that this will not always be so. So compelling is the work of this counterfeit system that the all-important question is asked, “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?” (verse 13). There will come a change at the close of the 2300-year period, in 1844, declares the Scripture. “Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed- (margin, “justified”). “Then shall the sanctuary be restored to its rightful state” (RSV).

At that time, then, things will come to pass that will restore the ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary to its rightful place as God brings the great controversy to a victorious climax.

Since Scripture is so specific and final in its declaration, it is important that we grasp the significance of the work of the heavenly sanctuary in the closing work of God. Daniel pictures the work of

restoration of the heavenly sanctuary as an essential part of God's closing work of redemption and judgment.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from Daniel 8:11-14 is that beginning in 1844 something of supreme importance is to take place relative to the work of Christ in the, heavenly sanctuary; that now in the time of the end, this sanctuary ministration is to play a leading part in bringing about the consummation of all things. When the spotlight of prophecy focuses attention upon the heavenly sanctuary in connection with this great time prophecy, are we now to dismiss the whole thing by declaring that nothing new is happening, and take for granted that things continue simply as they were since Christ ascended? Should not our attention be drawn to the sanctuary in heaven, where, we believe, God has now some significant revelation to give to us? Since God in prophecy has indicated the significance of the heavenly sanctuary, we must follow Christ's ministry there.

Should not this very prophecy and the sanctuary emphasis lead us at once to consider all that is revealed about the sanctuary? There is very little said in this chapter in Daniel as to the meaning and nature of this "cleansing," this 'Justification," this "restoring." All the passage says is that at a certain time in God's great calendar of celestial events the heavenly sanctuary will come into focus in a way that should arrest the attention of all. We are thus invited to bring into focus everything we find in the Scripture on the sanctuary, especially as it pertains to the closing work of God in heaven and on the earth.

The Word of God speaks of only two sanctuaries: one on earth and the other in heaven; one in type and the other the antitype. They both teach that the central truth and activity of the sanctuary is that of the mediatorial ministration of our great High Priest; that this ministration is twofold, spoken of as the "daily" and the "yearly," or day of atonement.

Other prophecies also focus attention upon the heavenly sanctuary, showing that the ministration of Christ holds the key to the consummation of the great controversy, how it is to be brought about, and what the outcome will be. That the sanctuary and Christ's ministration should hold the spotlight is at once obvious; for here we see the work of atonement, redemption, judgment; in a word, here is the answer to the whole sin problem, and how that problem is to be resolved. Can there be any greater issue for men and women to understand than this? Can we concentrate our attention upon anything greater than that which resolves the terrible problem of sin that has gripped this world for almost six thousand years and threatened the very security of the universe? If there is one question men want answered, it is the sin problem. Solve this and everything is solved. It is no wonder that other prophecies in the books of Daniel and the Revelation center in the activity of God from His throne in the heavenly sanctuary.

The prophecy of Daniel 7 gives a sweep of world kingdoms and events down to the end of time. What is the divine answer to the dominion of world powers and the little horn? Where is the solution to be found?

At once the prophecy takes us into the heavenly sanctuary, to the throne of God. There it is in the work of judgment at the throne that the issue is decided and God is triumphant over His enemies.

Daniel 11 and 12 show the rise and fall of worldly kingdoms, the consequent rise and power of the papacy in its attack upon the truth of God revealed in the sanctuary, upon God Himself, even to the time of the end. What is the divine answer to this? It is the standing up of Michael in the heavenly sanctuary for the deliverance of God's people following the declaration that "at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." (Chapter 12:1).

In Revelation 4-7 we are taken immediately into the throne room of the heavenly sanctuary. The prophet John beholds the same judgment scene that Daniel saw in chapter 7, the setting up of the great heavenly assize in the heavenly sanctuary, the opening of the books of judgment that is so decisive for the destiny of the saints of God. It is here only that we see that in the sealing of the true saints it is God alone who knows and decides cases. Nowhere else can this be done, either by the Roman Catholic Church or any other church.

Before the angels are commissioned to sound the seven trumpets, and before the trumpets can sound, John is shown an angel inside the heavenly sanctuary, who fills the golden censer with fire and casts it unto the earth (Revelation 8). It is the action in heaven that determines the action on the earth.

The sounding of the seventh trumpet (Revelation 11:15-19) ushers in the rule of Christ. But dominion and glory are declared first in the heavenly sanctuary, as in Daniel 7:13, 14, Christ receives this dominion here before it is realized upon the earth. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord.... And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God and their seats [thrones], fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, 0 Lord God Almighty, which art, and was, and art to come; because thou has taken to thee thy great power, and has reigned.... And the temple of God

was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament" (Revelation 11:15-19).

Revelation, chapter 10, is a chapter of superlatives connected with the finishing of the mystery of God on the earth. Wherein lies the answer to the bitter experience with the little book that so affects the proclamation of the final message to the world? In chapter 11:1,2, John is commanded to "rise, and measure the temple [naos, the inner part of the heavenly sanctuary] of God and them that worship therein." Again, it is the sanctuary that holds the key, the understanding of God's work in the sanctuary that holds the secret of what these prophecies mean and what will be the destiny of God's work in the earth.

Revelation 14 graphically portrays the last threefold message to the world, which is to usher in the return of our Lord; the time has come for the harvest of the earth to be reaped. Two harvests are set forth, the harvest of the righteous and of the wicked. How are these determined? From what place does the command go forth and the work of harvest proceed? It is from the sanctuary in heaven that all this action proceeds: "And another angel came out of the temple" (verses 15, 18). The subsequent action that takes place upon the earth is always preceded by the action of God from His throne in the heavenly sanctuary.

Likewise the judgment of God upon the nations in the seven last plagues pictured in Revelation 15 and 16 is directed from God's throne in the heavenly sanctuary (chapters 15:5, 6, 8; 16:5).

Revelation 19 pictures the time for the marriage of the Lamb (Christ) to His bride (the church). Christ is pictured as coming forth to receive His bride; from whence does He come? What is the signal for this glorious event? The declaration is made from the heavenly sanctuary – "his wife hath made herself ready" (verse 7). How is this known? Where can such a truth be discovered? How is this readiness determined? Only from God's throne, which is in the heavenly sanctuary. This marks the focal point in Christ's final activities at the end of the world. The heavenly sanctuary has revealed and declared the readiness of the bride; the Lord arises from His throne and prepares Himself to come for her. He will ride forth to exert His power and dominion; He will bring to pass all His promises and cherished hopes relative to His people.

One does not need to be an expert theologian to recognize the remarkable significance and importance of the heavenly sanctuary in the consummation of the great controversy. If one believes the word of God revealed in the books of Daniel and the Revelation, then the central feature of God's sanctuary and His ministration is obvious. Revelation is the book of the Lamb; but the Lamb is not upon the cross. He is on the throne in the heavenly sanctuary (Revelation 5:6). "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life" (Romans 5: 10). "We might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entered into that within the veil. Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (Hebrews 6: 18-20).

It is this truth concerning Christ's ministration in the sanctuary that was obscured by the counterfeit system of the little horn during the period of papal supremacy. But now the full message of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary is to be restored and proclaimed.

If one wishes to understand the whole truth about God's plan of redemption from the entrance of sin to the ultimate destruction of it, one has only to study God's work in the sanctuary in heaven and in the type here on earth. There is no mistaking its message, its completeness, and its significance. Satan's purpose becomes clear in his attack upon and opposition to the work of the heavenly sanctuary. Here we understand the utmost of satanic opposition to God through the centuries in his counterfeit system, his insistent attempt to obscure the work of the sanctuary and its place in the plan of redemption.

At the same time, it becomes equally clear how necessary and indispensable to the finishing of the work of God is the restoration of the truth about Christ's sanctuary ministration. Ellen G. White states that the sanctuary "opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God's hand had directed the great Advent Movement." - The Great Controversy, p. 423. It "is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men."-Ibid., p. 488. No revelation of truth has received greater opposition from Satan than this. For it is here that the issues are laid bare and decided; it is here that Christ receives dominion, glory, and a kingdom. It is here that the throne of God is seen in proper perspective.

Seventh-day Adventists believe that the sanctuary truths provide the solution to the sin problem, that the ministration of Christ from the throne is essential in resolving this terrible sin tragedy, and that it is the natural consequence of the death of Christ upon the cross. This is not in any way to deny the complete atonement for sin made once for all at the cross. We do recognize that following the work of Christ on earth there is another vitally important work in heaven before the sin problem can be resolved. Adventists anticipate the glorious consummation of the work of God in this generation. We see not all things put under

the feet of Christ; we still see that the complete solution to the sin problem has not been brought about. We believe that this is the hour when the controversy between Christ and Satan will be intensified, but it will end in glorious victory for our Lord. Adventists believe that in this great conflict the answer can be found in the work of Christ from the heavenly sanctuary and nowhere else.

We feel that Walter Martin, in his criticism of Adventists on this point, while emphasizing our position concerning the work of Christ on the cross relative to the atonement for sin, has not given proper place and consideration to the full work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Any correct interpretation of the Adventist position must be understood in the light of this over-all divine program for the complete solution of the sin problem.

II. The Judgment in Prophecy and Doctrine

We are concerned in particular with the Adventist interpretation of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary since 1844. Two questions need to be resolved: First, is there a judgment going on now which began in 1844? and second, what is the nature and scope of this judgment?

During the past two years in particular the judgment concept as held by Seventh-day Adventists has come tinder severe criticism, with particular emphasis upon our interpretation of Daniel 8:14 and Revelation 14:7. Adventists declare that these texts show that beginning in 1844 the hour of God's judgment began. We have interpreted this judgment with specific reference to two things: First, a work that is going on now in the heavenly sanctuary; and second, that this judgment concerns the saints of all ages, at which time their cases will finally be decided before the court of heaven.

In his recent book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, Walter Martin seeks to refute the Adventist position. He writes as follows:

"But the Adventists' error is that they draw from the Scriptures interpretations which cannot be substantiated by exegesis but rest largely upon inference and deduction, drawn from theological applications of their own design." - Page 176.

Seventh-day Adventists, relying upon Daniel 8:14, Daniel 7:9, 10, Revelation 14:7 and 11:18, which refer to "judgment," and "books," attempt to "prove" that the investigative judgment is meant, but examination of each of these texts in context reveals the paucity of the claim. None of these texts has anything to do with any judgment now going on.... It is significant that non-Adventist Biblical scholars have never allowed these so-called 'investigative judgment' interpretations, because there is no Scriptural warrant for them apart from implication and inference." Page 180.

Adventists, in the opinion of conservative Biblical scholars, not to mention the liberal wing of Protestantism, are only speculating with their sanctuary and investigative judgment theories. Actually, most are agreed that they have created doctrines to compensate for errors in prophetic interpretation. . . . Seventh-day Adventists, we believe, needlessly subscribe to a doctrine which neither solves their difficulties nor engenders peace of mind. Holding as they do to the doctrine of the Investigative judgment, it is extremely difficult for us to understand how they can experience the joy of salvation and the knowledge of sins forgiven. - Pages 182, 183.

Is there a judgment now going on which began in 1844? Is there scriptural warrant for this? What is the message of the prophecies of the book of Revelation? Two words give us the basis for a proper interpretation of these prophecies for the last days: redemption and judgment. As one studies the book it seems that God's work in heaven during the time of the end is largely a work of judgment. Furthermore, all judgment is seen proceeding from the throne room of the heavenly sanctuary, from the temple (Greek-naos) (Revelation 8; 9:11-21; 17; 18; 20). Revelation is a book that deals largely with events that are to happen in connection with the consummation of the great controversy between Christ and Satan. In the broadest sense God's work of judgment is His work of bringing to consummation His work on earth, His divine activity in the heavenly sanctuary whether it pertains to His own people, the nations of the world, or Satan and his counterfeit system.

Much of the work of judgment is revealed as taking place prior to the second coming of Christ; in fact, this work of judgment is essential if the return of our Lord is to be realized. Without this work of judgment from the throne of God, there can be no end to the present reign. Certain aspects of the judgment make it possible for Christ to proclaim Himself as Lord of lords and King of kings. Once this is understood, then the various phases of the work of judgment can be correctly placed. Evidently this is the intent of the passage in Revelation 14:6-14, where the work of judgment, the hour of God's judgment, is pictured as

prior to the Second Advent and leading up to it.

Why does Scripture set forth so much of the work of God from the throne room of the heavenly sanctuary after 1844 as a work of judgment? Obviously, God's purpose is that the attention of men everywhere shall be called to this unique work of the high-priestly ministration of Christ, that it is to God on His throne we must look for the consummation of all things. What happens on the earth is not isolated from God's work in heaven. What is taking place to usher in the consummation of all things is directly related to and is the result of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary. The prophecies relating to the time of the end are now being fulfilled because our blessed Lord is now directing all these things from His throne.

Seventh-day Adventists insist that the knowledge of the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary during this time of the end is imperative to the proper understanding of the closing scenes of the great controversy between Christ and Satan.

If God intends to bring the world to an end in our day through His work of judgment and redemption, and if the books of Daniel and Revelation present to us the sublime prophecies of this last hour, then it is of paramount importance that men everywhere know it. This work of Christ in bringing all this about is, in the books of Daniel and Revelation, declared to be God's work of judgment. That is the reason these books are full of such a message. The hour of judgment is the time of decision and finality, when the cases of men and of nations are determined by the great judge of the universe. This requires activity both in heaven and on the earth. The day in which we live is a day of final reckoning for all.

This hour of God's judgment, prior to the Second Advent, is graphically portrayed in Daniel, chapter 7. The sequence of events shows the rise of the four great world kingdoms Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. These are followed by the appearance of the mystery of iniquity, the little horn in its attack upon God, upon His truth and His law, upon the sanctuary, and upon the saints of God. This work of the little horn is pictured at the height of its power as continuing until the close of the 1260 days, that is, until 1798. What happens then? God's answer to all this is in His work of judgment. Three times in this chapter the work of judgment from the throne room of the heavenly sanctuary is pictured as following almost immediately upon the period of papal supremacy (Daniel 7:9, 10, 21, 22, 25, 26). There can be no mistaking the significance of this work of judgment prior to the Second Advent. This is the hour when God will set His throne in the heavenly sanctuary in a great heavenly assize that will determine the destiny of the great controversy.

The historical sequence of Daniel 7 shows the earthly powers in opposition to God, holding sway over the kingdoms of the earth, exercising dominion over the minds and hearts of men. As the drama unfolds we see this dominion passing from the powers of the world and Satan back to Christ, the rightful ruler. How this is brought about is declared in Scripture to be God's work of judgment. Throughout the greater part of the conflict between truth and error it appears that the saints are being overthrown, that oppression is too great for them to survive; even the truth and the law of God are being trampled underfoot. Everywhere it appears that the forces of evil are in the supremacy; then comes a dramatic change. A scene is pictured in heaven; the court of judgment is established. God is seated on His throne, and the judgment begins. Events occur both in heaven and on earth as a result of this supreme work of judgment. God now breaks into the world order from His throne room in the heavenly sanctuary. Hitherto the work has been limited to the work of redemption, but now the work of judgment is added. judgment is declared and given against the little horn and the opposing powers in favor of the saints. The throne of God is established by His work of judgment; God's throne is vindicated and justified in all its sovereign ministration. In the process the opposing powers are condemned and ultimately destroyed, while "the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom(verse 22).

That this judgment is not an action which has been continuously in progress during the dominion of these earthly kingdoms is evident from the fact that not until the work of the little horn has held sway for 1260 years is the work of judgment said to begin. The fact that there is a sequence in the rise and development and overthrow of the kingdoms of the world proves that this judgment is part of that same sequence of time.

Daniel 7:9, 10 states: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down [placed], and the Ancient of days [God the Father] did sit.... The judgment was set, and the books were opened." There was a time when those thrones of judgment were not placed, when the books were not opened, when they were not in use for this purpose of judgment. In the sequence of the events of this chapter there is a time when this judgment would begin. If there is any importance to the sequence of the four beasts, the ten kingdoms, and the little horn-if one nation is to follow the one previously mentioned-then it follows that this great judgment scene in heaven must follow the period of papal supremacy. If each of these events in the chapter are events in

time, then so is the judgment.

The nature of this judgment embraces judgment upon the little horn, but it also is judgment in favor of the saints. The work of judgment is pictured as taking place in the heavenly sanctuary and is concerned not with a limited aspect but with the total picture as it brings to a climax the great controversy. The ultimate issue is the triumph of God, the utter discomfiture of the enemies of God, the decision by this heavenly assize against the powers of darkness and in favor of the saints of God.

The purpose of this is described in verse 10 as a work of judgment, and in verse 14 as issuing in the establishment of the dominion of Christ over all peoples and the ushering in of the kingdom of glory.

The very fact that reference is made to the opening of the books points to a consideration in the judgment of carefully kept records. All this is necessary before Christ claims dominion and the kingdom from His Father. The central issue in this work of judgment is the establishment of Christ's sovereign rule over all the earth, the triumph of the saints, and the overthrow of the kingdom of darkness.

Obviously, in such a work of judgment that decides in favor of the saints and establishes the dominion of Christ, both sides of the controversy are to be seen in proper perspective. It could not be otherwise. When the Bible speaks of the investigative judgment, it does not set them (the saints) forth in isolation; always they are seen within the perspective of the world conflict and the total judgment. Even the judgment that vindicates the very God of heaven is seen in this light. It is the restricted concept that often throws the picture out of focus and gives ground for criticism of our position. Once it is seen that there is a great heavenly assize convening in the heavenly sanctuary, and that this began shortly after the period of papal supremacy, it is imperative that we come to understand the nature of that judgment. The very fact that parallel pictures of this judgment are found in other chapters in Daniel and Revelation gives us every reason to believe that this work of judgment, prior to the return of our Lord, is one of the most important aspects of the last message to the world. That men should know and believe that this time in which we live is the supreme hour of God's judgment for all, is as essential as any vital truth revealed in the Bible. It is unfortunate that men like Walter Martin dismiss the possibility of a judgment now going on, because they have not yet grasped the total judgment picture the Seventh-day Adventists believe is found in the Bible. If these time prophecies do not indicate that at the close of these periods there is to begin in heaven a great work of judgment not previously in function, then how does one explain all these references to the work of judgment and the heavenly sanctuary?

14. God's judgment Is Come

EDWARD HEPPENSTALL
Professor of Systematic Theology, Andrews University

THE ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION of the judgment of Revelation 14:7 has emphasized in particular that phase known as the investigative judgment of the saints. But does the hour of God's judgment have yet a wider scope? Does the period beginning in 1844 have universal significance in terms of judgment? What does God mean by it? Exactly what is embraced in this judgment? Is it concerned only with the saints and nothing more?

It is interesting to note that in the succeeding chapters of the book of Revelation following verse seven of the fourteenth chapter, time and again the work of God's judgments is referred to. God is proclaimed worthy and righteous because His 'Judgments are made manifest" (Revelation 15:4). "Thou art righteous, 0 Lord, which art, and was, and shall be, because thou has judged thus" (Revelation 16:5). "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments" (verse 7). "After these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God: for true and righteous are his judgments (Revelation 19:1, 2). "1 saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he does judge and make war" (verse 11).

The prophet John uses the word hour quite frequently in these latter chapters of the book of Revelation. By it he points to that essential time and part of Christ's ministration which brings to a close the reign of sin on the earth and establishes the reign of righteousness. The question is: Does God intend that in addition to the investigative judgment concept we should see still more of God's work of judgment prior to the consummation of all things? There is no contradiction of our previous position, but a widening of the perspective. Is this what God has in mind when He sets forth again and again His work of judgment

from the heavenly sanctuary in connection with the final message to the world prior to His second advent?

Obviously, from the book of Revelation, God's work of judgment does not cease until all things are subjected unto Him, until all sin is overcome and eliminated. For judgment is the work of God in these last days, through the millennium, and at its close, by which our Lord and our God and the saints of God of all ages are fully vindicated before the entire universe. And it is because the final work of Christ from the sanctuary accomplishes all this that it is called the work of judgment. Is it not this that restores the sanctuary and the throne of God to its rightful place?

It is important to notice that the central issue in all these scriptures concerned with the work of judgment is the justification and vindication of God, not of man. The great concern is that God is declared righteous. Only as this becomes true can the saints be proclaimed righteous. It is the vindication of God and His throne that alone guarantees the triumph and vindication of the believer.

The Hebrew meaning and the Revised Standard Version translation of Daniel 8:14 take on a wider significance in the light of this picture. Actually, Daniel 8:14 is concerned with the justification of God and His sanctuary. In this chapter it is the little horn that has defiled the sanctuary, trodden down God's law, blasphemed His name and character, and persecuted God's people. So terrible has been its power that it appears that the advantage is with Satan and his system. But the prophecy declares that at the end of the 2300 days, beginning in 1844, the judgments of God will be manifest as seen in the book of Revelation. All opposition and counterfeits in this last great struggle will be overthrown. God and His people will be vindicated.

One of the main causes of difficulty in Biblical interpretation is that the great issues of salvation, judgment, and the kingdom of God, the great controversy between Christ and Satan, are constantly being treated amateurishly and superficially. We narrow the work of God to this little world and from the perspective of our own personal piety. We treat the great themes of God, apart from universal or eternal perspectives, with little more than a parochial range of concern.

But if one reads the books of Daniel and Revelation aright, the great controversy incites questions and thinking from the standpoint of God's grasp of the universal issues. The inability to grasp the universal issues may lead to an ecclesiastical egoism' a naive and tacit assumption that God has no more to do than defend as an apologist the limited views held by His people. It is easy to become egotistic in one's religion, to believe that the only question is whether God loves me and mine. The real issue is whether God, through His work of salvation and judgment, has the power to subdue all things to Himself, including, our own hearts and minds, and to restore the absolute sovereignty of God throughout the universe, to make His throne forever secure. We all triumph or perish by this.

"Then comes the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he bath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Corinthians 15:24, 25).

Seventh-day Adventists have no final destiny but to share in bringing about the ultimate sovereignty of God in the world. Ours is no policy of entrenchment, maintaining the status quo. We all need God's perspective and a personal concern for the establishment of the worship of our righteous God everywhere. The tendency is to spend our time and energy on minor matters. The result is a so-called Christian life that lacks the victorious note of our victorious Christ.

Just what is the central issue in God's work from the throne room in the heavenly sanctuary? Is it God's minute investigation of His redeemed saints? True, it is this, butt it is much more than this. Is it not in His own self-vindication, the establishment of His throne?

Times without number Ellen G. White has made clear the issue. The issue was joined back in eternity when Satan charged God with being unjust; when Satan proceeded to show that the principles of God's throne were unfair and untenable; that he had a plan based on his own principles by which he would overthrow the throne of God and establish his throne above the stars of God. This issue is not something done in a corner, for when the issue was joined, the universe took sides. A tremendous number of the angelic host joined the opposition, to threaten the very existence and security of the throne of God.

The books of Daniel and Revelation reveal that the issue is fought over and from the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary. The Christian church has not grasped seriously enough the tremendous scope of the controversy that is now coming to a close through the work of God from His throne. Is it any wonder that Ellen G. White declares that the sanctuary truth is the central pillar of the Adventist faith? This church owes its power and message to the revelation of the work of God as ministered from the sanctuary above. We as Adventists have the right to expect power and strength from God, not as we have pride of church and creed and accomplishment, but only as we become instruments of God in helping to bring about

this glorious consummation by enlightening the world on the sanctuary truth.

The purpose of God from His throne is something more than to check up on His children here below. We are now being confronted with a far more terrible power of evil than we ever anticipated. The salvation of men and the triumph of God will be realized when we grasp and share with God the real issues involved and commit ourselves to the action of God now taking place in the sanctuary. The work of the church in Christ is not simply to justify men but to bring about the vindication of God and His character.

We speak of the investigation of the saints, and rightly so; but it is the final account that God gives of Himself in relation to His work of judgment and salvation that brings about the final consummation. The cry to God of saints and angels in the book of Revelation is "Worthy, worthy is the Lamb." This response is not born of something within ourselves. It is God's triumph, God's vindication of His way with man, with rebellious angels, and with Satan that elicits the grand response of all created beings to worship God, our Creator, and Him alone. The climax of all this controversy is set forth in the great convulsive judgments beginning with the time of the end; it is this revelation of God's final movements from His throne that is the key factor in the triumph of God and of the saints.

We need the sanctuary truth to show that the main issue in the controversy is within the plan and government of God, connected with the sovereignty of His throne. We are thereby invited to discard superficial solutions, easy beliefs, and lukewarm procedures. If we win it will be because we are caught up with God into His grand action for the consummation of the conflict.

Much of the present-day Protestant religion is concerned with the subjective, with emotionalism and human sentiment. It has lost the grasp of the total situation from God's point of view for this hour of destiny. The total alienation of Satan from every soul, angel, or man; the victory of Christ's righteousness; the vindication of God; and the restitution of all things is the final goal of this generation and of this church.

Before this is achieved, the most terrible struggle will ensue. Satan will make his final bid with a religious world dictatorship in an endeavor to justify his ruler ship. He himself will be "converted, after the modern order of things" (The Great Controversy, p. 588). There will be a great religious revival, a counterfeit revival that will bring in a counterfeit millennium upon the earth (Ibid., pp. 464, 588, 589).

Great catastrophes are now impending for the world. This is the hour of God's judgment, a day of judgment for the world, as well as for the church. How foolish it is to study the books of Daniel and Revelation and still believe that this world can escape the hour of God's judgment-such convictions are born out of the arguments of men. It is only as men grasp the activity of God from His throne in heaven that they can fulfill God's divine destiny for their own lives. The ground of our hope is in divine Scripture, the revelation of God guiding the affairs of men from His throne.

We know from this sanctuary truth that the justification of God, the vindication of God, is not to be found in some religious revival that will embrace the world in a happy state and usher in the millennium. It is to be found in the action of God from His throne, in His judgments, and His redemption, in the catastrophic ending of the world in the midst of the most severe crisis the world has ever seen.

The aim of the great rebel has ever been to justify himself, and to prove the divine government responsible for the rebellion. To this end he has bent all the power of his giant intellect. He has worked deliberately and systematically, and with marvelous success, leading vast multitudes to accept his version of the great controversy which has been so long in progress. For thousands of years this chief of conspiracy has palmed off falsehood for truth. But the time has now come when the rebellion is to be finally defeated, and the history and character of Satan disclosed. In his last great effort to dethrone Christ, destroy His people, and take possession of the city of God, the arch-deceiver has been fully unmasked. Those who have united with him see the total failure of his cause. Christ's followers and the loyal angels behold the full extent of his machinations against the government of God. He is the object of universal abhorrence.

Satan sees that his voluntary rebellion has unfitted him for heaven. He has trained his powers to war against God; the purity, peace, and harmony of heaven would be to him supreme torture. His accusations against the mercy and justice of God are now silenced. The reproach which he has endeavored to cast upon Jehovah rests wholly upon himself. And now Satan bows down, and confesses the justice of his sentence.

"Who shall not fear Thee, 0 Lord, and glorify Thy name? for Thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for Thy judgments are made manifest." Every question of truth and error in the long-standing controversy has now been made plain. The results of rebellion, the fruits of setting aside the divine statutes, have been laid open to the view of all created intelligence. The working out of Satan's rule in contrast with the government of God, has been presented to the whole universe. Satan's own works have condemned him. God's wisdom, His justice, and His goodness stand fully vindicated. It is

seen that all His dealings in the great controversy have been conducted with respect to the eternal good of His people, and the good of all the worlds that He has created. . . . The history of sin will stand to all eternity as a witness that with the existence of God's law is bound up the happiness of all the beings He has created. With all the facts of the great controversy in view, the whole universe, both loyal and rebellious, with one accord declare, "Just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints." . . .

Notwithstanding that Satan has been constrained to acknowledge God's justice, and to bow to the supremacy of Christ, his character remains unchanged. The spirit of rebellion, like a mighty torrent, again bursts forth. Filled with frenzy, he determines not to yield the great controversy. The time has come for a last desperate struggle against the King of heaven. He rushes into the midst of his subjects, and endeavors to inspire them with his own fury, and arouse them to instant battle. But of all the countless millions whom he has allured into rebellion, there are none now to acknowledge his supremacy. His power is at an end." - The Great Controversy, pp. 670-672.

In these graphic words the author lays bare the issue and the outcome-the vindication of God and the complete isolation and alienation of the originator of sin.

That is what God has been seeking to do all along. He could have forced a confession from men and wicked angels long ago; but that is not God's method. He must wait in His wisdom until out of their own voluntary free will they will acknowledge the rightful sovereignty of Christ and the Father before all. Not one will be left to question this. Not a single person will have one doubt as to God, His character, and His righteous judgment.

The hour of God's judgment means that ultimately God will so reveal His righteousness in salvation and judgment that the unrighteous will confess and praise Him. Can God get the world to do this even from the very heart of its servitude to sin and Satan? If God can, and He will, then this will issue in the final vindication of God before all; and lost men and women and rebellious angels will in this last hour at the end of the millennium forget their lost estate and will praise God for His righteousness and His justice.

Thus the sanctuary of God is then justified and vindicated. His throne is forever secure.

III. The Investigative Judgment

1. Do the saints come into judgment?

Walter Martin asserts: "Since our Lord knows the disposition of 'cases' allegedly being reviewed in Heaven, what need is there for 'investigative judgment'? We believe the Scriptures decidedly do not warrant such a doctrine." – The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, p. 182.

He also insists that there is no judgment of the saints now going on. He quotes John 5:24 saying, "the Greek deals a devastating blow to the Seventh-day Adventist concept of Investigative judgment: 'He that hears my word and believes him that sent me has everlasting life and shall not come under judgment but is passed from death to life' (literal translation). Christians, therefore, need not anticipate any Investigative judgment for their sins."-Ibid., p. 178.

When Martin appeals to the Greek, 1 presume he is referring to the use of the Greek word krisis. The word carries with it the meaning of the process of separation by judicial procedure, a judgment that goes with a person, condemnation. Martin concludes from this that there is therefore no future investigative judgment of the saints. But the text does not bear out his position. It is doubtful that John is speaking of judgment in the eschatological sense at all. The verb is in the present tense. John is not speaking of final judgment as such, but rather with current Christian living as indicated by the phrase "is passed from death unto life." It parallels Paul's statement: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Romans 8: 1).

If Dr. Martin means by his statement that there is no future judgment for the saints, then he is in plain disagreement with the truth of Scripture which declares: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Corinthians 5: 10). Paul states, including himself: "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Romans 14:10). "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Ecclesiastes 12:14).

It seems that Martin tries to build an argument from one Greek word without considering the whole meaning of the passage, finding out whether John is speaking of the Christian's current standing before God or whether he has the eschatological aspect of judgment in mind. At this point Dr. Martin has

failed to take into consideration other related texts that argue more strongly for a future judgment for the saints.

2. Complete representation before the throne of God

In His priestly office Christ offered Himself a sacrifice to God upon the cross (Hebrews 5:1; 7:26, 27; 8:3; 10:12). But Christ does not continue this function of offering Himself upon the cross now. He did this once and He will not do it the second time. He does, however, continue His priestly function in the heavenly sanctuary, for Christ is made "a priest for ever," He "continues ever" as priest (Hebrews 7:21, 24). Obviously, our Lord did not enter the heavenly sanctuary to do nothing. The complete ministry of our Lord is brought clearly to view, not only in the study of the types but also in the books of Hebrews, Daniel, and Revelation. This high priestly ministration of Christ corresponds to the twofold aspect revealed in the type and designated as the "daily" and the "yearly," or day of atonement ministrations. As He daily ministers, Christ's work is declared to be that of intercession (Hebrews 7:25; Romans 5:10; 8:34), of succoring His people (Hebrews 2:17, 18; 4:14, 15). He appears as the sinner's advocate with the Father (1 John 2: 1; John 16:26), and as the director of His church upon the earth (Revelation 1: 1-3).

In His yearly ministration He is revealed in the books of Daniel and Revelation, and also in the typical services, as carrying out the work of judgment. The Jews throughout their history have recognized this twofold ministration in relation to Israel as the people of God. Their yearly Yom Kippur, or Day of Atonement ministration, is interpreted by their leaders and scholars as God's great day of judgment as it affects His people. On what did they base their beliefs and doctrine? On the revelation given to Moses.

This twofold ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary reveals Christ's complete representation on our behalf before the throne of God. As our High Priest, Christ represents man to God. Frequently in prophecies already referred to we see Christ coming to the Father (Daniel 7:13, 14; Revelation 5:6, 7). We see Christ standing on the right hand of God. This is a real coming, representatively on our behalf. This is no theory. Only in and through Christ does man have access to God (Ephesians 2:16; 3:12). It is only as Christ comes to the Father that man has true and actual representation, whether in the work of intercession, succor, or judgment. Christ is to us all of these in His priestly ministration. He is truly and actually our surety in the presence of the Father. Christ brings to bear the full benefits of a perfect man and a perfect salvation. He is our sufficient security, our absolute assurance of the salvation He has accomplished. And in the judgment now going on He confesses our names before the Father, as He has promised to do.

There is no action or status concerning the saints in the heavenly sanctuary but what it is ministered and represented by our blessed Lord. Christ will not and does not surrender any part of His high-priestly function on behalf of His children, whether it be Redeemer, Intercessor, or judge. Christ is their representative. Christ is one with His children and for His children in every act that decides the destiny and future of His saints, from the time of their acceptance to the time of their judgment and vindication. This relationship needs to be understood and followed all the way to final victory.

How has this representative work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary fared since His ascension? In the great controversy between Christ and Satan, Scripture declares in Daniel 8 that the little horn has taken away the daily and has trodden underfoot the sanctuary of God. For more than a thousand years the papal power (the little horn) instituted and operated a counterfeit mediatorial system claiming the power to forgive sins and to decide cases.

The priest has the power of the keys, or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise, and of changing them from slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of his priests, and either not to pardon or to pardon, according as they refuse or give absolution, provided the penitent is capable Of it. SAINT ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI, Dignity and Duties of the Priest, p. 27.

When St. Michael comes to a dying Christian who invokes his aid, the holy archangel can chase away the devils, but he cannot free his client from their chains till a priest comes to absolve him.-Ibid., p. 31.

The priest holds the place of the Savior himself, when, by saying "Ego te absolvo," he absolves from sin. . . . But what only God can do by his omnipotence, the priest can also do by saying "Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis;" for the forms of the sacraments, or the words of the forms, produce what they signify-Ibid., pp. 34, 35.

Were the Redeemer to descend into a church, and sit in a confessional to administer the sacrament of penance, and a priest to sit in another confessional, Jesus would say over each penitent, "Ego te

absolvo," the priest would likewise say over each of his penitents, "Ego te absolvo," and the penitents of each would be equally absolved. Ibid., -p. 28.

Thus the uniqueness and exclusiveness of the mediatorial ministry of our Lord in the heavenly sanctuary is usurped. Instead of God's operating directly from His holy sanctuary, God is said to operate through sacraments ministered by human priests. The human instrument now takes the place of the divine. This human factor becomes the determining factor in man's salvation, either to pardon or not to pardon. It is to men that lost sinners are looking for forgiveness, salvation, and decision in judgment. They believe men are saved by receiving the sacraments, not by receiving the Holy Spirit direct from the living Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. All this separates men from the active priestly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 2:5).

The prophecy of Daniel 8:11-14 states that not until the end of the 2300-year period will the ministration of Christ be restored to its rightful place, and justified. The leading prophecies of both Daniel and Revelation that deal with this great controversy between Christ and Satan point out that through all these centuries the true saints of God have been persecuted and killed by the very institution that claims to minister salvation and decide cases for weal or for woe. From outward appearances it appears that everything is against the true children of God. Here we are confronted with an amazing spectacle counterfeit religious system that actually decides against the true saints of God and exercises judgment to destroy them while at the same time designating others as the children of God.

What is the solution to this counterfeit system? Where is it to be found? The Bible points the believer to the work of Christ our High Priest in His mediatorial ministration in the heavenly sanctuary. He alone is the one mediator between God and man. He alone has the power and the right to decide cases. He alone is the judge of who the true saints are.

How vital, then, is the knowledge of Christ's mediatorial ministry in all its aspects? Millions of people have looked to the church of their day with assurance of sins forgiven and eternal life, but only in the heavenly sanctuary are the true records of men's lives to be found. Only here are the divine decisions and judgments made and recorded; here is the only court of appeal. It is through Christ's ministration alone that men receive forgiveness and succor. It is in the judgment from the sanctuary alone that cases are decided, nowhere else. All this might be taught and understood in the justification and restoration of the heavenly sanctuary. The sanctuary truth is part of the final message to the world. It is here alone that men can understand the closing events of this world's history, the ultimate judgment and vindication of men; for the Bible teaches that it is Christ alone who is our Intercessor, our Mediator, and our judge.

3. The meaning of the phrase "investigative judgment"

The use of the term "investigative- needs to be carefully interpreted. The doctrine of an investigative judgment is not to be conceived as God's poring over the record books in order to figure out the accounts. "The Lord knows them that are his."

This term has meaning in light of the Biblical teaching on the keeping of the records of all men's lives, thoughts, and deeds. That such records are kept even to the minutest detail is clearly taught in the Bible; and that men will be judged according to what is recorded in the books (Daniel 7:10; Revelation 20:12). That God would make and keep records of the saints is incredible unless they had some future reference. A number of references are made to the opening of the book of life, which contains the names and records of the saints. Daniel pictures the books being opened in judgment. He declares in Daniel 12:1 and 2 that "every one that shall be found written in the book" shall be delivered. This takes place when Michael stands up. The similarities between this passage and the one dealing with the judgment in Daniel 7:9 to 14 are striking. The coming of Christ to the Father to receive dominion and the kingdom, and the standing up of Michael appear to be part of the same over-all activity. The result of all this is that dominion is given to Christ. The saints share in the judgment because the kingdom of God is declared to belong to them. Michael stands up and speaks for His saints because their names are found in the book of life.

Judgment is intrinsic to the everlasting gospel (Revelation 14: 6, 7). "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel" (Romans 2:16). The redemption wrought in Christ is both the salvation of men and the judgment of men. It is this unity of the gospel and judgment that proclaims the gospel as righteous in every respect.

Much of the world's religion would dispense with the judgment of God. Today the love of God is often divorced from His judgment. This type of religion ignores the holiness of God that issues in judgment. What this unstable world and society needs as much as anything else is not an easygoing love,

but respect for God and His righteous will, a realization that God has a controversy with all men, that a day of divine reckoning and judgment will come for all men, good and bad.

God is not primarily a benevolent grandfather handing out forgiveness indiscriminately. He is the Lord of the universe; and His sovereign and holy will must prevail if the universe is to endure. This truth must be seen when God seeks to bring about the consummation of all things. Revelation declares that both gospel and judgment go hand in hand. Nowhere is one for the saved and the other for the lost. In none of God's work or in His guidance in the affairs of men is judgment absent. Nowhere does the Bible teach that all are going to be saved; but it does say that "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

For the redeemed the true meaning of salvation bears the test of the judgment now proceeding. The fundamental issue in the judgment reveals men as either in Christ or out of Christ, in the book of life or out of it. This investigative judgment requires a right relation to God. All the deeds, thoughts, and motives of men are evaluated in the light of individual relationship to Christ. This is particularly true with regard to all those who profess Christianity. Not all who make a profession are true saints of God. The separation between the true and the false within the church is not easily attained. There is one principal test applied to all who profess Christ-Are their works of human devising or are they the fruit of an indwelling Christ? Does their conformity to the ways of Christ indicate righteousness by works or righteousness by faith?

That such an investigation will be made prior to the return of our Lord is taught in the parable of the man without a wedding garment, in Matthew 22. Christ here likens the kingdom of heaven to a certain king who made a marriage for his son. Invitations were sent out, but some refused to attend. But for those who came to the feast, a special wedding garment was provided by the king. When all the guests were assembled, the king began an examination, or investigation, of the guests. Did all have on the special garment he had provided? No, one man had not. The king ordered him to be expelled into outer darkness. Christ is here teaching the necessity of wearing the garment of Christ's righteousness, so that when man is called to the marriage feast of the Lamb he will be acceptable. He also teaches that before the marriage feast takes place He will make sure that only those who have on this garment will be allowed to sit down to the feast. Does this not imply an investigation or a prior judgment?

Salvation is more than knowing that our sins have been forgiven. The status of ultimate salvation for each person will be challenged by Satan himself. The consummation of our own destinies will not pass without an outright denial of Christ's right to His children. In the face of Satan's desperate fight to take the entire human race with him to perdition, it is not likely that Christ's claim to sinners who have been redeemed will go unchallenged. Satan's pattern of accusation is brought to light in Zechariah 3. It has been an essential part of Satan's work through the centuries to castigate every sinner who seeks deliverance from his sins through Christ. The human heart and mind has been a battleground, and Satan does not give up easily. In Zechariah 3, Joshua the high priest stands clothed in the filthy garments of his own sinfulness, arraigned at the bar of God. That Satan has a legitimate case in every man goes without question. He has no need to build a case. The whole record of Satan's work reveals that he will relinquish no man either personally or in the judgment without challenging God's right to grant him eternal life. In spite of all this, Christ intercedes for His child and clothes him with the white garments of His righteousness. Satan is silenced. That battle before God and man will go on over every soul.

Before Christ claims His children for His own, before resurrection or translation of His saints, the right of ownership will be disputed and established. The purpose is not merely to provide the saint with so many stars in his crown or acres in his heavenly vineyard. It is rather to place in perspective both Himself (as the righteous, holy God) and His redeemed children in the light of His righteous judgment, that all may be vindicated at last. This righteous declaration and vindication of His children is an essential part of the vindication of God Himself, of His everlasting gospel, of His divine government and direction of the controversy with Satan and with sin.

The temptation is toward a soft and tender type of religion, with an easygoing God and a forever-forgiving Christ. The hour of God's judgment speaks both of His love and His holiness. The investigative judgment of God is not to condemn men, not to make His people suffer the penalty for their sins when He already has borne that, but it is the evidence of God's righteous judgment, the final vindication of the saints before the universe. This hour is the crisis of all crises, the harvest of all harvests, the testing hour for both the righteous and the wicked. The redemption of the elect does not eliminate them from judgment; for they are part of it; and this judgment will reveal a righteous God and a judgment in favor of the saints.

There will be no appeal from this court now sitting. The final crisis of mankind is here. And only when it is revealed how all men stand before Christ, and in relation to Christ, will each man be finally judged. It is this fact that gives us the ultimate purpose of the great controversy. It is this that assures us that

Christ will win at last. This is far more than forgiveness of sin; it is our righteous standing before all the universe that is revealed and declared. We believe in this hour of judgment because we believe in a final crisis that will vindicate both God and His saints.

Thus we see the balance of redemption and judgment that has been God's purpose and righteous action all along.

The hour of judgment calls for the supernatural intervention of God in the affairs of men, for the action of God from His throne in the sanctuary. To preach merely some moral theories on the level of human operation is to miss the work of Christ.

The hour of God's judgment has come, and nothing can stop the work of God in the sanctuary above, nothing can shake the judgment that is now going on, the judgment that will issue in the final crisis of the world. For almost six thousand years the world has been under the control of Satan. Now we have come to the final account that must be rendered; and in the accounts of God, everything is manifest, even to the uttermost farthing.

At no other time and in no other period of this world's history has there been committed to men so serious a responsibility as to proclaim the salvation and the judgment of God through Christ's closing ministration in the heavenly sanctuary. God asks our complete commitment to Him in order that we might proclaim this judgment-hour message that will issue in the eternal vindication of God and of His saints.

15. The Nature of Man

D. E. MANSELL
Pastor, Southern New England Conference

ONE OF THE chapters in the new book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism, by Walter R. Martin, attempts to refute the Adventist doctrines of conditional immortality and the destruction of the wicked, by showing that the Bible teaches conscious existence after death and the eternal torment of unbelievers.

All true Christians hold that God is the Creator of all things, including conscious existence. Mr. Martin believes this, and we believe it too. Hence, this is not the question that divides us. Nor is it the question of whether God could sustain life forever or annihilate it if He so ordained. The crux of the matter is: Has God given man, irrespective of his character, conscious existence that He will never take away? Mr. Martin teaches that God has. Seventh-day Adventists maintain that God has not.

We fail to see any reason why God should have willed that man must have an endless conscious existence, whether regenerate or unregenerate, and we do not believe that the Bible so teaches. On the contrary, we hold that the Scriptures plainly teach that God created man with the possibility for endless existence, but that this depended on man's obedience to the divine will. When man sinned, endless existence became possible only through acceptance of eternal life in Jesus Christ.

Mr. Martin holds that the soul, or spirit, which he equates with man's "cognizant, immaterial nature" (page 127), has an endless existence regardless of character (see page 139), for he declares: "Conditional Immortalitists try to answer Dr. Hodge's argument [that unbelievers are punished forever] by declaring that the soul is not eternal by creation; but the Bible emphatically teaches that it is, since we have seen that the word 'death' does not imply unconsciousness as Adventists declare" (page 132).

This declaration shows that Mr. Martin believes that the Bible teaches that the soul is eternal by creation. Since Mr. Martin's argument would have no force unless God had willed that the soul must exist endlessly as a conscious entity, we conclude that this is what he means when he says that the soul is eternal by creation. This much is clear. His reasons for so believing are not so clear. In fact, we cannot help wondering if Mr. Martin could afford to make them clear. Let us see why.

Our friend declares that because "death" does not imply unconsciousness, he has, therefore, proved that the Bible emphatically teaches that the soul is eternal by creation. This appeals to us as a rather unusual method of adducing proof. In essence we are asked to believe that the lack of an implication constitutes emphatic proof. We fail to see how this constitutes proof, let alone emphatic proof.

We shall now proceed to examine the evidence, which Mr. Martin says "We have seen," which is supposed to prove that 'death' does not imply unconsciousness." In order to facilitate comparison we shall follow Mr. Martin's outline of presentation.

1. Textual Analysis

On pages 118 and 119 of his book, Mr. Martin, commenting on 1 John 5:11-13 says, “In the grammar and context of this passage eternal life (eionion zoes [sic]) is the present possession of every believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, and if the term eternal life does not include conscious fellowship then the whole New Testament meaning is destroyed. The Holy Spirit used the present indicative active of the verb echo, expressing present, continuous action. Thus we see that the believer, having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, already possesses never-ending life as a continuing quality of conscious existence.” (Italics his.)

In the first place, it seems to us utterly superfluous to bestow upon believers “a continuing quality of conscious existence” if all men, regenerate and unregenerate, possess conscious existence that is eternal by creation.

In the second place, it seems to us passing strange that anyone would try to prove conscious existence after death on the grounds that believers possess eternal life. Let us see why. If believers possess “a continuing quality of conscious existence” by virtue of the fact that eternal life has been bestowed upon them. by the same token unbelievers do not possess “a continuing quality of conscious existence,” since they do not have eternal life (1 John 5:12; 3:15). It is evident that this argument proves too much, and hence proves nothing for Mr. Martin’s contention. But this is not all. Our friend has yet to establish that the whole New Testament meaning of “eternal life- includes “conscious fellowship.” We submit that he has given no proof for this assertion.

Under this same section Mr. Martin says that a case parallel to 1 John 5:11-13 “obtains in the context of John 5:24, where the Holy Spirit informs us that a spiritually dead man, passes by faith into spiritual or eternal life, but with no change in his physical nature, thus indicating the dualism of body and soul” (page 119). We fail to see how this passage necessarily indicates the dualism of body and soul, but Mr. Martin hastens to declare that “this completely refutes the general Adventist contention that everlasting life or immortality is bestowed upon the believer only at the resurrection of his body- (ibid.). This is a rather startling bit of logic. In essence. we are asked to believe that an indication ‘ which Mr. Martin does not even claim to have established, completely refutes a contention.

What is this Adventist contention? Mr. Martin says it is that eternal life, or immortality, is bestowed upon the believer only at the resurrection of the body. But this is not an Adventist contention at all. We do not equate the terms “eternal life” and -immortality.” This fact is singled out in the “statement,” by H. W. Lowe, an Adventist, appearing on page 15 of Mr. Martin’s book. In this statement Mr. Lowe points out that Mr. Martin is “incorrect when he says that Adventists equate eternal life with immortality.” Thus we see that Mr. Martin completely refutes something we don’t even teach.

What Seventh-day Adventists teach on this point is made abundantly plain when Mr. Lowe says, “We emphatically teach that a true believer in Christ has eternal life abiding in him now, ‘and this life is in his Son,’ 1 John 5: 11. We believe that immortality, or that quality of being which makes death impossible, is something bestowed on the believer at the resurrection when our Lord returns” (page 15).

The second text offered to prove the conscious fellowship of the believer after death is John 11:25, 26, the main point being that going beyond Lazarus, who believed on Jesus and had physically died, “Jesus lifts the veil and reveals that, in the realm of the physically alive, whoever believes in Him shall never experience the greatest of all terrors, spiritual death” (page 121). The next paragraph shows that by “spiritual death” our friend means “loss of communion of fellowship as a spiritual entity.” The fallacy of this argument is that Jesus said nothing about 9oss of communion of fellowship,” let alone about a spiritual entity,” and these are the very points that need to be established.

As with the preceding arguments, the argument based on 2 Timothy 1:10 and Romans 2:7, to the effect that “eternal life” is “a conscious quality of spiritual existence” (page 122), also assumes what it is under obligation to prove, hence proves nothing.

We now come to Philippians 1:21-23. Again, Mr. Martin assumes what he is under obligation to prove, namely, that Paul “desired to depart from his body and to spiritually enjoy the presence of his Lord” (page 124). Our friend may think that Paul desired to depart from his body and go to the presence of Christ as a spiritual entity, but, as he realizes full well, “the Bible does not say so” (page 122).

Adventists insist that “the Bible does not say so,” not out of stubbornness, but for the simple reason that this passage of Scripture says nothing about leaving the body and spiritually enjoying the

presence of the Lord. Not only this, but we believe that there are sound contextual reasons for holding the position we do, Mr. Martin's protestations to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is a curious fact that while Mr. Martin lays great emphasis on the grammar of Philippians 1:23, which he claims "is grammatically devastating to the Seventh-day Adventist position," he passes lightly over the context and exegesis of the passage under consideration. Now, we do not for a moment admit that the grammar of the phrase "to depart and be with Christ, which is far better" is at all devastating to our position. On the contrary, we believe that it is devastating to Mr. Martin's position, for the simple reason that the passage says nothing whatsoever about departing from the body and spiritually enjoying the presence of the Lord, and this is what Mr. Martin is trying to prove.

But more than this, he significantly ignores certain portions of the context in which this phrase is found. In the statement that precedes this phrase Paul declares that he is "in a strait betwixt two.---The context shows plainly that by "two" Paul means "life" and "death." Therefore, the strait Paul was in was choosing between life and death (verses 21, 22). Now, according to Martin the believer "can never experience loss of communion of fellowship as a spiritual entity, though his body may 'become' dead" (page 121). Therefore, according to Mr. Martin's theory, whether Paul lived or died "communion of fellowship" would continue right on, regardless. Mr. Martin implies that since Paul enjoyed communion with Christ in life, and would continue to enjoy the same fellowship after death, he was in a dilemma. This conclusion would be logical were it not for the fact that there is something that Paul desires "which is far better" (verse 23). Far better than what? Obviously, far better than life or death. What was it? Paul says that it was "to depart, and to be with Christ" (verse 23). Now, since departure to be with Christ is better than either life or death, it is evident that death would not usher Paul into the "presence of his Lord" (page 125), as Walter Martin says it would.

Seventh-day Adventists believe that Paul is here referring to translation, that is, to being taken bodily to heaven without seeing death, as was Enoch (Hebrews 11:5), Elijah (2 Kings 2:11), and as will be the living saints at the Second Advent (1 Thessalonians 4:17). This would truly be "far better" than either this present life or death. It would take Paul from this present mortal state to the ultimate state without dying.

The final passage that is cited to establish the conscious existence of the believer after physical death is 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18. Mr. Martin says, "In verse 14, the Holy Spirit tells us that God intends to bring with Him (sun auto), that is, with Jesus at His second advent, believing Christians who have experienced physical death" (page 125). Let us see how else Paul describes these "believing Christians" whom Jesus brings with Him. In verse 14 Paul informs us that they are those which "sleep in Jesus." What does Paul mean by "sleep"? Mr. Martin volunteers an answer. He avers, "In every instance where the word 'sleep' is used to describe death, it always refers to the body and cannot be applied to the soul, especially since 'sleep' is never used with reference to the soul" (pages 125, 126). This statement makes it crystal clear that our friend believes that in "every" instance where sleep describes death it "always" refers to the "body." Since the Bible plainly teaches that our Lord comes from "heaven" at His second advent (1 Thessalonians 4:16; Philippians 3:20), Mr. Martin seems to have taken the rather incongruous, not to say absurd, position of placing the sleeping bodies of believing Christians in heaven, for it is those who "sleep in Jesus" that God will "bring with him," and Mr. Martin insists "categorically" that sun must mean "together with."

This is an impossible situation for our brother, for he must either admit that sleep describing death does not "always" refer to the body in "every" instance, or that the phrase "bring with him" does not perforce mean "bring together with Him" from heaven. Thus we see that rather than refuting "the SDA teaching on the intermediate state of the dead," our friend has placed himself in a dilemma of his own devising.

One thing is clear: Whichever horn of the dilemma Mr. Martin takes, his contention that the souls of the dead in Christ enjoy conscious fellowship in the intermediate state is not sustained.

II. "Soul" and "Spirit"

As Mr. Martin correctly informs us, the original words from which the terms soul and spirit are translated are, respectively: Nephesh and ruach in the Hebrew, and psuche and pneuma in the Greek. These words occur about 1,600 times in the original text and are used with a wide variety of meanings and nuances. Among the various meanings are, -principle of life," "breath," and "consciousness."

Since the main issue under discussion is whether man's soul, or spirit, is eternal, we need only consider these words as they relate to man. A study of nephesh, ruach, psuche, and pneuma shows that when these words are used in reference to man, not once are they even remotely connected with the idea of endlessness. This is a significant fact, one which any layman can verify with the aid of an analytical concordance. Mr. Martin says that he quite agrees with the Adventist conclusion that "a careful study of all the adjectives used in Scripture to qualify the word 'spirit' as applied to man indicates that not even one approaches the idea of immortality" (page 130). "But" he objects that " 'immortality' refers only to the resurrection body of the saints and to the nature of God Himself." (ibid.). Be that as it may, we wonder whether our friend agrees that the idea of "endlessness" is never predicated of the words soul or spirit. If he does, and we cannot see how he can help but agree, he has no Biblical basis whatsoever for his claim that the soul, or spirit, is eternal.

Mr. Martin claims that "such verses as Isaiah 57:6, Zechariah 12: 1, Isaiah 55:3, and Genesis 35:18, belie the Adventists' criterion for determining the spiritual nature of man" (page 127). This is interesting. The only trouble is that it is not true. Seventh-day Adventists are fully aware that the Hebrew words translated "soul" and "spirit" frequently refer to man's intellectual and spiritual nature when used in reference to living persons. But this is not the point at issue. The point is: Where is the evidence that the original words refer to man's "cognizant, immaterial nature" after death? In other words, since the Bible says that nephesh can die (Ezekiel 18:4, etc.), and ruach can refer to the principle of life (Genesis 6:16; 7:22; see marginal reading), it must be established that nephesh and ruach have the meaning of "consciousness" or "cognizance before Isaiah 57:16, Zechariah 12:1, Isaiah 55:3, and Genesis 35:18 can be used as proof that the soul, or spirit, has an independent conscious existence after death.

What has been said about the original Hebrew words for "soul" and "spirit" is equally true of psuche and pneuma. The New Testament teaches that psuche can die (Revelation 16:3; Acts 3:23) and pneuma is the principle of life (John 6:63). Therefore, it must first be established that these Greek words mean conscious personality after death, before Matthew 10:28, Luke 8:55, 1 Thessalonians 5:23, Hebrews 4:12, and Revelation 16:3 can be used to prove our friend's contention.

Mr. Martin uses Philippians 1:23 as evidence that when the soul, or spirit, meaning conscious personality, leaves the body at death it goes either to the presence of the Lord or into the place of punishment. In the first place, these passages do not even use the words soul or spirit. In the second place, we have shown that Philippians does not prove that Paul desired to die that he might enjoy the presence of the Lord as a spiritual entity. As for Luke 16, we agree with Mr. Martin that "one does not develop a doctrine from a figure of speech" (page 121), and for this reason we believe that one should not develop a doctrine from a parable, either.

16. Life After Death

D. E. MANSELL
Pastor, Southern New England Conference

FOUR BIBLICAL INCIDENTS are next presented to prove that the soul is conscious after death: The death of Stephen, the words of Jesus to the thief, Moses' presence on the Mount of Transfiguration, and Saul's experience at Endor. We shall examine each incident separately.

On page 128 the statement is made that Stephen's committing his spirit (pneuma) into the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ "establishes the fact that the immaterial nature of man is independent of his body." We agree that at death something immaterial leaves the body, but does this prove that this something is a conscious entity? We believe not, for the following reasons: When Jesus died, He committed His spirit (pneuma) into His Father's hands. According to the dualistic view of man to which Mr. Martin evidently subscribes (see page 119), the soul, or spirit, is the "real man," the body a mere integument, or shell. Thus, according to this view, when Jesus died, His body was removed from the cross and placed in Joseph's tomb, but the "real man," which Mr. Martin prefers to call the "unit" (page 128), or "spiritual entity" (page 121), went to be with the Father. If so, how strange that "three days" later He should explicitly declare, "I am not yet ascended to my Father" (John 20:17).

According to Mr. Martin's theory He had ascended to His Father on Friday afternoon. We therefore conclude that the spirit (pneuma) which leaves the body at death is not the "real man." We believe

that it is the spirit (ruach), or "breath of lives" (literal translation) that God "gave" (Ecclesiastes 12:7) man in the beginning, and which he gives to every living creature (compare Genesis 2:7 with chap. 7:22 and Psalm 104:29, 30). When a man dies this life principle "goes forth" and returns "unto God who gave it," the body returns "to the earth," and "in that very day his thoughts [an integral part of consciousness] perish" (compare Ecclesiastes 12:7 and Psalm 146:4). We see, therefore, that Mr. Martin has no scriptural warrant for assuming that the immaterial part of man, called the spirit, which Stephen committed into our Lord's hands, was a conscious entity.

On Luke 23:43, Mr. Martin says that Jesus -never qualified" the words "verily, verily, 1 say unto you," "because qualification was unnecessary- (page 129). Now, it may be true that nowhere else is it recorded that Jesus ever qualified these words, but this does not prove that, therefore, they were unnecessary on the occasion Jesus spoke them to the penitent thief. We believe that they were, owing to the unusual circumstances under which they were uttered. Not only that, but the original text, translated and interpreted in harmony with our view, is not ridiculously redundant as Mr. Martin makes it out to be. The original text reads, amin lego soi simeron met' emoft esi en to paradeiso, and may either be translated, "Verily I say unto thee, To day thou shall be with me in paradise" or "Verily I say unto thee to day, Thou shall be with me in paradise." Greek grammar allows the adverb "today" to qualify either the verb lego, "I say," or the verb esi [eimi], "thou wilt be." There is no redundancy in either translation. We prefer to punctuate the phrase with the comma after the adverb "today" so that it qualifies the verb "I say." Mr. Martin evidently prefers to make the adverb qualify the verb "thou wilt be." We raise no objection to his right to interpret the passage that way, but we do object to his claim that it can only be interpreted his way and that therefore this is proof that the soul has a conscious existence after death. It is not.

As for Moses and the Transfiguration, Mr. Martin says that the Adventists have no grounds for saying that Moses appeared on that occasion in his resurrected body, because Jude does not say that Moses was raised from the dead. He concludes that therefore "it is evident that the soul of Moses appeared to our Lord" (page 129). This is amazing. In essence Mr. Martin is saying that because Jude 9 does not say Moses' body was resurrected, he has therefore proved that it was his soul. The difficulty is that Mr. Martin has not established that the soul has a conscious existence after death, and the text under consideration doesn't even mention the word soul. Once again Mr. Martin assumes what is to be proved.

Now, while it is true that Jude 9 does not say that Moses' body was resurrected, it cannot be denied that reference is made to his body. Jude 9 says that Michael "the archangel" and Satan "disputed about the body of Moses," and 1 Thessalonians 4:16, the only other Biblical occurrence of the word "archangel," says that the "Lord himself shall descend from heaven ... with the voice of the archangel . . . : and the dead in Christ shall rise first." We see no reason for Paul's reference to the archangel unless the archangel is the Resurrector of the dead. Therefore, we conclude that Moses was bodily resurrected at the time Michael the archangel and the devil had their dispute. The preponderance of evidence is therefore in favor of the assumption that Moses appeared to our Lord in his resurrected body. There is no evidence that even suggests that it was Moses' soul.

In 1 Samuel 28:7-19 is the record of Saul's visit to the woman of Endor, who had a '1amiliar spirit." Mr. Martin alleges that "every instance" in this account indicates that Samuel in his spiritual nature addressed Saul. Nowhere is it even intimated that it was not Samuel, and any attempt to establish what the Hebrew text simply does not allow is evidence of failure to recognize the hermeneutic principle of interpretation governing the process of sound exegesis" (pages 130, 131). In the first place, we believe that a comparison of the account of Saul's interview in 1 Samuel with a literal translation of 1 Chronicles 10:13 does allow that a "familiar spirit," not Samuel, addressed Saul. 1 Samuel 28:7 says Saul asked his servants to seek for "a woman that hath a familiar spirit," literally "a woman who is mistress of a familiar spirit (Hebrew, 'esheth ba'alath ob), but in 1 Chronicles 10: 13 it says Saul "asked of a familiar spirit, to inquire" (literal translation. Hebrew, lish'o1 ba'ob lidrosh). The original text certainly allows the interpretation that Saul asked of the familiar spirit itself. We believe that this familiar spirit impersonated Samuel and that in calling the familiar spirit "Sarnuel" the writer of 1 Samuel is simply using the language of appearance.

In the second place, 1 Samuel 28:6 says that Saul "inquired of the Lord," but 1 Chronicles 10:14 says that Saul "inquired not of the Lord." It is not reasonable that God, who would answer Saul "neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets- (1 Samuel 28:6), would answer him through the medium of one who was an abomination to Him (compare Leviticus 19:31; 20:6, 27; Deuteronomy 18:10, 11; 1 Samuel 28:3; Isaiah 8:19). Therefore, we conclude that God was not answering Saul through the supposed "Samuel." Saul was not inquiring of the Lord when he spoke to the familiar spirit.

In the third place, it is strange that if, as Mr. Martin teaches, at death believers go "into the

presence of the Lord" (page 128), and unbelievers go "into a place of punishment" (ibid.), that Samuel should have come "out of the earth" (1 Samuel 28:13, 14. Compare with verses 11 and 15), or that Saul should have gone to "be with" Samuel, after he committed suicide (verse 19). It simply doesn't make sense.

We believe that a doctrine based on the questionable foundation of a forbidden interview with an enemy of God, is no proof that "Samuel in his spiritual nature addressed Saul."

III. Hell and Eternal Punishment

We now turn to the question of whether unbelievers will be tormented endlessly in hell. We agree with Mr. Martin that "the thought of a never-ending agony of rational beings fully realizing their distressing plight is so appalling that it exceeds comprehension- (page 138). It is more than appalling; we believe it is unscriptural.

Eternal torment is founded on the assumption that God has given all men, regardless of their characters, souls that He will never reduce to nonexistence. This assumption, as we have shown, is un-Biblical, because not once in the entire Bible is man's soul, or spirit, even remotely associated with the idea of endlessness. We cannot emphasize this point too strongly.

We fully agree with Dr. Hodge, whom Mr. Martin quotes as authority, "That the Hebrew and Greek words rendered in our version 'eternal' or 'everlasting,' mean duration whose termination is unknown" (page 131). We also agree with him when he says, "When used in reference to perishable things, as when the Bible speaks of the 'everlasting hills,' they simply indicate indefinite existence to which there is no known or assignable limit" (pages 131, 132). We do not agree with him when he says, without any Biblical proof whatever, that the "human soul" has "unending existence," for the simple reason that the Scriptures do not say so, even though the terms soul and spirit are used more than 1,600 times in the Bible. On the contrary, the Scriptures consistently declare that all existence, including conscious existence, is entirely dependent on the sustaining power of God (Acts 17:28; John 1:3, 4. Colossians 1:16, 17; Hebrews 1:3; Nehemiah 9:6; Psalm 36:9; etcetera) and therefore we conclude that the words "eternal" and "everlasting" when applied to man mean existence to which there is no assignable limit. Only God is eternal in the absolute sense. All things else owe their origin and continued existence to Him. In the case of the righteous, "eternal" and "everlasting" mean "endless," not because they have souls that are "eternal by creation" (page 132), but because they have become "partakers of the divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4) by faith in Christ.

Viewed in this light, Matthew 25:41 and 46 presents no dilemma to the Adventists. When unbelievers are cast into "everlasting fire" they are punished for an indefinite but limited duration. Since they do not partake of the "divine nature" they are perishable, and the words "eternal" and "everlasting," when applied to them simply mean "duration whose termination is not known." On the other hand, since the righteous are partakers of the divine nature that is imperishable, the words "eternal" and "everlasting" mean endless duration.

Mark 9:47, 48 presents no problem. The expression, "Their worm dies not" is plainly a figure of speech, and we agree with Mr. Martin that "one does not develop a doctrine from a figure of speech" (page 121); therefore we reject his development of the doctrine of eternal torment on the basis of this text.

Peter's reference to punishment and deliverance in this context is important. Both Noah and Lot were delivered from destruction, while those who refused to repent were swept away in judgment from God in this present life. The apostle also emphasizes that there is coming a day of judgment when all the ungodly will be finally destroyed, but the righteous who turn to the Lord escape that fate. There is no evidence in this text to suggest that the ungodly are now being punished in any intermediate state. To contend for this is clear evidence of eisegesis. Their punishment will come when "the angels that sinned" are destroyed in the final destruction of the wicked.

IV. Hell and Punishment in New Testament Greek

In this final section Mr. Martin endeavors to support his belief in eternal torment on the basis of the Greek words that are used to describe the punishment of unbelievers. He begins by citing Matthew 5:22 and 10:28: 'Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell [gehenna] fire. "Fear him which is able to destroy [apolesai] both soul [psuche] and body [soma] in hell [gehenna]." Mr. Martin says that gehenna "portrays a place of punishment for the unsaved," and apolesai [apollumi], which is coupled with

it in Matthew 10: 28, is said to mean "to be delivered up to eternal misery." From this he concludes that gehenna "symbolizes eternal separation and conscious punishment of the spiritual nature of the unregenerate man" (page 135). A comparison of Matthew 10:28 with this statement shows that Mr. Martin interprets "soul" to mean "spiritual nature."

Our first question is: From what does the soul, or spiritual nature, eternally separate when the unregenerate man is cast into hell? He answers on page 128 that the "immaterial nature of man (soul and spirit) is separate from the body (Matthew 10:28; Luke 8:55; 1 Thessalonians 5:23; Hebrews 4:12; Revelation 16:3). That it is independent of man's material form, and departs from that form at death, to go either into the presence of the Lord (Philippians 1:23) or into a place of punishment (Luke 16)." This makes it quite evident that Mr. Martin believes that the soul, or spiritual nature, separates from the body when the unregenerate man is "plunged" into "Hell" (see page 131). The second question is: Since apollumi is grammatically and contextually coupled with the body as well as the soul, why does Mr. Martin ignore the application of apollumi to the body in the conclusion he draws? We believe that it is because the definition "to be delivered up to eternal misery" given apollumi, implies consciousness, and it would have been absurd to deliver up the body for eternal misery if it is eternally separated from the spiritual nature, which is supposed to be the conscious part of man. He tried to avoid this pitfall by simply ignoring the body. By ignoring this issue he has avoided an inconsistency, but has thereby vitiated his argument.

As for Isaiah 66:24 teaching eternal punishment, we repeat that "one does not develop a doctrine from a figure of speech" (page 12 1).

The second text Mr. Martin presents to sustain the doctrine of eternal torment is 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9. He claims that the word olethros, translated "destruction," actually should be translated "ruination" and that therefore the wicked are ruined but not destroyed. Then he goes on to draw an analogy between a broken light bulb and the "destruction" of the wicked, claiming that though the function of the bulb is destroyed, the glass remains. The trouble with this analogy is that Mr. Martin has transposed the elements in it.

According to his theory the body is material, the soul immaterial. In order to be consistent, the body should be analogous to the glass, the soul to the function of the bulb, not vice versa, as he has it. Seventh-day Adventists hold that when the body is broken through death, consciousness, which is a function of the soul, ceases. Hence, the need for a resurrection of both the just and the unjust (John 5:28, 29; Acts 24:15). If the soul or spirit is capable of conscious existence apart from the body, what cause is there for a resurrection? Not only this, but what cause is there for a second coming or a general judgment? Thus we see that Mr. Martin is still working on the false assumption that the soul is eternal by creation.

The Greek word basaniz6, found in Revelation 20:10 (also Matthew 8:6, 29; Mark 5:7; Luke 8:28; Revelation 14:10, 11), is next presented as evidence that the wicked suffer eternal "conscious 'torment-(page 137). Mr. Martin then goes on to declare that by this text "the theory of annihilation or, as the Adventists say, the final destruction, of the wicked is itself annihilated" (page 137).

It strikes us as rather strange that this man should speak with such confidence in reference to Revelation 20:10 and 14:10, 11, when a few pages earlier he confesses, "The Bible does not tell us the nature of Hell and the lake of fire so vividly recorded in the Book of Revelation" (page 131). It seems to us that by this admission he has effectively annihilated his claim to have destroyed our doctrine.

There is no need to comment on Matthew 8:6, 29; Mark 5:7 and Luke 8:28, since there is no question that basaniz6 means conscious torment; however, it should be pointed out that this word does not suggest eternal torment. Since the phrase "for ever and ever" (Greek, eis tous aionas ffin aionon, or, eis aionas aionon), like the words "everlasting" and "eternal," are applied to the wicked who are not by nature imperishable, we conclude that the expressions in Revelation relating to the torment of the wicked are of unknown but limited duration.

The final grammatical point brought forth in favor of the theory of eternal torment is the word abide (Greek, menei) found in John 3:36. This text is coupled with Romans 2:8, 9 and Revelation 14:10, from which the conclusion is inferred that God's wrath continues to operate on the wicked eternally.

First of all, the Greek word menei, while it may carry the idea of continuous action, does not necessarily carry the idea of eternal continuous action. This obviously is derived from Revelation 14:10. which as we have pointed out assumes that the soul is eternal by nature. Therefore, the argument based on John 3:36 is invalid. We believe that the wrath of God abides on the wicked continually until they have been punished according to their works.

Conclusion

To sum up: Mr. Martin begins his attempt to establish conscious existence after death by proving that the righteous have eternal life. In this he has failed because he does not establish that eternal life always includes conscious fellowship or that it even includes conscious fellowship in the passages he claims support his contention.

The second group of arguments is based on the Biblical words soul and spirit, which he presents as evidence that man's "cognizant, immaterial nature" survives as a conscious entity after the death of the body. In this he has failed because the words soul and spirit have many meanings besides "consciousness" or "cognizance," and he does not establish that this is the meaning in the texts he sets forth as proof for his contention.

The third and the fourth set of arguments are founded on the assumption that he has established that the soul is eternal by creation. In this he has signally failed, because the Scriptures invariably teach that man owes his existence to the sustaining power of God, and nowhere does the Bible even remotely intimate that the soul or spirit is eternal, either by creation or because the power of God maintains its existence eternally.

Apart from the scriptural evidence that man does not have an eternal conscious existence, we believe that reason indicates that it would be unwise and unjust to ordain that man must have an endless conscious existence irrespective of character. Unwise, because in creating man a free moral agent there was the definite possibility that he might fall. Unjust, because having fallen he is irretrievably condemned to eternal torment for the sins of a relatively short lifetime. Mr. Martin counters that it is not "proper or reasonable to make our human sentiments and judgments the measure of God's essence and activity,- but we reply that if human beings are capable of judging between the benefits of eternal life and the evils of eternal damnation, we are not wholly incapable of seeing the gross injustice of consigning rational beings to never-ending agony for the sins committed in this brief life.

But we do not rest our case on reason alone. The Scriptures make it plain that when the struggle between good and evil is over God will be "all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:24-28). We cannot imagine God being in the wicked, nor could God be "all" if the rebels against His government are allowed to live on endlessly blaspheming His holy name. We therefore conclude that the Scriptures teach that endless conscious existence is possible only by accepting "eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Are The Dead Really Dead?

1. State Of The Dead

Genesis	2:7	Man is a soul
Joshua	10:28,30,32	Souls can be killed
	10:35,37,39	Souls can be killed
Job	4:17	Man is mortal
	7:9, 10	Dead Vanish away, consumed
	14:12, 21	Dead have no knowledge
	17:3	Grave is the house of the dead
	27:3	Spirit is breath of life
Psalm	6:5	Dead have no thoughts
	30:9	Dead have no thoughts
	31:12	Dead have no mind
	31:17, 18	Cannot speak after death
	38:18	Dead have no thoughts
	71:30	Dead are in their graves
	78:39	Dead disintegrate and disappear
	88:4-6	Lying in the grave
	88:10-12	Dead have no thoughts
	89:48	Goes to the grave

	90:5, 6	Sleeping in the grave
	90:10-12	Thoughts end at death
	115:17	Dead are not worshipping God
	146:4	Dead have no thoughts at all
Ecclesiastes	9:5-10	No knowledge or thoughts when dead
	12:7	Spirit goes to God
Isaiah	38:18, 19	No knowledge in the grave
Ezekiel	18:4,20	Souls do die
Acts	2:29,34	David not in heaven yet
1 Timothy	6:16	Only Christ is immortal
Revelation	16:3	Souls die at the end of time

2. Non Immortality Of The Soul

Genesis	2:7	Soul = Real person
	3:19	Go to dust at death
	3:22	Adam not immortal
2 Kings	2:11	Real bodies in heaven
Isaiah	66:21,22	Flesh bodies in the New Earth
Matthew	3:10-12	Wicked are Burnt up
	7:19-27	Wicked are Destroyed
	13:24-43	Furnace of annihilation
	13:48-50	Destroyed at the end of time
	16:25,26	Loose your soul and end all life
	16:27	People are rewarded at the Second Coming
	19:16,29	Only the Righteous rewarded with life
	25:31-46	Final separation at the Second Coming
John	3:16	Life only in Christ
	5:28,29	Dead are in the graves
	6:39,40,44,54	Raised from grave at the last day
	14:1-3,19	Life only in Christ
Acts	17:31	Judgment yet future
	24:25	Judgment yet future
Romans	2:6-12	Wicked perish
	14:10	All are judged at once (Matthew 13:39)
1 Corinthians	9:25	We will become immortal
	15:53-55	We are not immortal yet
Phillipians	3:19	Whose end is destruction
1 Thessalonians	4:16,18	Resurrection and translation - The only way to heaven
2 Thessalonians	1:7-9	Wicked are destroyed
1 Timothy	6:16	God only is immortal
2 Timothy	1:10	Rewarded on the last day - not before
1 Peter	1:4,21,23	Life only in Christ
1 Peter	5:4	Eternal life received at the second coming
Revelation	2:11	Wicked receive the Second DEATH
	20:9	Devoured by fire
	20:12-15	Wicked receive the Second DEATH
	21:4	No more sorrow, pain, crying [No eternal torment].
	22:3	No more curse
	22:8	Second Death

3. What Is The Soul?

Genesis	2:7	Physical man
	12:13	Can be killed
	46:15,18,22	Physical people
	46:25,26,27	Physical people
Leviticus	4:2	Person - Can sin
	5:1,2	Can Sin (Romans 6:23)
	5:4	Can talk with real voice
	7:21	Real human body
	7:18,20,27	Eats physical food
	9:14	Can be destroyed
	17:12,15	Eats physical food
	18:29	Real people - not ghosts
	20:1 - 6	Can be killed
	22:3	Can be killed
	23:30	Can be killed
Numbers	15:30-36	Stoned to death
	19:13,20,22	Can touch it and kill it
	21:4,5	Eats food
	31:28	Person
Deuteronomy	12:15,20	Human body
	14:26	Eats and drinks
Joshua	10:28,30,32	Can be utterly destroyed
	10:35,37,39	Can be utterly destroyed
	11:11	Killed by the sword (Revelation 19:15)
1 Samuel	2:16	Human body
	24:11	Human body
	25:29	Human body - can be killed
Job	6:7	Can touch it
	27:8	God destroys it
	33:22,28,30	Goes to the grave
Psalm	7:1-5	Human life
	16:10	Goes to grave
	22:20	Can be killed
	22:29	Not immortal
	33:19	Needs deliverance from death
	35:4,7	People seek to kill it
	35:17	Can die
	40:14	Can die
	56:13	Can die
	86:2, 14	Needs preserving power
	89:48	Soul in the grave
	97:10	Needs preserving power
	116:7, 8	Can die
Proverbs	6:30, 32	Can be destroyed
	10:3	Human body
	13:25	Eats food
	19:15	Physical body
	23:14	Goes to grave
Isaiah	29:8	Human body
Ezekiel	13:19	Can be slain
	18:4,20	Can die
	22:27	Can be destroyed
Matthew	10:28	Destroyed in hell

Acts	2:27,31,41,43	Person
	3:23	Person
	7:14	Real people
	27:37	People
James	5:20	Can experience death
1 Peter	3:20	Need saving from death
Revelation	16:4	Can die

4. Death Is A SLEEP

Deuteronomy 31: 16	Moses	2 Sam 7:12	David
1 Kings 1:21	David	1 Kings 2:10	David
1 Kings 11:21	David	1Kings 11:43	Solomon
1Kings 14:20	Jeroboam	1Kings 14:31	Rehoboam
1Kings 15:8	Abijam	1Kings 15:24	Asa
1Kings 16:6	Baasha	1Kings 16:28	Omri
1Kings 22:40	Ahab	1Kings 22:50	Jehosophat
2 Kings 8:24	Joram	2 Kings 10:35	Jehu
2 Kings 13:9	Jehoahaz	2 Kings 13:13	Joash
2 Kings 14:16	Jehoash	2 Kings 14:22	Azaraih
2 Kings 14:29	Jeroboam	2 Kings 15:7	Azariah
2 Kings 15:22	Menahem	2 Kings 15:38	Jotham
2 Kings 16:20	Ahaz	2 Kings 20:21	Hezekiah
2 Kings 21:18	Menasseh	2 Kings 24:6	Jehoiakim
2 Chronicles 9:31	Solomon	2 Chronicles 12:16	Rehoboam
2 Chronicles 14:1	Abijah	2 Chronicles 16:13	Asa
2 Chronicles 21:1	Jehosophat	2 Chronicles 26:2	Uzziah
2 Chronicles 26:23	Uzziah	2 Chronicles 27:9	Jotham
2 Chronicles 28:27	Ahaz	2 Chronicles 32:33	Hezekiah
2 Chronicles 33:20	Manasseh	Job 3:13	Job
Job 7:21	Job	Job 14:12	Dead People
Psalm 13:3	David	Psalm 76:5,6	Wicked
Psalm 90:5	Wicked	Jeremiah 51:39	Lost People
Jeremiah 51:57	Lost People	Dan 12:2	Saved and Lost
Matthew 9:24	Daughter	Matthew 27:52	Saints
Mark 5:39	Damsel	Luke 8:52	Damsel
John 11:11	Lazarus	Acts 7:60	Stephen
Acts 13:36	David	1 Corinthians 11:30	Sinners
1 Corinthians 15:6	Brethren	1 Corinthians 15:18,20	Saints
1 Thessalonians 4:13-15	Saints	1 Peter 3:4	Humans

5. The Non-Invisible Rapture

Isaiah	26:19-21	Righteous and wicked rewarded at the End of The World
Matthew	13:36-42	Harvest - **The End** of the world.
	16:27	Everyone rewarded at once (Not in two separate phases).
	24:27-31	All eyes see him in **CLOUDS** at the harvest of the righteous.
	25:31-46	Everyone rewarded at once. Wicked die immediately.
	26:64	Coming in the **CLOUDS**.
Mark	13:26,27	All eyes will see Him at the harvest.
	14:62	Coming in the **CLOUDS**.

Luke	24:37-43	Jesus rose with a real body - not spirit
John	2:19-22	Jesus rose and will return in a visible body.
	6:39,40,44,54	Raised from the grave at the **Last Day** not 7 years before.
	11:24	Resurrection at the **Last Day** not 7 years before.
	12:48	**Last Day** - day of judgment not 7 years before.
Acts	1:9-11	Come in the **CLOUDS**.
1 Thessalonians	4:16,17	Meet in **CLOUDS**.
2 Thessalonians	1:7-10	Righteous and wicked rewarded at once.
Hebrews	9:28	Shall openly appear at the harvest of the righteous.
Revelation	1:7	Comes in the **CLOUDS** - All **EYES WILL SEE HIM** Harvest
	14:14-16	In The **CLOUDS** - **HARVEST OF THE RIGHTEOUS**.
	20:5,6	Resurrection begins the 1,000 years.
	22:12	Everyone is rewarded at once.

6. Hellfire - Is It For Real?

2 Peter 2:9	Nobody in hell today
Matthew 13:42	Wicked are cast into hell at the end of the world
John 12:48	Judged on the last day
John 5:28,29	Now in the grave
Job 21:30,32	
Romans 6:23	Receive death not life
Revelation 21:8	Annihilation
Romans 6:23	
Job 21:30	
Psalm 145:20	
37:9	
37:20	
37:38	
62:3	
Matthew 13:40-42	Punished on this earth
Revelation 20:9	
Proverbs 11:31	
2 Peter 3:10	
Revelation 22:12	Suffer for different lengths of time
Matthew 16:27	
Luke 12:47,48	
Isaiah 47:14	The fire will go out
Revelation 21:1,4	
Malachi 4:1-3	

7. Promises Of The Second Coming

CHRIST	John 14:3, Revelation 22:20	I will come again.
Enoch	Jude 14	Behold the LORD comes.
Job	Job 19:25-27	I shall see God.
David	1 Chronicles 16:33	He comes to judge the Earth.
Isaiah	Is 40:10	His reward is with Him.
Daniel	Daniel 2:44, 7:15	An everlasting kingdom.
Zechariah	Zechariah 14:5	The Lord my God shall come.
Malachi	Mal 3:1-3, 4:1-3	Shall burn as an oven.

Matthew	Matthew 16:27	For the Son of man shall come.
Mark	Mark 13:26	They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds.
Luke	Luke 9:26	Come in His Father's glory.
John	Revelation 1:7, John 14:1-3	He comes in the clouds and all eyes shall see Him.
Paul	Hebrews 10:37, 1 Thess 4:16	The Lord shall descend with a shout.
Peter	2 Peter 3:10	The Earth shall melt with fervent heat.
Jude	Jude 14	With 10,000's of His saints.
ANGELS	Acts 1:11	This same Jesus.

8. Signs Of His Coming

Matthew	24:5,11,23,24	False Christs	
	24:6,7	Wars and rumors of wars	
	24:37-39	As in the days of Noah	
Mark	13:24-30	False Christs, False prophets	
		Wars, Earthquakes, famines, troubles	
		Counterfeit miracles	
Luke	17:26,27	As in the days of Noah	
	17:28-32	As Sodom and Gomorrah	
	21:11	Earthquakes, famines, disease	
	21:25,26	Wars, revolutions, perplexity	
2 Thessalonians	2:3	Rise of the Roman Catholic Church	
1 Timothy	4:1-3	False doctrines, Spiritualism and doctrines of demons	
2 Timothy	3:1-13		
		Perilous times	Men lovers of self
		Covetous	Boasters
		Proud	Blasphemers
		Disobedient to parents	Unthankful
		Unholy	Without natural affection
		Truce breakers	False accusers
		Incontinent	Fierce
		Traitors	Despises of those that are good
		Heady	Lovers of pleasure more than God
		High minded	Pretending to be Godly but are not
		Not knowing truth	Reject truth of God
		Corrupt minds	Reprobates from the faith
		Evil seducers	Getting worse every day
James	5:1-8	Labor troubles - strikes	
2 Peter	3:3-12	Scoffers rejecting creationism & flood account	
Jude	14-18	Evil speech	
Revelation	6:12-17	Signs in the heavens	
	13:1-18	Rise in power of the Catholic Church	

9. Powerful And Glorious

Matthew	13:40-43	Furnace of fire
	16:27	Glory of His Father and the angels
	24:27-30	Lightning, every one will see it
	25:31	Glory of God and the angels
	26:64	See Him in the clouds of heaven
Mark	8:38	Comes with the glory of God the Father
	13:26	Coming with power and great glory

	14:62	Coming in the clouds of heaven
Luke	9:26	Glory of the Father and the angels
	17:24	As lightning in heaven
	17:26-30	Like the flood that destroyed them all
	21:25-28	See Jesus in the clouds of heaven
Colossians	3:4	He shall appear
1 Thessalonians	4:16	Shout, trumpet, resurrection
2 Thessalonians	1:7,8	Revealed in heaven, flaming fire
2 Timothy	4:7,8	Love his appearing
Titus	2:13	Glorious appearing
Hebrews	9:28	He shall appear
1 Peter	1:7	Appearing of Jesus Christ
2 Peter	1:16	Power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ
1 John	3:2	We shall see Him
Jude	1:14,15	Comes to judge the earth
Revelation	1:7	All eyes shall see Him
	6:15-17	Face of Him who sits on the Throne
	14:14	Coming in the clouds of heaven
	19:11-16	Comes to destroy the wicked

10. He Comes Visibly

Job	19:25,26	I shall see God
Psalm	50:3	Devouring fire
Isaiah	40:5	All flesh shall see His glory
Nahum	1:5	The earth will burn at His presence
Matthew	24:30	They shall see Him coming the clouds of heaven
Mark	13:26	Coming with power and glory
	14:62	See Him coming in the clouds of heaven
Luke	17:26-30	Fire and brimstone coming down out of heaven
	21:27	See Him coming in a cloud
Acts	1:9-11	See Him in the clouds of heaven
1 Corinthians	15:52	Resurrection from the dead
Philippians	3:20	Looking for Christ to come in the heavens
1 Thessalonians	4:17	Meet the Lord in the clouds
Titus	2:13	Glorious appearing of Christ
2 Peter	3:10	The heavens shall pass away and earth shall melt
1 John	3:2	We shall see Him as He is
Revelation	1:7	All eyes shall see Him
	14:14	Coming in the clouds of heaven
	19:11-16	Destroy the armies of the earth

11. Audibly

Psalm	50:3	God shall not keep silent
Isaiah	27:3	The great trumpet shall blow
Zephaniah	1:14-16	Trumpet and voice of God
Luke	17:26-30	Noah's flood, Sodom and Gomorrah
1 Corinthians	15:52	The trumpet shall sound
1 Thessalonians	4:16	Voice of the archangel, trumpet of God
2 Peter	3:10	Heavens will pass away with a great noise

12. Angels Come With Christ

Zechariah	14:5	Come with all his saints
Matthew	16:27	Come with His angels
	25:31	All the holy angels with Him
Mark	13:27	He shall send His angels
Luke	9:26	The glory of the holy angels

13. Reward The Righteous

Psalm	50:3,5	Gather My saints together
	58:11	A reward for the righteous
Isaiah	40:10	His reward is with Him
	62:11	His reward is with Him
Matthew	13:37-50	The harvest at the end of the world
	16:27	He shall reward every man according to His works
	24:30,31	Gather together His elect
	25:31-34	Inherit the kingdom of God
Mark	13:27	Gather together His elect
John	5:25-29	Resurrection of life
	6:39,40,44,54	Raised from the grave
	13:36	Shall follow Jesus to heaven
	14:1-3,28	Many mansions in heaven
1 Corinthians	15:51-53	Put on immortality
1 Thessalonians	4:16,17	Raised to eternal immortality
1 Peter	1:4,5,7	Crown of eternal life
	4:13	Share in His eternal glory
	5:4	Receive a crown of glory
2 Peter	3:10-13	A New Heavens and a New Earth
1 John	3:2	We shall be like Him
Revelation	14:14	Harvest the earth
	22:12	Reward every man according to his work

14. Destroy The Wicked

Psalm	37:38	Transgressors shall be destroyed together
	68:2	The wicked perish
	91:8	Reward of the wicked
Isaiah	13:9-11	Punish the wicked
	26:21	Punish the inhabitants of the earth
	66:15-17	Shall be slain
Matthew	3:7	The wrath to come
Luke	3:7	The wrath to come
	17:26-30	As in the days of Noah and Sodom & Gomorrah
	20:16	Destroy the evil doers
1 Thessalonians	5:3	Sudden destruction
2 Thessalonians	2:8	Destroy with the brightness of His coming

15. Is The Second Coming Invisible?

Chariots

Psalm 104:3	Clouds of heaven
Psalm 68:17	Angels - Sinai
2 Kings 2:11	Flaming Chariots
Isaiah 66:15-17	Flaming Sword (Revelation.19:11-16)

Clouds

Exodus

16:10	Visible to human eye
19:9-16	Thunder, lightning, fire, smoke, earthquake
20:18	Exceedingly loud
24:15,16	Devouring fire

Lightning

Psalm 144:6	Destroys the wicked
Zech 9:14	Destroys the wicked
Matthew 24:27	From the east to the west
Matthew 28:3	Blinding light
Luke 17:24	Lights up the whole sky
Exod 19:16-25	Exceedingly loud and bright
Psalm 77:18	Light up the whole planet and shake it
Psalm 97:4	Burns His enemies to death
Revelation 16:18	Devastates the Earth

Thunder

Exodus 9:23,29	Plague of death
Revelation 16:18	Seventh plague
Job 40:9	The voice of God
Exodus 20:18	Exceedingly loud
Psalm 78:48	Kills and destroys wicked

Trumpets

Zech 9:14	Powerful like lightning
Exod 19:13-19	Exceedingly loud
Is 27:1,13	Heard in all the countries
Zeph 1:14-16	Heard in all the cities

16. The Wicked Are Annihilated

Genesis	3:19	Turned to dust
	6:7,17	Completely destroyed
	19:23-29	Fire and brimstone
Exodus	22:20	Utterly Destroyed
1 Chronicles	28:9	Cast off forever
Job	18:18	Blotted off the planet
	20:9	No longer exist
	21:17	Blotted out
	22:20	Fire Consumed them
	34:24	Brake in pieces
Psalm	1:6	Ungodly shall perish
	2:9	Brake in pieces
	21:9,10	Destroyed utterly by fire

	34:21	Slay the wicked
	37:1,2	Cut down and wither away
	37:9	Evil doers will be cut off
	37:10	Shall not be
	37:20	Turn to smoke - perish
	37:22,28,34	Cut off
	37:36,38	Destroyed altogether
	50:3	Devoured
	52:5	Destroyed forever
	55:23	Destruction in pit
	58:7	Melt away as water and cut in pieces
	59:13	Consumed in wrath
	62:3	God will slay the wicked
	68:2	Burned as wax and perished
	69:28	No longer living
	73:18	Cast into destruction
	75:3	Dissolved
	92:7	Destroyed forever
	104:35	No longer exist
	139:19	God will slay the wicked
	145:20	Destroyed the wicked
Proverbs	10:25	No longer exist
	12:7	No longer exist
	13:13	Destroyed
Isaiah	11:4	Slay
	33:12	Burn as weeds
	41:11,12	Turned into nothing
Ezekiel	18:4,20	Dead forever
Obadiah	1:16	No longer exist
Nahum	1:10	Burned as stubble
Malachi	4:1	Burnt up
	4:3	Turned to ashes
Matthew	3:10,12	Chopped up and burnt
	7:13,19,27	Destruction, Chopped up and burnt, Fall and ruined
	10:28	Destroy body and soul
	13:30,40,42,48,50	Burned up
	21:41,44	Broken and destroyed
	22:7	Burned and destroyed totally
Mark	12:9	Destroyed and ruined
Luke	6:49	Ruined and destroyed
	13:7,9	Cut down and annihilated
	19:27	Slain and annihilated
	20:18	Grind to powder
John	3:16	Perish - death
	5:24	Death
John	6:50	Die
	8:24	Die
	10:10	Opposite of life
	15:2	Wither and die
Romans	8:13	Die
	9:22	Eternal Destruction
	11:20-24	Cut off and destroyed
1 Corinthians	3:17	God will destroy
Galatians	6:8	Everlasting Death
Philippians	3:19	End is destruction

17. Resurection And Translation - Only Way To Heaven

Genesis 5:24	Enoch
Hebrews 11:5	Enoch
2 Kings 2:1-11	Elijah
1 Thess 4:16	Righteous of all ages

18. The Source Of Life

A. God is the Source of Life

Job 12:9,10
Psalm 36:9; 66:8,9
Jeremiah 2:13
John 5:27
Acts 17:24,25,28

B. Life Given at the Beginning

Genesis 2:7
Job 33:7
Is 45:12
Jeremiah 27:5

C. Forfeited By Sin

Genesis 2:17; 3:19
Romans 5:12,15

D. God Through Jesus Returns Life to Us

John 1:4; 3:16; 5:21,25; 6:33,47-51
John 10:10,27,28; 14:6; 17:2
Romans 6:23

E. Conditional Immortality

John 3:15,16,36; 4:14; 6:40; 20:31
1 Timothy 1:16
2 Timothy 1:1
1 John 5:11-13

19. The Thief On The Cross - Luke 23:43

A. Paradise is Heaven

2 Corinthians 12:2	God's dwelling place
Revelation 2:7	Tree of life is there
Genesis 2:8	Was In Paradise
Revelation 22:1-3	The Tree Of Life is Now In the New Jerusalem
	New Jerusalem Is Now in Heaven
	Revelation 21:2,10; 3:12
	Hebrews 11:16; 12:22

B. Thief Had Not Gone To Heaven That Day

John 6:39,40,44,54
14:1-3
Matthew 13:36-43

C. Jesus in The Heart of the Earth After He Died

John 20:17	Had not yet gone to heaven
Psalm 16:10	Still in hell (The Grave) for three days and nights
Acts 2:25-27	Three days and nights in grave
Matthew 12:40	Three days and nights in heart of earth

D. Both In The Grave

Matthew 27:60	Mark 15:46
Luke 23:53	John 19:40,42

20. Lazarus and the Rich Man - Luke 16:20-31

Hebrews 11:8-19, 35-40	Abraham not in heaven.
2 Thessalonians 1:7,8	No pre Advent fire

21. Immortality - God's Alone and Given At Second Coming

Romans. 1:23, 2:7
1 Corinthians 9:25, 15:52-55
1 Timothy 1:17, 6:15,16
2 Timothy 1:10
1 Peter 1:4,23, 3:4

22. Only Righteous Have Eternal Life

Matthew	19:16	1 Timothy.	6:12,19
	25:46	Titus	1:2
Mark	10:17,30		3:7
Luke	10:25	1 John	1:2
	18:18,30		2:25
John	3:15,16		5:20
	4:14,36	Jude	1:21
	6:27,40	Revelation.	2:7,10
	12:25,50		3:5
	17:2,3		11:11
Romans	2:7		13:18
	5:21		17:8
	6:22,23		20:12,15
Galatians	6:8		21:6,27
1 Timothy	1:16		22:1,2,14,17,19

23. Life Only In Christ

John 3:36

5:24
6:47,54
10:28
1 John 3:15
5:11-13

24. The New Earth And The New Jerusalem

A. What is God Preparing for His people?

Hebrews 11:16 God is preparing a city
12:22

B. Where is This City now Located?

Revelation 21:2 In heaven in outer space
1 Kings 8:28-30

C. What is the city like?

Revelation 21:16 590 Kilometers Long
Revelation 21:2 NAME
Revelation 21:17,18 WALLS

D. What is the City Like?

Revelation 21:12,13,21 GATES
Revelation 21:21 STREETS
Revelation 21:2,11,16 APPEARANCE
Revelation 22:1,2 TREE OF LIFE
Revelation 22:1,2 RIVER OF LIFE (Genesis 2:10-14)

E. Where Will it be Transferred to?

Matthew 5:5 On this earth
Isaiah 66:22,24 New earth

F. What Reassuring Facts are There About the New Earth?

Revelation 21:3 God will live with us
Psalm 16:11 No boredom
Isaiah 33:24 No sickness or iniquity
Revelation 22:3 No more curse
Isaiah 65:22,23 Build homes and live in them
Revelation 7:16,17 No hunger, thirst or pain
Isaiah 40:31 No more tiredness
Isaiah 35:5,6 No more blind, deaf, lame, sick
Philippians 3:21 All healed of diseases
Revelation 21:8,22:25 Wicked excluded

G. Will the Saints Have Real Bodies in Heaven?

Luke 24:36-43,50,51 Jesus rose with a real body
Acts 1:9-11 Went to heaven with real body
Philippians 3:21 Give us real bodies at His coming
Isaiah 66:22-24 All FLESH

H. What Thrilling Things Will There be to do in the New Earth?

Isaiah 65:21,22 Build houses and vineyards
John 14:1-3 Have a home in the Holy City

Isaiah 35:10	Everlasting joy and peace
51:11	Sing songs of praise
Psalm 87:7	Play musical instruments
Revelation 14:2,3	Choir and music
Isaiah 66:22-24	Keep God's Sabbath Day
Matthew 8:11	Meet the patriarchs and prophets
Revelation 7:9-17	Live with Jesus forever
Revelation 14:4	See God's face and live
Zephaniah 3:17	Hear God sing to us
Psalm 37:3,4	Have all our desires fulfilled

I. How Good Will the New Earth and the New Jerusalem be?

1 Corinthians 64:4	Beyond our imagination
Isaiah 64:4	Beyond human comprehension

J. Does God Offer Everyone a Place?

Revelation 22:17	Who so ever will
1 Peter 1:4	Reserved in heaven
John 14:1-3	Prepared by Jesus Himself for us

K. How can we be Assured a Place in the Holy City?

Revelation 3:20	Open our hearts to Jesus
22:14	Keep God's 10 Commandments
John 1:12	Power to obey His will
Matthew 7:21	Must do God's will to be saved

The Seventh Day Sabbath

A. The Days Of Creation Are Literal 24 Hour Days

A. Genesis 1:5 Light = Day , Darkness = Night

B. Genesis 1:5,8,13,19,23,31 Evening and Morning = Day
Evening and Morning = 24 Hour Day

Exodus 18:13 , 27:21	Leviticus 24:3
Judges 19:9	1 Samuel 17:16
1 Chronicles 16:40	2 Chronicles 2:4 , 13:11 , 31:3
Ezra 3:3	Job 4:20
Psalm 55:17	Mark 1:32 - Sunset
Leviticus 23:32	Leviticus 11:22-40

C. Genesis 1:14		Heavenly bodies determine day length
D. Genesis 1:16-18		Sun divides the day
E. Genesis 4 , 5:3		Day 7 was less than 130 years
F. Exodus 20:8-11		Seventh day literal Sabbath
G. Genesis 7:4,10		Literal week before the flood - Gen. 8:10,12
H. Genesis	5:1-32	Literal chronology before and during the flood
	6:3	
	7:4,7,	
	7:11-13	
	7:17,24	
	8:3-6,10-14	
I. Hebrews	4:4,9	The Sabbath completed (Genesis 2:1-3, Exodus 20:8-11 ; 31:17)

J. Hebrews 11	New Testament writers took Genesis literally
K. Isaiah 66:22-24	Literal week and Sabbath in the New Earth
L. Genesis 1:11-19	Plants created before sunlight
M. Genesis 1:11-25	Plants created before bees
N. John 11:9	12 Hours in the day
O. Genesis 1:5	The first day
P. Mark 2:28	The Sabbath made for man

Q. Literal week and Sabbath preserved since the Tower of Babel
R. Over 106 scientific dating methods for a young earth
S. Day cannot be of a definite and indefinite length at the same time
T. Hebrew word yom means 24 hour day

B. The Ten Commandments Are God's Character

1. God is JUST - Romans 3:26.	His law is JUST - Romans 7:12.
2. God is TRUE - John 3:33.	His law is TRUE - Nehemiah 9:13.
3. God is PURE - 1 John 3:3.	His law is PURE - Psalm 19:7,8.
4. God is LIGHT - 1 John 1:5.	His law is LIGHT - Proverbs 6:23.
5. God is FAITHFUL - 1 Corinthians 1:9.	His law is FAITHFUL - Psalms 119:86.
6. God is GOOD - Nahum 1:7.	His law is GOOD - Romans 7:12,16.
7. God is SPIRITUAL - John 4:24.	His law is SPIRITUAL - Romans 7:14.
8. God is HOLY - Isaiah 6:3, 1 Peter 1:15.	His law is HOLY - Exodus 20:8, Romans 7:12.
9. God is TRUTH - John 14:6.	His law is TRUTH - Psalms 119:142,151.
10. God is LIFE - John 14:6.	His law is LIFE - Matthew 19:17.
11. God is RIGHTEOUSNESS - Jeremiah 23:6.	His law is RIGHTEOUSNESS - Psalm 119:172.
12. God is PERFECT - Matthew 5:48.	His law is PERFECT - James 1:25.
13. God is ETERNAL - John 8:35.	His law is ETERNAL - Psalms 111:7,8.
14. God is PEACE - Isaiah 9:6.	His law is PEACE - Psalm 119:165.
15. God is THE WAY - John 14:6	His law is THE WAY - Psalm 119:30-32
16. God is SURE - 2 Timothy 2:19	His law is SURE - Psalm 19:7, 111:7,8
17. God is UNCHANGING - Malachi 3:6	His law is UNCHANGING - Psalm 111:7,8
18. God is SWEET - Psalm 34:8	His law is SWEET - Psalm 19:10, 119:103
19. God is WISE - Psalm 111:10	His law is WISE - Psalm 19:7
20. God is OUR MEDITATION - Psalm 63:6	His law is OUR MEDITATION - Psalm 1:2
21. God is JUDGE - Psalm 50:6	His law is JUDGE - James 2:12
22. God is ENLIGHTENMENT - Psalm 18:27	His law is ENLIGHTENMENT - Psalm 19:8
23. God is LOVE - 1 John 4:7,8	His law is LOVE - Romans 13:8-10
24. God is CLEAN - Psalm 19:9	His law is CLEAN - Ezekiel 22:26
25. God is BLESSED - Psalm 28:6	His law is BLESSED - Exodus 20:11
26. God is DELIGHT - Psalm 37:4	His law is DELIGHT - Psalm 1:2
27. God is WONDERFUL - Isaiah 9:6	His law is WONDERFUL - Psalm 119:18
28. God is LIBERTY - Isaiah 61:1	His law is LIBERTY - James 1:25, Psalm 119:45
29. God is COMFORT - Psalm 23:4	His law is COMFORT - Psalm 119:50
30. God is OUR SONG - Revelation 15:3	His law is OUR SONG - Psalm 119:54
31. God is MERCIFUL - Exodus 34:5	His law is MERCIFUL - Psalm 119:58
32. God is KNOWLEDGE - Isaiah 11:2	His law is KNOWLEDGE - Psalm 119:66
33. God is HOPE - Psalm 130:7	His law is HOPE - Psalm 119:74
34. God is LIFE - Psalm 36:9	His law is LIFE - Proverbs 3:1,2
35. God is SOUND - Proverbs 8:13,14	His law is SOUND - Psalm 119:80
36. God is UNDERSTANDING - Psalm 147:5	His law is UNDERSTANDING - Psalm 119:99
37. God is HAPPINESS - Psalm 146:5	His law is HAPPINESS - Proverbs 29:18
38. God is JOY - Psalm 16:11	His law is JOY - Psalm 119:162

C. God's Law is Eternal

Psalm 1:1-3	Our meditation all the day long.
Psalm 19:7-8	The law of God is perfect converting the soul.
Psalm 40:8	God's law is a delight within our heart.
Psalm 78:1-7	The Ten Commandments are for His people.
Psalm 111:7,8	The eternal law of God.
Psalm 103:18-20	The angels keep the commandments of God.
Psalm 105:8-10	The Ten Commandments are binding for 20,000 years [Until 19,000 AD].
Psalm 119:126,150	God will destroy the lawless ones.
Psalm 119:105	The law is our guide and lamp.
Psalm 119:165,174	It is our peace and delight.
Isaiah 8:16	God will seal the law among His disciples.
Isaiah 8:20	The commandments are a test of truth and error.
Isaiah 66:22-24	The Sabbath will be kept in heaven.
Matthew 5:17-19	Jesus came to uphold the Ten Commandments - not abolish them.
Matthew 19:17-19	Keep the Ten Commandments to enter heaven Jesus said.
John 14:15	If you love Jesus keep the Commandments.
John 15:10	Jesus is our example and He kept the law of God.
Luke 23:56	The Sabbath commandment still existed after Jesus died on the cross.
Romans 2:13	The doers of the law are justified.
Romans 3:20	The law gives a knowledge of right and wrong.
Romans 3:31	We establish the law.
Romans 4:15	Sin is the breaking of the law.
Romans 5:13	Sin is the breaking of the law.
Romans 7:7	Sin is the breaking of the law.
Romans 7:12	The law is holy, just and good.
Romans 7:25	The true Christian serves the law of God.
Romans 8:1-4	The true Christian obeys the righteous law of God.
Romans 8:7	The evil mind rejects keeping the commandments of God.
Romans 13:8-10	True love is obeying the law of God.
1 Corinthians 7:19	Keeping the Commandments is what really matters.
1 Corinthians 10:1-4	Jesus gave the Ten Commandments at Mount Sinai.
1 Timothy 1:8	The Ten Commandment Law is good in Paul's day.
Hebrews 4:4,9	The Sabbath rest remains on the seventh day.
Hebrews 8:8-10	Keeping the Ten Commandment Law is part of the New Covenant.
James 1:25	Those who keep the perfect Law are blessed by God in what they do.
James 2:8 - 12	We will be judged by the Ten Commandments [Revelation 20:11-15].
1 John 2:3,4	We must keep the Commandments to know Jesus.
1 John 3:22,24	We must keep the Commandments to abide in Jesus and the Holy Spirit.
1 John 5:2,3	The love of God is to keep His Commandments.
Revelation 11:19	The Ark of the Ten Commandment Covenant still in heaven.
Revelation 15:5	The Ark of the Ten Commandment Covenant still in heaven.
Revelation 12:17	God's saints keep the commandments.
Revelation 14:12	God's saints keep the commandments.
Revelation 21:8	Commandment breakers cast into the Lake of Fire.
Revelation 22:14	God's saints keep the commandments.
Revelation 22:15	Lawless people are excluded from the Paradise of God.

D. Sabbath Preserved in Old Testament Times

PERSON	BIBLE TEXT	DATE - B.C.
Moses	Ex 16:4-35 , 20:1-17	1466
Joshua	Joshua 24:26	1406
Othniel	Judges 3:11	1367
Ehud	Judges 3:30	1309
Barak & Deborah	Judges 5:31	1209
Gideon	Judges 8:28	1209
Tola	Judges 10:2	1166
Jair	Judges 10:3-8	1143
Jepthah	Judges 12:9	1103
Ibzan	Judges 12:9	1097
Elon	Judges 12:11	1090
Abdon	Judges 12:14	1080
Eli	1 Samuel 1:1	1072
Kohathites	1 Chron 9:32 , Numb3:30	1446 - 980
David	Psalm 119	1011-971
Solomon	Prov 28:7,Eccl 12:13,14	971-931
Asa	2 Chron 14:1-4	911-870
Jehosophat	2 Chron 17:1-9	870-848
Jehoida	2 Chron 23:18,2 Kings 11:5-9	835
Elijah & 7,000	1 Kings 18:18,19:18	874-852
Amos	Amos 2:4	781-740
Hosea	Hosea 4:6	781-716
Prophets	2 Kings 17:13	732
Hezekiah	2 Chron 30:1,16 , 31:21	716-687
Isaiah	Isaiah 8:16 , 20 , 58:12-14	781-716
Josiah	2 Kings 22:8-11 , 23:24	640-609
Zepheniah	Zepheniah 3:4	640
Ezekiel	Ezekiel 20:12 , 20 , 44:24	595
Jeremiah	Jeremiah 6:19 , 17:27	627
Daniel	Daniel 9:14	607 - 538
Haggai	Haggai 2:11	521
Zecheriah	Zecheriah 7:12	521
Ezra	Ezra 7:10-12	457
Nehemiah	Nehemiah 13:15-22	445
Malachi	Malachi 2:9	397
Angels	Psalm 103:20	Eternally

E. The Law Given At Mount Sinai

Jesus Christ speaks from the holy mountain - 1 Corinthians 10:1-4

1. Thou shall have no other gods before me.

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

3. Thou shall not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that takes his name in vain.

4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shall not do any work. Thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

5. Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God gives thee.

6. Thou shall not kill.

7. Thou shall not commit adultery.

8. Thou shall not steal.

9. Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

10. Thou shall not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shall not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

F. Jesus Kept The Ten Commandments

Commandment 1

Mt	6:24	Mt	22:37	Mt	19:17	Mt	4:10
Mt	14:33	Mt	10:37,38	Mt	10:32,33	Mt	6:33
Mk	12:24-32	Mk	8:33	Lk	2:14	Lk	4:8
Lk	12:8,9	Lk	1:16	Lk	11:2	Lk	12:31
Jn	19:15	Jn	17:3	Jn	11:25	Jn	4:24

Commandment 2

Jn	4:24

Commandment 3

Mt	27:29	Mt	6:9,10	Mt	15:19	Mt	12:31,32
Mt	27:39-43	Mk	15:18,19	Mk	14:65	Mk	7:22
Mk	3:28,29	Lk	11:2	Lk	22:64,65	Lk	23:36,37
Lk	12:10	Lk	23:39	Jn	19:3		

Commandment 4

Mt	12:2	Mt	12:5	Mt	12:8	Mt	12:10
Mt	12:11	Mt	12:12	Mt	24:20	Mt	28:1
Mt	12:1	Mk	3:4	Mk	16:9	Mk	16:2
Mk	16:1	Mk	6:2	Mk	1:21	Mk	2:28
Mk	2:27	Mk	2:24	Mk	2:23	Mk	3:2
Mk	15:42	Lk	4:31	Lk	13:10	Lk	6:9
Lk	6:7	Lk	6:6	Lk	6:5	Lk	6:1
Lk	4:16	Lk	13:15	Lk	13:16	Lk	6:2
Lk	14:1	Lk	14:3	Lk	14:5	Lk	18:12
Lk	23:54	Lk	23:56	Lk	24:1	Lk	13:14
Jn	19:31	Jn	20:1	Jn	9:16	Jn	9:14
Jn	7:22	Jn	5:18	Jn	5:10	Jn	5:9
Jn	7:23	Jn	20:19				

Commandment 5

Mt	19:18,19	Mt	15:3,4	Mt	12:31	Mk	10:19

Commandment 6

Mt	21:38	Mt	27:22,23	Mt	27:20	Mt	27:3-5
Mt	27:1	Mt	26:59	Mt	5:21	Mt	26:14-16
Mt	26:4	Mt	24:9	Mt	27:35	Mt	23:31
Mt	26:66	Mt	20:18,19	Mt	17:23	Mt	14:8,10
Mt	11:12	Mt	10:28	Mt	10:21	Mt	22:6
Mt	19:18	Mt	15:19	Mt	23:34,35	Mt	26:52
Mk	12:5	Mk	7:21	Mk	10:19	Mk	3:6
Mk	6:16	Mk	6:19	Mk	10:33,34	Mk	12:7,8
Mk	13:12	Mk	15:20	Mk	9:31	Mk	15:24
Mk	14:1	Mk	15:13-15	Mk	14:64	Mk	14:55
Mk	14:21	Mk	14:10,11	Mk	6:24-27	Lk	22:2
Lk	10:30	Lk	18:20	Lk	9:9	Lk	24:7
Lk	23:33	Lk	23:23	Lk	22:5,6	Lk	20:19
Lk	20:14	Lk	19:47	Lk	18:33	Lk	13:31
Lk	11:47-51	Lk	9:22	Lk	4:29	Lk	12:4,5
Jn	19:6,7	Jn	16:2	Jn	8:44	Jn	13:2
Jn	7:19,20	Jn	19:15	Jn	7:1	Jn	8:37
Jn	12:10	Jn	11:50				

Commandment 7

Mt	12:39	Mt	19:9,18	Mt	15:19	Mt	5:27-32
Mt	14:4	Mt	5:8	Mt	16:4	Mk	6:18
Mk	8:38	Mk	10:2-12	Mk	7:21	Mk	10:19
Lk	16:18	Lk	7:37	Lk	15:30	Jn	8:3,4

Commandment 8

Mt	19:18	Mt	23:14	Mt	21:38	Mt	21:12,13
Mt	6:19,20	Mt	15:19	Mk	7:22	Mk	10:19
Mk	12:40	Mk	11:17	Lk	18:20	Lk	19:46
Lk	3:13	Lk	19:8	Lk	10:30	Lk	20:14
Jn	2:16						

Commandment 9

Mt	7:15	Mt	27:63	Mt	26:69-75	Mt	26:34,35
Mt	26:24,25	Mt	26:14,16	Mt	24:23,24	Mt	28:13
Mt	11:18,19	Mt	27:12,13	Mt	24:10,11	Mt	26:59,60

Mt	19:18	Mt	5:11	Mt	5:33	Mt	15:19
Mt	24:4	Mt	26:48	Mk	13:21,22	Mk	10:19
Mk	13:22	Mk	3:22	Mk	7:22	MK	13:12
Mk	14:1	Mk	14:10,11	Mk	14:21	Mk	14:30,31
Mk	14:41	Mk	14:66-72	Mk	15:3,4	Mk	14:56,57
Mk	13:5,6	Lk	22:5,6	Lk	22:54-62	Lk	19:8
Lk	20:20	Lk	6:22	Lk	22:21	Lk	21:16
Lk	6:16	Lk	7:33,34	Lk	11:15-20	Lk	21:8
Lk	22:34	Lk	23:2	Jn	3:19-21	Jn	13:2
Jn	8:44,55	Jn	10:20	Jn	18:25-27	Jn	6:71
Jn	18:17	Jn	13:38				

Commandment 10

Mt	26:14-16	Mt	19:22	Mt	21:38	Mt	5:28
Mk	4:19	Mk	7:22	Mk	12:7,8	Mk	14:10,11
Mk	10:22	Lk	11:39	Lk	12:16-21	Lk	12:15
Lk	16:14	Lk	16:19-22	Lk	18:23	Lk	19:8
Lk	20:14	Lk	22:5,6	Jn	8:44	Jn	2:16

G. The Two Laws Compared

Attribute	**The Ten Commandments**		**The Cremonial Law**	
1. Spoken By	God	Deut 4:12	Moses	Lev 1:1-3
2. Written By	God	Ex 31:18	Moses	Deut 31:9
				Deut 10:3,4
3. Written On	Stone	Ex 31:18	Paper	Deut 31:24
		Deut 10:3,4		
4. Inside Ark	Yes	Deut 10:1-5	No	Deut 31:26
5. Complete ?	Yes	Deut 5:22	No	Lev 1:1-3 , 4:1-3
6. Eternal ?	Yes	Ps 111:7,8	No	Heb 7:12
7. Good ?	Yes	Rom 7:12	No	Coll 2:14
8. Points Out ?	Sin	1 John 3:4	Savior	Lev 4:27- 31
				John1:29
9. Obey ?	Yes	Matt 5:19	No	Acts 15:24
10. Spiritual ?	Yes	Rom 7:14	No	Heb 7:16
11. Perfect	Yes	Ps 19:7	No	Heb 7:19
12. Liberty	Yes	James 2:11,12	No	Gal 5:1
13. Delight	Yes	Ps 119:17,77	No	Acts 15:10
14. Christ Upheld	Yes	Is 42:21	No	Eph 2:15
15. Till Eternity	Yes	Matt 5:18	No	Gal 3:19
16. Our Standard ?	Yes	James 2:8-12	No	Coll 2:16,17
17. Sabbath Began	Creation	Ex 20:8-11	Sinai	Lev 23:24
18. Sabbath Began	Before Sin	Gen 2:1-3	After Sin	Lev 23:24

God's 10 Commandment Law Is Not Moses' Cremonial Law

The Law Of God	The Law Of Moses
1 Chron 16:40	Joshua 8:31,34
22:12	22:5
2 Chron 12:1	23:6
17:9	1 Kings 2:3
31:3,4	2 Kings 14:6
35:26	21:8

Ezra	7:10,12		23:25
	7:21,26	2 Chron	23:18
Neh	8:18		25:4
	10:28,29		30:16
Psalm	1:2	Ezra	3:2
	19:7		7:6
	37:31	Neh	8:8
	40:8		
	78:1		
	81:4		
	89:30		
	119:1-176		

H. Paul Kept The Ten Commandments

1.	Acts	24:14	Acts	27:23	Rom	1:21-32	Rom	1:9
	Rom	3:30	Rom	3:18	1 Cor	14:25	1 Cor	8:4,6
	1 Cor	10:20,21	2 Cor	6:15	Eph	4:6	Phill	3:19
	Phill	3:3	Coll	2:18	1 Th	1:9	2 Th	2:4
	1 Tim	1:17	1 Tim	2:5	1 Tim	1:3	2 Tim	3:4
	Heb	12:28	Heb	9:14	Heb	3:12		
2.	Acts	15:20,29	Acts	19:35	Acts	17:16,29	Acts	21:25
	Rom	2:22	Rom	11:4	Rom	1:23	Rom	11:4
	1 Cor	10:7,14	1 Cor	6:9	1 Cor	10:20,21	1 Cor	10:19
	1 Cor	5:10,11	2 Cor	6:16	Gal	5:20	Eph	5:5
	Coll	3:5	Coll	5:21	1 Th	1:9		
3.	Acts	18:6	Acts	26:11	Rom	2:24	Coll	3:8
	1 Tim	1:13	1 Tim	6:1	1 Tim	1:20	2 Tim	3:2
	Tit	2:5						
4.	Acts	13:42	Acts	20:7	Acts	18:4-11	Acts	17:2
	Acts	16:13	Acts	13:44	Acts	13:27	Acts	13:14
	Acts	15:21	1 Cor	16:2	Heb	4:4,9		
5.	Rom	1:30	Eph	6:2	Coll	3:20	1 Tim	5:4
	1 Tim	3:12	1 Tim	3:4	2 Tim	3:2		
6.	Rom	3:15	Rom	11:3	Rom	1:29	Rom	13:9
	Gal	5:21	1 Th	2:15	1 Tim	1:9		
7.	Acts	15:20	Acts	15:29	Rom	1:29	Rom	2:22
	Rom	7:2,3	1 Cor	5:11	1 Cor	6:13	1 Cor	6:18
	1 Cor	7:2	1 Cor	10:8,10	1 Cor	5:9	1 Cor	5:1
	1 Cor	5:10	1 Cor	6:15	1 Cor	10:34,36,39	1 Cor	6:9
	1 Cor	10:11,13	2 Cor	11:2	Gal	5:19	Eph	5:3,5
	Eph	5:23,33	Coll	3:18,19	Coll	3:5	1 Th	4:3
	1 Tim	3:2	1 Tim	1:10	1 Tim	3:12	2 Tim	3:6
	Tit	2:4,5	Tit	1:6	Heb	13:4	Heb	12:16
8.	Rom	13:9	Rom	2:21	Rom	2:22	1 Cor	6:8
	1 Cor	7:5	1 Cor	6:10	2 Cor	11:8	Eph	4:28

	1 Th	4:6	1 Tim	1:10			
9.	Acts	13:6	Rom	3:4	Rom	3:13	Rom	13:9
	Rom	1:25	1 Cor	6:8	2 Cor	11:13	2 Cor	11:31
	2 Cor	11:3	Gal	1:20	Gal	1:6-8	Eph	5:6
	Eph	4:25	Eph	4:14	Coll	3:9	1 Th	2:3
	1 Th	4:6	2 Th	2:11	1 Tim	2:7	1 Tim	4:2
	1 Tim	6:10,21	1 Tim	1:10	2 Tim	2:18	2 Tim	4:4
	2 Tim	3:13	2 Tim	3:3	Tit	1:2	Tit	2:3
	Heb	6:18						
10.	Rom	13:14	Rom	7:7	Rom	13:9	Rom	1:24
	Rom	6:12	1 Cor	10:6	Gal	5:16,24	Eph	2:3
	Eph	4:19,22	Coll	3:5	1 Th	2:5	1 Tim	3:3,8
	1 Tim	6:10	1 Tim	6:9	2 Tim	4:3	2 Tim	3:6
	2 Tim	2:22	2 Tim	3:2	Tit	2:12	Tit	3:3
	Heb	13:5						

I. The Law In Galatians Is The Ceremonial Law

None of the 10 Commandments are mentioned in Galatians. The Sabbath is not mentioned once. The issue in the book of Galatians is not Sabbath keeping but that of circumcision.

Acts	14:6,21	The gospel was planted in Galatia
	15:1-5	Men arose preaching circumcision for salvation
Gal	2:3,7,8,9,12	Circumcision is the issue, not the Sabbath Day!
	5:2,3,6,11	
	6:12,13,15	
Gal	3:10	The book of the law
Acts	15:5	The law of Moses
Deut	31:18	God's law written on stone not in paper book
	10:1-4	Written on stone
	31:9	Ceremonial law written on paper
	33:2-4	God's law and Moses' law
1 Corr	7:19	Circumcision abolished but the 10 Commandments are eternally binding
Gal	5:6	Faith and love
John	14:15,16	Keep the commandments with love
	15:10,14	
James	2:8-12	Judged by the Law
Heb	8:8-10	The New Covenant

J. The New Testament Ten Commandments

Commandment 1

Mt	6:24	Mt	22:37	Mt	19:17	Mt	4:10
Mt	14:33	Mt	10:37,38	Mt	10:32,33	Mt	6:33
Mk	12:24-32	Mk	8:33	Lk	2:14	Lk	4:8
Lk	12:8,9	Lk	1:16	Lk	11:2	Lk	12:31
Jn	19:15	Jn	17:3	Jn	11:25	Jn	4:24
Acts	24:14	Acts	7:7	Acts	27:23	Acts	7:42,43
Acts	5:29	Rom	3:30	Rom	1:9	Rom	3:18

Rom 1:21-32	1 Cor 8:4,6	1 Cor 14:25	1 Cor 10:20,21
2 Cor 6:15	Eph 4:6	Phill 3:3	Phill 3:19
Coll 2:18	1 Th 1:9	2 Th 2:4	1 Tim 1:3
1 Tim 1:17	1 Tim 2:5	2 Tim 3:4	Heb 12:28
Heb 9:14	Heb 3:12	Jam 4:7	Jam 2:19
1 Jn 5:20,21	Rev 21:3	Rev 22:9	Rev 21:22
Rev 13:4	Rev 19:4,10	Rev 4:8-11	Rev 5:14
Rev 7:13-17	Rev 11:16	Rev 22:3	

Commandment 2

Jn 4:24	Acts 15:20,29	Acts 19:35	Acts 7:43
Acts 17:16,29	Acts 21:25	Rom 2:22	Rom 11:4
Rom 1:23	Rom 11:4	1 Cor 10:7,14	1 Cor 6:9
1 Cor 10:20,21	1 Cor 10:19	1 Cor 5:10,11	2 Cor 6:16
Gal 5:20	Eph 5:5	Coll 3:5	Coll 5:21
1 Th 1:9	1 Pet 4:3	1 Jn 5:21	Rev 22:15
Rev 9:20	Rev 13:14,15	Rev 14:9,11	Rev 15:2
Rev 16:2	Rev 21:22	Rev 21:8	Rev 2:20
Rev 19:20	Rev 2:14	Rev 20:4	

Commandment 3

Mt 27:29	Mt 6:9,10	Mt 15:19	Mt 12:31,32
Mt 27:39-43	Mk 15:18,19	Mk 14:65	Mk 7:22
Mk 3:28,29	Lk 11:2	Lk 22:64,65	Lk 23:36,37
Lk 12:10	Lk 23:39	Jn 19:3	Acts 26:11
Acts 18:6	Rom 2:24	Coll 3:8	1 Tim 6:1
1 Tim 1:20	1 Tim 1:13	2 Tim 3:2	Tit 2:5
Jam 2:7	Jude 1:15	Rev 2:9	Rev 13:1,5,6
Rev 17:1-5	Rev 16:9,11,21		

Commandment 4

Mt 12:2	Mt 12:5	Mt 12:8	Mt 12:10
Mt 12:11	Mt 12:12	Mt 24:20	Mt 28:1
Mt 12:1	Mk 3:4	Mk 16:9	Mk 16:2
Mk 16:1	Mk 6:2	Mk 1:21	Mk 2:28
Mk 2:27	Mk 2:24	Mk 2:23	Mk 3:2
Mk 15:42	Lk 4:31	Lk 13:10	Lk 6:9
Lk 6:7	Lk 6:6	Lk 6:5	Lk 6:1
Lk 4:16	Lk 13:15	Lk 13:16	Lk 6:2
Lk 14:1	Lk 14:3	Lk 14:5	Lk 18:12
Lk 23:54	Lk 23:56	Lk 24:1	Lk 13:14
Jn 19:31	Jn 20:1	Jn 9:16	Jn 9:14
Jn 7:22	Jn 5:18	Jn 5:10	Jn 5:9
Jn 7:23	Jn 20:19	Acts 13:42	Acts 20:7
Acts 18:4-11	Acts 17:2	Acts 16:13	Acts 13:44
Acts 13:27	Acts 13:14	Acts 1:12	Acts 15:21
1 Cor 16:2	Heb 4:4	Heb 4:9	Rev 14:7

Commandment 5

Mt 19:18,19	Mt 15:3,4	Mt 12:31	Mk 10:19
Rom 1:30	Eph 6:2	Coll 3:20	1 Tim 5:4
1 Tim 3:12	1 Tim 3:4	2 Tim 3:2	1 Pet 1:14

Commandment 6

Mt 21:38	Mt 27:22,23	Mt 27:20	Mt 27:3-5
Mt 27:1	Mt 26:59	Mt 5:21	Mt 26:14-16

Mt	26:4	Mt	24:9	Mt	27:35	Mt	23:31
Mt	26:66	Mt	20:18,19	Mt	17:23	Mt	14:8,10
Mt	11:12	Mt	10:28	Mt	10:21	Mt	22:6
Mt	19:18	Mt	15:19	Mt	23:34,35	Mt	26:52
Mk	12:5	Mk	7:21	Mk	10:19	Mk	3:6
Mk	6:16	Mk	6:19	Mk	10:33,34	Mk	12:7,8
Mk	13:12	Mk	15:20	Mk	9:31	Mk	15:24
Mk	14:1	Mk	15:13-15	Mk	14:64	Mk	14:55
Mk	14:21	Mk	14:10,11	Mk	6:24-27	Lk	22:2
Lk	10:30	Lk	18:20	Lk	9:9	Lk	24:7
Lk	23:33	Lk	23:23	Lk	22:5,6	Lk	20:19
Lk	20:14	Lk	19:47	Lk	18:33	Lk	13:31
Lk	11:47-51	Lk	9:22	Lk	4:29	Lk	12:4,5
Jn	19:6,7	Jn	16:2	Jn	8:44	Jn	13:2
Jn	7:19,20	Jn	19:15	Jn	7:1	Jn	8:37
Jn	12:10	Jn	11:50	Rom	3:15	Rom	13:9
Rom	1:29	Rom	11:3	Gal	5:21	1 Th	2:15
1 Tim	1:9	Jam	5:6	Jam	2:11	Jam	4:2
1 Pet	4:15	1 Jn	3:15	1 Jn	4:20	1 Jn	2:9
1 Jn	3:12	Rev	21:8	Rev	22:15	Rev	2:13
Rev	6:8-10	Rev	11:7	Rev	12:4	Rev	13:15
Rev	18:24	Rev	17:6	Rev	19:2	Rev	9:21

Commandment 7

Mt	12:39	Mt	19:9,18	Mt	15:19	Mt	5:27-32
Mt	14:4	Mt	5:8	Mt	16:4	Mk	6:18
Mk	8:38	Mk	10:2-12	Mk	7:21	Mk	10:19
Lk	16:18	Lk	7:37	Lk	15:30	Jn	8:3,4
Acts	15:29	Acts	15:20	Rom	2:22	Rom	1:29
Rom	7:2,3	1 Cor	5:9	1 Cor	10:34,36,39	1 Cor	5:10
1 Cor	10:8,10	1 Cor	7:2	1 Cor	6:18	1 Cor	6:13
1 Cor	5:1	1 Cor	6:9	1 Cor	5:11	1 Cor	6:15
1 Cor	10:11,13	2 Cor	11:2	Gal	5:19	Eph	5:23,33
Eph	5:3,5	Coll	3:18,19	Coll	3:5	1 Th	4:3
1 Tim	3:12	1 Tim	1:10	1 Tim	3:2	2 Tim	3:6
Tit	2:4,5	Tit	1:6	Heb	12:16	Heb	13:4
Jam	2:11	Jam	3:15	Jam	4:4	1 Pet	3:1,5,7
1 Pet	4:3	2 Pet	2:14	Jude	1:19	Jude	1:4
Jude	1:7	Rev	2:14	Rev	2:20-22	Rev	9:21
Rev	14:8	Rev	17:15,16	Rev	18:3,9	Rev	19:2
Rev	22:15	Rev	21:2	Rev	17:1-5	Rev	21:9
Rev	21:8						

Commandment 8

Mt	19:18	Mt	23:14	Mt	21:38	Mt	21:12,13
Mt	6:19,20	Mt	15:19	Mk	7:22	Mk	10:19
Mk	12:40	Mk	11:17	Lk	18:20	Lk	19:46
Lk	3:13	Lk	19:8	Lk	10:30	Lk	20:14
Jn	2:16	Acts	5:1-5	Rom	13:9	Rom	2:22
Rom	2:21	1 Cor	6:10	1 Cor	7:5	1 Cor	6:8
2 Cor	11:8	Eph	4:28	1 Th	4:6	1 Tim	1:10
Jam	5:4	1 Pet	4:15	Rev	9:21		

Commandment 9

Mt	7:15	Mt	27:63	Mt	26:69-75	Mt	26:34,35
Mt	26:24,25	Mt	26:14,16	Mt	24:23,24	Mt	28:13

Mt	11:18,19	Mt	27:12,13	Mt	24:10,11	Mt	26:59,60
Mt	19:18	Mt	5:11	Mt	5:33	Mt	15:19
Mt	24:4	Mt	26:48	Mk	13:21,22	Mk	10:19
Mk	13:22	Mk	3:22	Mk	7:22	MK	13:12
Mk	14:1	Mk	14:10,11	Mk	14:21	Mk	14:30,31
Mk	14:41	Mk	14:66-72	Mk	15:3,4	Mk	14:56,57
Mk	13:5,6	Lk	22:5,6	Lk	22:54-62	Lk	19:8
Lk	20:20	Lk	6:22	Lk	22:21	Lk	21:16
Lk	6:16	Lk	7:33,34	Lk	11:15-20	Lk	21:8
Lk	22:34	Lk	23:2	Jn	3:19-21	Jn	13:2
Jn	8:44,55	Jn	10:20	Jn	18:25-27	Jn	6:71
Jn	18:17	Jn	13:38	Acts	6:13	Acts	5:3,4
Acts	13:6	Rom	13:9	Rom	3:13	Rom	3:4
Rom	1:25	1 Cor	6:8	2 Cor	11:13	2 Cor	11:31
2 Cor	11:3	Gal	1:20	Gal	1:6-8	Eph	4:14
Eph	5:6	Eph	4:25	Coll	3:9	1 Th	2:3
1 Th	4:6	2 Th	2:11	1 Tim	4:2	1 Tim	1:10
1 Tim	2:7	1 Tim	6:10,21	2 Tim	2:18	2 Tim	3:13
2 Tim	4:4	2 Tim	3:3	Tit	1:2	Tit	2:3
Heb	6:18	Jam	3:14	1 Pet	3:16	2 Pet	2:18,19
2 Pet	2:13	2 Pet	2:1	2 Pet	3:17	1 Jn	4:20
1 Jn	5:10	1 Jn	4:1	1 Jn	1:10	1 Jn	2:4
1 Jn	2:27	1 Jn	2:21,22	1 Jn	1:6	1 Jn	4:6
2 Jn	1:7	Jude	1:16	Jude	1:10	Rev	18:23
Rev	13:14	Rev	12:9	Rev	21:8	Rev	2:2
Rev	20:3,8	Rev	22:15	Rev	3:9	Rev	21:27
Rev	20:10						

Commandment 10

Mt	26:14-16	Mt	19:22	Mt	21:38	Mt	5:28
Mk	4:19	Mk	7:22	Mk	12:7,8	Mk	14:10,11
Mk	10:22	Lk	11:39	Lk	12:16-21	Lk	12:15
Lk	16:14	Lk	16:19-22	Lk	18:23	Lk	19:8
Lk	20:14	Lk	22:5,6	Jn	8:44	Jn	2:16
Rom	1:24	Rom	6:12	Rom	13:14	Rom	13:9
Rom	7:7	1 Cor	10:6	Gal	5:16,24	Eph	4:19,22
Eph	2:3	Coll	3:5	1 Th	2:5	1 Tim	6:10
1 Tim	3:3,8	1 Tim	6:9	2 Tim	4:3	2 Tim	3:6
2 Tim	3:2	2 Tim	2:22	Tit	3:3	Tit	2:12
Heb	13:5	Jam	1:14,15	Jam	5:1-5	Jam	4:1,3
Jam	3:16	1 Pet	1:14	1 Pet	2:11	1 Pet	4:2,3
2 Pet	2:18	2 Pet	3:3	1 Jn	2:16,17	Jude	1:11
Jude	1:16,18	Rev	7:13-17	Rev	18:9-19	Rev	9:21

K. Summary of the New Testament Commandments

											Exhibit K
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**Total**
Mt	8		5	9	3	24	7	6	18	4	**84**
Mk	2		4	12	1	19	5	4	15	5	**67**
Lk	6		5	19		17	3	6	13	9	**78**
Jn	4	1	1	10		10	1	1	8	2	**38**
Acts	5	5	2	10			2	1	3		**28**
Rom	4	4	1		1	4	3	3	4	5	**29**
1 Cor	3	5		1			12	3	1	1	**26**
2 Cor	1	1					1	1	3		**7**
Gal		1				1	1		2	1	**6**
Eph	1	1			1		2	1	3	2	**11**
Phil	2										**2**
Coll	1	2	1		1		2		1	1	**9**
1 Th	1	1				1	1	1	2	1	**8**
2 Th	1								1		**2**
1 Tim	3		3		3	1	3	1	4	3	**21**
2 Tim	1		1		1		1		4	4	**12**
Tit			1				2		2	2	**7**
Heb	3			2			2		1	1	**9**
Jam	2		1			3	3	1	1	4	**15**
1 Pet		1			1	1	2	1	1	3	**10**
2 Pet							1		4	2	**7**
1 Jn	1	1				4			9	1	**16**
2 Jn									1		**1**
Jude	2		1				3		2	2	**10**
Rev	15	12	11	1		15	14	2	11	3	**84**
Total	**66**	**35**	**37**	**64**	**12**	**100**	**71**	**32**	**114**	**56**	**587**

L. Fourteen Texts Used Against the Sabbath Answered

1. Didn't Paul condemn the Galatians for "observing special days and months and seasons and years?" Doesn't this mean Paul was teaching that the Sabbath had been abolished? (Galatians 4:10)

The answer to your question is found by understanding who Paul was writing to and what circumstances he was addressing. By reading Galatians 4:8-11 and analyzing the verses surrounding the text you quoted, we discover Paul was not even speaking about the Sabbath. Let's carefully examine what he wrote:

Verse 8 "Formerly, when you did not know God." Here Paul tells us he was not writing to Jews because, as God's chosen nation, the Jews already knew God. Instead Paul was writing to people who were once pagans and who had recently converted to Christianity. Before converting to Christianity these pagans did not know God and they "were slaves to those who by nature are not gods." They were worshipping heathen idols and pagan deities which do not have the divine nature of the true God. Paganism was common in Paul's day, and in 1 Corinthians 10:20 he also had to warn the Corinthian Christians against participating in pagan sacrifices and celebrations.

Verse 9 "But now that you know God." After Paul preached the Gospel to these pagans and they learned about the true God, they converted to Christianity. Now as Christians they know God. But they are beginning to slip back into their old pagan habits: "you are turning back to those weak and miserable principles." These were heathen principles taught by the pagans. What were the "weak and miserable principles" of paganism that these new Christian converts found so appealing that they risked being "enslaved by them all over again?" Paul answers that question in the next verse.

Verse 10 "You are observing special days and months and seasons and years!" Paul wrote this to Christians who were falling back into their old pagan customs. Those "special days" were not the special days that Christians or Jews observe, they were the special days that pagans observed. For instance, pagans celebrated the solstices: June 22 (the beginning of the summer season) and December 22 (the beginning of the winter season). Pagans also celebrated the first day of each week, Sunday, in memory of their Sun god. They had many fast days and feast days which were part of their pagan religion.

Verse 11 "I fear for you, that somehow I have wasted my efforts on you." Paul had worked hard to present the Gospel to these people. He warned them his efforts would be wasted if they left Christianity by turning back to their old pagan customs and revelry.

Conclusion: There is nothing here about obeying God's Ten Commandments, or worshipping on the seventh day of the week, or abolishing God's holy Sabbath day. Instead, Paul is warning his new Christian friends against turning back to the old pagan celebrations they had once observed.

2. Paul tells us in Romans 14:5 no day is more sacred than another, therefore we can worship any day we please.

No, what Paul said is: "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." When we look at the context we learn Paul was addressing personal preferences, not direct commands from God. Let's look carefully at Paul's words:

In verse 1 Paul tells us he is speaking about "disputable matters." These are the gray areas of Christian life where personal preferences are exercised, because they do not deal with clearly defined commands of God.

Verses 2-4 tell us these "disputable matters" concern things such as whether or not a person prefers to be a vegetarian. In the absence of a direct command from God to "eat only vegetables," each person is free to exercise his own personal preference. Paul writes that God accepts our personal preferences in these gray areas.

Verses 5-9 tell us that there are also gray areas when it comes to "days." Notice the word "sacred" has been added by the translators for the original Greek reads: "One man judges a day above a day, another judges every day." The King James version reads: "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike." In other words a fisherman might think the fish bite better on Tuesday than they do on Friday. Or a farmer may prefer to plant his crops on Monday instead of Thursday. Whatever we

think about one day being better than another is our personal business.

But in verses 10-12 Paul warns Christians that every one of us will "give an account of himself to God." While God accepts our personal preferences in the gray areas, He does not permit us to choose which of His commands we will obey. Disobedience is sin and we will be condemned for disobedience: Romans 14:22.

Conclusion: Paul did not say that God's holy Sabbath day had been abolished. Instead Paul said as long as we obey what God has specifically commanded, we are free to exercise our personal preferences in the gray areas of Christian life. But since God specifically made Saturday holy and clearly designated it as the day for rest and worship, we are sinning if we disobey God's command.

3. Doesn't Ephesians 2:15 say the Ten Commandments were abolished by Christ's death on the cross?

No, Ephesians 2:15 does not even mention the Ten Commandments. Instead it says: "by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations." The law that Paul was speaking about has both commandments and regulations. That law was the "barrier, the dividing wall of hostility" he referred to in verse 14. It was the ceremonial law with its commandments and regulations about sacrifices and unclean foods that created a wall between Jews and Gentiles. Christ fulfilled the ceremonial law and abolished its regulations and sacrifices through His death. But the moral law in Ten Commandments was not abolished nor was it even relaxed by Christ. Instead, Jesus made the Ten Commandments broader and more far-reaching (Matthew 5:21-48). The Ten Commandments continue to define sin and point sinners to Christ as their Savior (Galatians 3:24). Paul tells us that our faith in Christ never abolishes God's Ten Commandment law (Romans 3:31).

Conclusion: The ceremonial law which contained commandments and regulations regarding foods and sacrifices was abolished when Christ died on the cross. But the Ten Commandments continue to be in effect as the definition of sin. We Christians must always obey what God specifically requires in His moral law.

4. Paul tells us in Colossians 2:14, 16 that the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross. Therefore aren't Christians free to worship on Sunday instead of Saturday since the Sabbath commandment no longer is in effect?

Again, the Ten Commandments are not even mentioned here. Instead, Colossians 2:14 says: "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." Notice that the Bible makes a distinction between the "written code" which was canceled at the cross and God's Ten Commandments. God's Ten Commandments are eternal and were placed inside the Ark of the Covenant. The ceremonial laws ended at the cross and were kept in a pocket outside of the Ark (Deuteronomy 10:4, 5; 31:24-26). The ceremonial laws are the "written code" which regulated "what you eat or drink" as well as "religious festivals, New Moon celebrations, (and) Sabbaths" (Colossians 2:16). Jesus fulfilled and established the Ten Commandments by living a sinless life; but He fulfilled and abolished the "written code" of ceremonial celebrations and worship services which pointed forward to His first coming as the Messiah (sacrificial lambs, offerings, Annual Holy Days, et cetera). Jesus specifically stated He did not come to abolish God's Ten Commandment Law, but rather to fulfill it by living a sinless life (Matthew 5:17-19).

In the original Greek the words "written code" are literally "the handwritten certificate of indebtedness." The words "code, with its" are supplied by the translators and do not appear in the original Greek. Thus Christ took away the "handwritten certificate of our indebtedness," and nailed it to the cross when He forgave all our sins (Colossians 2:13).

In its simplest terms, this written certificate of indebtedness states: "The wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). By sinning we are indebted to pay for our sins with our life. But Jesus paid our death penalty on the cross with His life, thus blotting out our death certificate. In addition, He fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies and the religious regulations and ceremonies which pointed forward to His first coming and death on the cross. Thus we can be forgiven for our past sins, but the Ten Commandments were not abolished by Jesus' death on the cross. Therefore we are not free to sin and we must be conformed to the requirements of God's Law through the power of the Holy Spirit working in our lives (Romans 7:7, 12, 13, 22, 25; 8:1-8, 12-14).

Now let's read Colossians 2:16 and study each of the key phrases: "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." The word "therefore" refers back to the previous verses where we are told that Christ "forgave us all our sins" (Colossians 2:13); "canceled the written code with its regulations, that was against us" (Colossians 2:14); and by His death on the cross disarmed and triumphed over the "powers and authorities" (Colossians 2:15).

The key point Paul is making here is: "therefore" since Christ has done all this for you, "do not let anyone judge you." Why? Because Christ "forgave us all our sins;" "canceled the written code;" and "triumphed over the powers and authorities" who had the right to condemn us to death for our sins. "Therefore" we are not to judge or be judged by others on the basis of the externals of Judaisms ceremonial laws ("what you eat, drink, religious festivals, New Moon celebrations, or Sabbaths"). What other human beings think in these matters is not important (Romans 14:16-18). But we Christians must always remember God is the final judge of both our actions and our characters (Romans 2:11-16). Since we are all accountable only to Him we must each make certain that we do not deliberately disobey what He has clearly commanded.

Now, let's look specifically at what Paul meant when he said we are not to let people judge us by what we "eat, drink, religious festivals, New Moon celebrations, or Sabbaths." First, remember the Ten Commandments do not regulate "eating or drinking." Those dietary laws are found in the ceremonial regulations God established for the Jews (see Exodus 12:9, 18; Leviticus 3:17; 10:9; chapter 11, etcetera).

Also, the Ten Commandments do not regulate "religious festivals." The laws concerning Jewish religious festivals are in the ceremonial regulations God established for the Jews (see Exodus 23:14-16; Leviticus 23:41; Numbers 29:12, et cetera). Paul is clear that we are not to judge people by what they eat or drink, or by the religious festivals they keep. But abstaining from judging does not remove our personal responsibility to God, nor does it change the fact that God will judge each of us if we deliberately disobey Him. Read Colossians 3:5, 6 and notice that Paul lists at least three of the Ten Commandments there. Paul is clear that God will judge us by the Ten Commandments.

The Ten Commandments also do not regulate "New Moon celebrations." New Moon celebrations were regulated by the ceremonial laws God established for the Jews (see Numbers 28:14; Ezra 3:5; Psalm 81:3, etcetera).

But, what about the phrase "a Sabbath day?" The original Greek reads "in respect of a feast or of a new moon or of sabbaths." The words "a Sabbath day" are supplied by the translators! The Hebrew word "sabbath" means "rest." All Jewish religious feasts and festivals were called "Sabbaths" because they were times of rest from daily work. The Jews celebrate six annual Holy Days which they call "Annual Sabbaths" (Passover, Day of Atonement, Feast of Tabernacles, Pentecost, Feast of Trumpets and First Fruits). The Ten Commandments do not regulate these annual "Sabbaths." It is the ceremonial law God established for the Jews that regulates all those annual Sabbath Festivals (Leviticus 16:1-34; 23:5-25, 34-36).

The Annual Sabbath Festivals began with Moses in 1450 B.C., pointed forward to Christ and ended at the Cross. But the weekly Sabbath Day began on the seventh day of creation week, 2,500 years before there ever was a Jew, and continues for all eternity (Isaiah 66:22, 23). The Sabbath is part of God's eternal Ten Commandment Law which will be used to judge every person (Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14; 1 John 3:4; James 2:10-12; Matthew 15:3-9).

5. In Galatians 2:19 Paul says that he died to the law. Doesn't that mean he didn't bother to keep God's Ten Commandments once he became a Christian?

No. Before Paul became a Christian he tried to earn his salvation by keeping God's Law. Now, as a Christian, Paul has come to the realization that God's Ten Commandments are not a method for earning salvation - rather the Ten Commandments are designed to define sin, restrain evil, and turn us to Jesus for cleansing, forgiveness and salvation (Romans 3:20-24). Thus Paul "died to the law" as a method for earning salvation and he now relies fully on Jesus Christ for his salvation (Galatians 2:17-21). There's nothing here about doing away with God's Ten Commandments or doing away with the weekly Sabbath day.

6. Doesn't Paul tell us in Romans 3:28 that we are justified by faith, therefore we don't have to observe the Ten Commandments?

It is absolutely true that only Jesus justifies ("saves") us, and that we must have a growing faith in Him.

God's Ten Commandments can never save us. But let's read on to see what Paul said in verse 31: "Do we then nullify the law by this faith? Not at all! Rather, we uphold the law." A saved Christian chooses to obey God's Law, not because he's trying to earn salvation, but because it is natural to obey the God we love and worship (Matthew 22:35-40; 1 John 5:2, 3).

7. Since Galatians 2:16 tells us that we are not saved by keeping the Law, shouldn't we forget God's Ten Commandments and just love Jesus?

No, Jesus said if we love Him we will obey what He commands (John 14:15). Love can never be separated from obedience. Many people think that since Paul condemns law-keeping as a method of earning salvation, that he is against God's Ten Commandments. However in the next two verses (Galatians 2:17, 18) Paul makes it clear that it is not his intention to teach Christians to sin by breaking God's law! Notice positively Paul speaks about God's Law:

Paul's View of God's Law

* Christians do not nullify ("make of no value") God's Law by their faith in Jesus. Instead, our faith upholds God's Law: Romans 3:31.
* Keeping God's Commandments is what counts in a positive, loving, Christian life: 1 Corinthians 7:19.
* God's Law is good if it is used properly: 1 Timothy 1:8.
* If God's Law did not exist, there would be no sin (and therefore there would be no need for grace and no need for our Savior Jesus Christ): Romans 5:13.
* We are to put away our sinful natures: Romans 13:12-14.
* Being under grace does not give us a license to sin: Romans 6:15.
* God's Law is holy, righteous and good: Romans 7:12.

The Bible is clear that we are not loyal to God if we deliberately choose to disobey Him: 1 John 2:3-6; 3:3-6.

8. In Matthew 5:17 Jesus said He came to fulfill the Law. Doesn't this mean that He abolished God's Ten Commandments?

When we read this text very carefully we discover that Jesus specifically stated He did not come to abolish the Law. Instead, Jesus promises us in verse 18 that as long as heaven and earth exist not a single stroke of a pen will disappear from God's Law! The Holy Spirit informs us in 1 John 3:5 that Jesus came to "take away our sins," not to take away God's Law! Remember, simply because I "fulfill" the speed limit by driving 55 miles an hour on Monday does not mean I have abolished the speed limit law and now can drive 75 on Tuesday! Any policeman will tell us "fulfilling" the law does not abolish the law.

9. Doesn't Paul say that we are not under the Law, but under Grace? (See Romans 6:14).

Yes. But he also says being under grace doesn't give us an excuse to sin by breaking God's Ten Commandment Law because "sin shall not be your master" (see verses 14 and 15). Paul is not against God's Ten Commandments, he is against anyone trying to earn eternal life by keeping them. The Ten Commandments are not designed to save us and cannot save us. They define sin and point us to Jesus for our salvation. Through His grace we receive forgiveness for our sins and Divine power to overcome them: 1 John 1:9. The more Christ-like we become, the more offensive sin will be to us, and the greater our appreciation will be that Jesus died to pay the penalty for our sins! Remember, Jesus died to pay the penalty for sin (law-breaking), He did not die to take away the Ten Commandments so we could live in sin.

10. Weren't the Ten Commandments given to the Jews and not to Christians?

We have just demonstrated that the Ten Commandments are repeated in the New Testament and that everyone, including Christians, will be judged by God's eternal Ten Commandment Law. So we Christians cannot really believe that God would permit us to lie, steal, murder and commit adultery, while He prohibited the Jews from committing those same sins!

God does not have one law for Christians and another law for Jews. Neither does God have separate laws for Pagans, Atheists, Hindus and Moslems. Both the Old and New Testaments are clear that every person will be judged according to God's Ten Commandments. Paul tells us that we "are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:26-29). As far as God is concerned, there is no Jew or Gentile - He treats us all as one in Christ. God's Ten Commandments define sin for every person on earth and point every one of us to Jesus Christ for salvation (Romans 3:29-31). Paul is clear that if God's Ten Commandments had been abolished there would be no sin and thus we would not need Jesus Christ as our Savior (Romans 5:13). All of God's people are to live within the bounds He set for us in His Ten Commandments.

11. Doesn't God expect us to do more than just keep the Ten Commandments? That's too simple!

The Bible tells us in Deuteronomy 5:22 that after giving His people the Ten Commandments, God "added nothing more." Solomon, the world's wisest man, wrote: "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man" (Ecclesiastes 12:13). Jesus said: "If you want to enter life, obey the commandments" (Matthew 19:17). If we are keeping God's Ten Commandments through God's indwelling power because we love Him, they are sufficient. But if we are keeping God's Ten Commandments on our own merits because we are trying to earn our salvation, then they are not enough. Jesus' most scathing rebukes were directed to religious people who added to God's commandments hoping to earn a place in heaven by keeping many rules (Luke 11:46, 52; Mark 7:6-9). Our salvation depends upon our relationship with Jesus, while our Christian duty to God and to man is defined by God's Ten Commandments.

12. Isn't it all right to choose our own day of worship as long as we keep one day out of seven?

Not if we are going to follow the Bible. Sunday-observing Christians will quickly agree the Bible specifies that Jesus is the only name that can save us (Acts 4:12). They do not say it is all right to "choose one name out of seven." They also agree the Bible states there is only one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God - not one out of many to choose from (Ephesians 4:5, 6). So why do many Sunday-observing Christians stumble over the Bible fact that Saturday is the only day of the week that God made holy and commanded us to use for rest and worship (Genesis 2:2, 3; Exodus 20:8-11)? God made one day holy, and He commanded us to keep it holy! His commands are not multiple choice.

13. Does it really matter whether or not we keep the Sabbath? Aren't there bigger issues to focus on such as loving Jesus?

Should we tell a murderer he can murder as long as he "loves Jesus?" Can a thief go on stealing as long as he "loves Jesus?" No! God takes sin so seriously that He destroyed all unrepentant sinners in the Flood (Genesis chapters 6-8). Sin is so serious that it cost the life of God's Son, Jesus Christ (John 3:16). And, at the end, God will destroy all unrepented sinners when He cleanses this earth of all sin. The Ten Commandments define sin (1 John 3:4). No Christian is safe to continue breaking God's Ten Commandments while professing to love Jesus Christ (1 John 2:4). God's Ten Commandments are not His Ten Suggestions!

14. How can we be certain that the seventh day of the week God blessed 6,000 years ago is the day we now call Saturday?

It is very simple to prove that the weekly cycle has never been broken throughout the history of this earth. Consider the following:

God blessed the seventh day and made it holy during Creation Week (Genesis 2:2, 3). This was the beginning of the weekly cycle. Four thousand years later the New Testament clearly states Jesus worshipped on Saturday. He was crucified on Friday (the Jews called the sixth day of the week "Preparation Day"), rested in the grave during the Sabbath (the seventh day of the week we call Saturday), and rose early on the first day of the week (Sunday morning) (see Luke 23:52-24:1).

For two thousand years Christians have memorialized Easter Sunday, the first day of the week, as

the day Christ rose from the dead. For two thousand years the Jews have carefully kept track of Saturday, the seventh day of the week, as the day God made holy. There simply is no debate that Saturday is the seventh day of the week and Sunday is the first day of the week. The Dictionary clearly states Saturday is the seventh day of the week. Even astronomers are certain that the weekly cycle has never been broken from creation to the present day.

M. The Ten Commandments In Revelation

1.	Rev	21:3	Rev	22:9	Rev	21:22	Rev	13:4
	Rev	19:4,10	Rev	4:8-11	Rev	5:14	Rev	7:13-17
	Rev	11:16	Rev	22:3				
2.	Rev	22:15	Rev	9:20	Rev	13:14,15	Rev	14:9,11
	Rev	15:2	Rev	16:2	Rev	21:22	Rev	21:8
	Rev	2:20	Rev	19:20	Rev	2:14	Rev	20:4
3.	Rev	2:9	Rev	13:1,5,6	Rev	17:1-5	Rev	16:9
	Rev	16:11,21						
4.	Rev	14:7						
5.	Rev	12:17	Rev	14:12	Rev	22:14	(Matt 17:17-22)	
6.	Rev	21:8	Rev	22:15	Rev	2:13	Rev	6:8-10
	Rev	11:7	Rev	12:4	Rev	13:15	Rev	18:24
	Rev	17:6	Rev	19:2	Rev	9:21		
7.	Rev	2:14	Rev	2:20-22	Rev	9:21	Rev	14:8
	Rev	17:15,16	Rev	18:3,9	Rev	19:2	Rev	22:15
	Rev	21:2	Rev	17:1-5	Rev	21:9	Rev	21:8
8.	Rev	3:11	Rev	9:21				
9.	Rev	18:23	Rev	13:14	Rev	12:9	Rev	21:8
	Rev	2:2	Rev	20:3,8	Rev	22:15	Rev	3:9
	Rev	21:27	Rev	20:10				
10.	Rev	7:13-17	Rev	18:9-19	Rev	9:21		

O. The Ten Commandments Before Sinai

Many Christians today are saying that the Ten Commandments did not exist before the birth of Moses and are therefore not eternal. They assert that the commandments were only meant for the Jews and ended at calvary. They further claim that the Sabbath commandment is not eternally binding and ceased 2,000 years ago. Does the Bible teach that the Ten Commandments were in existence before Moses? Were all people from Adam to Moses to be judged by the Decalogue?

1. Genesis References

The book of Genesis contains numerous references and allusions to the Ten Commandments. In Exodus 5:5 Moses told the children of Israel to rest. The word rest is the Hebrew word shabath which according to

Strong's Hebrew Dictionary means to keep the Sabbath. The fact that they were known before Sinai shows that the patriarchs knew and kept them.

1.	14:19,20	17:1,9	35:2-4		
2.	31:19,30-36	35:2,4			
3.	Jude 1:14,15	2 Pet 2:6-8			
4.	2:1-3	Exodus 5:5			
5.	9:22	22:7,8			
6.	27:42	37:21	4:8-12	4:23,24	6:11
	John 8:44				
7.	16:4,5	19:32-38	20:1-8	26:10,11	34:2-7
	39:9	2:21-25	Jude 1:7		
8.	21:25				
9.	20:1-8	12:18,19	27:24	34:13	37:30-33
	3:4,5	21:23	John 8:44		
10.	30:1	John 8:44			

2. The Fall of Lucifer and Adam

According to Ezekiel 28:15 Lucifer was perfect when God created him. The Bible defines sinless perfection as perfect conformity to the Ten Commandments (1 Kings 8:61, 1 Kings 11:4,5, Psalm 19:7, Jam 1:25). Lucifer choose to sin while in heaven (1 John 3:8-10, Isaiah 14:12-15) and rebel against the law of God's government. Sin itself is the breaking of the Ten Commandments (1 John 3:4). Baal worship was Satan's religion which typifies hatred and disobedience to the law of God while the Hebrew worship was the exact opposite. From his fall until his destruction in the lake of fire Lucifer never changes from being a liar and a deceiver (John 8:44, Rev 20:13). His religion has always attacked the law of God (Gen 3:1-10, 2 Kings 17:16, Jer 2:8, 7:9).

1.	Is 14:12-15	Mt 4:8-10	Lev 17:7	Deut 32:17	Ps 106:37
	Jud 2:13	1 Kg 16:31	Jer 7:9		
2.	Is 14:12-15	Lev 17:7	Deut 32:17	2 Chr 11:15	Ps 106:37
	1 Kg 3:2	Jer 7:9			
3.	Is 14:12-15	John 10:33	Lev 17:7	Deut 32:17	
4.	Lev 17:7	Deut 32:17			
5.	Is 14:12-15				
6.	Ps 106:37	Jer 7:9	John 8:44	John 13:2	Rev 2:10, 12:7-10
7.	Lev 17:7	Jer 7:9			
8.	Jer 7:9	Luke 8:12	Rev 12:7-10		
9.	John 8:44	Rev 12:7-10	Rev 20:10	Jer 7:9	
10.	John 8:44	Is 14:12-15	John 13:2		

Were the Ten Commandments in heaven right from the beginning? The heavenly sanctuary contains the original Ark of The Covenant which house the decalogue. This temple is God's throne (Psalm 11:4, Isaiah 6:1, Revelation 4:10,11) which has certainly existed since the days of Adam even from eternity (Psalm 45:6, 93:2).

Text	**Attribute**
Psalm 9:7	A Throne of Judgment
Psalm 47:8, Prov 20:8	A Throne of Holiness
Psalm 89:14 , Prov 20:28	A Throne of Justice, Judgment, Mercy and Truth
Psalm 97:2, Prov 16:12	A Throne of Righteousness, Judgment
Psalm 103:19,20	A Throne of His Commandments
Prov 29:14	A Throne of Faithfulness

These attributes of God's throne are also attributes of God's eternal holy law :

Text	Attribute
James 2:8-12	Judgment
Exodus 20:8, Romans 7:12	Holiness
Romans 7:12	Justice
Psalm 119:58	Mercy
Nehemiah 9:13	Truth
Psalm 119:172	Righteousness
Deuteronomy 10:1-5	Commandments
Psalms 119:86, Rom 3:31	Faithfulness

The New Testament books of Hebrews and Revelation picture Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary where the Ark of the Covenant and the Ten Commandments are now present. Revelation 15:5 mentions the phrase 'tabernacle of the testimony' which according to the Old Testament was the place where the Decalogue was housed (Exodus 26:33,34 30:6 Deut 10:1-5 , 31:9) The word testimony used in verse 5 is referring to the eternal law of God (Exodus 25:16, 21, 22, 31:18, 32:15, 34:29, Psalm 19:7, Psalm 78:5, Psalm 81:3,4, Isaiah 8:16,20). The ark still contained the Testament Law when John was in vision in 96 AD. This phrase is found in the OT referring to the Tables of Law in the Mosaic sanctuary (Exodus 26:30-35; 27:21; 30:26,36; 31:7; 38:21; 39:35-3 ; 40:3-5,19-21; Lev 24:3).

In Hebrews 8:8-12 the apostle Paul states that God will write the law in our minds. Paul in the book of Romans uses the same language to describe the Decalogue as a guide for right thinking (Rom 7:23,25 ; 8:7). This text in Hebrews is borrowed from the book of Jeremiah (31:31-34) where the OT prophet is clearly outlining obedience to the Decalogue. The phrase in Hebrews and Jeremiah is very similar to many others in the OT referring to having the Ten Commandments written in the mind (Deut30:10 ; Josh 22:5 ; 2 Ki 10:31 , 23:25 ; 2 Chr 21:31 ; Ezra 7:10 ; Job 22:22 ; Psalm 37:31).

The book of Hebrews closely parallels that of Revelation in the layout and functioning of the heavenly sanctuary. Both base their ideas on those originally laid out in the OT books of Exodus and Leviticus. In Hebrews chapter 8 we are clearly told that Christ is the High Priest in the heavenly Temple and then in chapter 9 we are shown how the layout of the earthly temple is a guide to that of the one above.

Hebrews	Revelation	Feature	OT Equivalent
8:5	7:15	The Heavenly pattern	Exodus 25:9,40
9:2	1:12,13 4:5	Lamp Stands	Exodus 25:37
9:2	6:9 8:3	Altar Table	Exodus 27:1-8
9:4	8:3-5	Golden Censor	Lev 10:1
9:4	11:19 15:5	Ten Commandments	Deut 10:1-8
None	4:4,10	24 Elders	1 Chron 24:1-19
None	4:6-10	4 Senior Elders	1 Chron 24:1

3. The Prophet Enoch

The prophet Enoch was a man who walked with God (Genesis 5:22-24) and was taken to heaven without dying (Heb 11:5). What does it mean to walk with God ? In Psalm 119 we are told that the right way to walk in is the keeping of God's commandments (Psalm 119:1,9,29-32). The Bible also uses the word path to describe the keeping of the commandments :

Psalm	23:3	The path of righteousness
	25:8-10	Those who keep His covenant and testimonies
	119:35,105	The path of your commandments
Proverbs	2:1,8,9	Hide my commandments with you
Isaiah	2:3	The law of Zion
	58:12,13	The Sabbath way
Micah	4:2	The path of the law

Isaiah 30:9-11 states that the wicked hate the path of God's law and turn aside form obeying it. When Enoch walked with God he was walking in the way of the Ten Commandments. Enoch was the first prophet mentioned in the Bible (Jude 14,15, Luke 1:70). Before sending the flood God would send a

message of warning to the world as He does nothing without revealing his secrets unto the prophets (Amos 3:7). The Bible clearly shows that God only reveals His will to prophets who obey the Ten Commandments.

Proverbs	29:18	Only visions to the obedient
Jeremiah	26:4-6	The law and prophecy go hand in hand
Lamentations	2:9	By forsaking the law prophets loose the vision
Ezekiel	7:26	The law and the prophets go together
Ezekiel	20:3,7,8,12,13	God withholds the visions form the lawless ones

4. Noah and the Flood

In Jude 14 and 15 we are told that the prophet Enoch prophesied concerning Christ's second coming to judge the ungodly. The word ungodly means those who reject God's commandments as the text below clearly say. The flood was sent to destroy mankind because they had become so evil in their behavior. The Bible presents their evil deeds as violence, immoral, blasphemers.

2 Chr 19:2	Hate God
Psalm 1:1	Hate God's law
Psalm 43:1	Deceitful and unjust
Psalm 73:3-12	Violence, Covetous, Blasphemy, Liars
1 Tim 1:9	Lawless, Murderers, Disobedient to parents, Whore mongers, Homosexuals, Liars
2 Peter 2:5,6	Sodomy

5. Sodom and Gemorah

The destruction of Sodom and Gemorah presents to us God's judgements against those who would break His holy law and sin so wickedly. The Sodomites practiced vile and unnatural sexual perversions condemned in the Decalogue. In 1 Kings 14:24 we are told that the sin of the sodomites was the same as those sins practiced by the Philistine nations.

Genesis	13:13 , 18:20-26, 19:1-28			
Jude	1:7,8			
Deut	29:21-28			
Isaiah	1:9,10, 23:12,14			
Luke	17:29			
2 Pet	2:6-8			
Revelation	11:8			
1 Kings	14:24	Lev	18:1-30	Incest, Adultery, worship devils, Homosexuality, Bestiality.
		Deut	18:9-12	Divination, Astrology, Seances, Witches, Psychics
			20:18, 32:16	Worshipping the Devil and pagan gods
			29:17	Worshipping the idols of paganism
			2 Kings 16:3	Worshipping the idols of paganism

In 2 Peter 2:8 we are told that the men of Sodom were destroyed by God for being lawless in their deeds. What is lawlessness ? In 1 Timothy 1:9 we are told that Lawlessness is - Murderers, Disobedient to parents, Whoremongers, Homosexuals, Liars etc.

6. Sin Existed From Adam to Moses

In Romans 5:12-14 it is stated that sin existed from Adam to Moses. What is sin? In 1 John 3:4 as well as many other places we are told that sin is breaking God's holy law. Therefore because these people were sinners they were law breakers. The apostle Paul tells us that the law defining sin is the Ten Commandments (Rom 7:7). In Romans 5:12 we are told that Adam introduced sin into the world and then in verse 13 we are told that sin only exists where the is God's law. It is obvious that Adam sinned by breaking God's holy law and believing the lies of the Devil.

How did people of that era determine what was right and wrong if there was no law? The fact is that people of that time knew of sin and its definition which is impossible if there was no standard to define it by. What did Noah and Enoch preach to the people of their day if they did not know right from wrong. If someone had gone up to them and asked is it wrong to lie, steel, murder etc would Noah have said "Well I don't really know because God hasn't set any rules yet."? This doctrine teaches that for 2,500 years nobody on earth knew right from wrong yet the Bible states that Abraham and Job knew God's law (Genesis 26:5, Job 22:22).

Perfect	Noah - Genesis 6:1, Abraham - Genesis 17:1
Definition	1 Kings 8:61, 1 Kings 11:4,5, Psalm 19:7, Jam 1:25
Corrupt	Genesis 6:11,12
Definition	Exodus 32:7,8, Deut 4:16,25, Judg 2:19, Ezek 16:47
Sin	Genesis 4:7, 18:20, 20:9, 31:36, 39:9, 42:22, 50:17.
Definition	Rom 3:20, 5:13, 7:7, James 2:9-12, 1 John 3:4
Evil	Genesis 2:9,17, 3:5,22, 6:5, 8:21, 44:4,5, 48:16, 50:15-20
Definition	Psalm 119:101, Prov 6:23,24
Wickedness	Genesis 6:5, 13:13, 18:23,25, 19:7, 38:7, 39:9
Definition	Psalm 119:53, 61, 95, 110, 119, 155
Iniquity	Genesis 15:16, 19:15, 44:16
Definition	Psalm 119:133-136

The Bible states that different people in the book of Genesis were righteous (Noah - Genesis 7:1 , 2 Pet 2:5, Abel - Heb 11:4 and Lot 2 Pet 2:7,8). The Bible defines Righteousness as obedience to God's law - Psalm 1:5,6 , 19:9 , 119:105-106, 137-138, 164-165.

7. All Mankind To Be Judged by the Ten Commandments

One day everybody will stand before the great judgment seat of God (Rom 14:10, Revelation 20:11-15). All mankind is to be judged by the Ten Commandments. Therefore all people from Adam to Moses will be judged by the same great standard. There will be only one standard for everybody in that day. People from all ages will have one code to be judged by and not different codes for different ages.

1 John	3:4	Transgression of the law
James	2:8-11	The only standard to be judged by
Ecclesiastes	12:13 , 14	The only standard of right and wrong
Romans	2:13	Doers of the law justified
	3:20	Definition of sin
	3:31	Establish the law
	4:15	The Law is the only definition of transgression
	5:13	Only definition of sin
	7:7	Sin defined by the law
	7:12	Law is Holy , Just and Good
	7:25	The Law of God
	8:1-4	Right doing is defined by the Law
	8:7	Opposite of Sin
	13:8-10	Opposite of hate and disobedience

8. The Sabbath Made at Creation Week

If the Sabbath was only for the Jews God would not have made it at creation week but rather after the birth of Moses like the Aaronic priesthood. The Bible says that the Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27) and

that woman was created for man (1 Cor 11:9). Were woman only created for Jews ? God created the Sabbath 2,000 years before Abraham was born (Genesis 2:1-3, Exodus 20:8-11, 31:15-18). The Sabbath was created before sin existed as part of Paradise and is therefore eternal as paradise. Isaiah 66:22-24 portrays the Sabbath being kept in the new paradise on earth that will last an eternity. The Garden of Eden was God's plan to make heaven on earth (Genesis 1,2 Revelation 21, 22). What God made in the garden was to be as eternal as heaven itself. The word Eden is Hebrew and means pleasure.

Attribute	Eden	Heaven
Man's Dominion	Genesis 1:28	Revelation 21:7
Man's Diet	Genesis 1:29	Isaiah 65:21-23, Revelation 22:2
Man's Occupation	Genesis 2:15	Isaiah 65:21-23
The Sabbath	Genesis 2:1-3	Isaiah 66:22-24
Paradise Garden	Genesis 2:8,9	Isaiah 35:1 , Revelation 21:1
The River of Life	Genesis 1:10-14	Revelation 22:1,2
Gold & Precious Stones	Genesis 2:11,12	Revelation 21:17-20
Marriage	Genesis 2:18-25	Revelation 21:9
The Tree of Life	Genesis 3:22-24	Revelation 22:2
Sinless Perfection	Genesis 1:31	Revelation 21:3

9. The Tower of Babel and the Sabbath

At the Tower of Babel God created the language groups we have today (Genesis 11:5-9). From Babel the people spread out and covered the face of the earth. Many of these groups still retain stories of the creation week and Noah's flood. There are 105 ethnic groups that have had the same seven day week (Sunday to Saturday) as western Europeans have. Many of these groups had the seven day week without any contact with Europeans or Jews. This shows that they had it since Babel times. At least 85 of these groups call Saturday 'Sabbath' showing that a knowledge of the creation week was passed down since earliest times.

10. The Ten Commandments In The Garden Of Eden

In the Bible we are told that God will eradicate sin (Nahum 1:9) and make a new heavens and a new earth just like the garden of Eden (Isaiah 65:17,66:22,2 Pet 3:13, Revelation 21:1-5). The Old and New Testaments clearly portray this paradise as a place free of sin and lawlessness (Revelation 21:8).

1.	Revelation	22:3	Isaiah 66:22-24	
2.	Revelation	21:22 ; 21:8		
3.	Matthew	12:31,32		
4.	Isaiah	66:22-24	Matthew 19:17	Revelation 22:14
5.	Exodus	20:12	Matthew 5:5	
6.	Revelation	21:8		
7.	Revelation	21:8		
8.	Matthew	6:19,20		
9.	Revelation	22:15		
10.	Isaiah	65:21-25		

11. The Weekly Cycle and Calendars

The weekly cycle was well established before Sinai. The flood account mentions the weekly cycle five times. The book of Genesis makes clear references to calendars and chronological records right from the beginning showing that man knew how these worked from Edenic times.

Calendars And Chronologies
1:14-19, 2:1-3, 4:3, 5:1-32, 7:11,17, 8:4,5,13

Weekly Cycle
Genesis 7:4,10, 8:10-14, 29:27,28, 50:10

Exodus 7:25, 12:15,19, 13:6,7
Job 2:13

12. Ancient Revelation And Worship Styles

The book of Genesis reveals an elaborate system of worship and rituals set up by people living before Moses time to worship God. There were priests, offerings, tithing, circumcision, marriage, burial rites, visions etc. This shows that much information was revealed to people in visions not recorded in Genesis. Melchisedek was a priest of the Most High God and received tithes from Abraham. How did Abraham and Melchisedek know about tithing? It was revealed in visions not mentioned in the Bible. The Bible does not say God revealed this information even though He did. God walked with Adam and Eve in the garden and talked with them (Genesis 2:16-25, 3:8, Revelation 21:3) on a daily basis. God would have told them that He created the earth in six days and rested on the seventh day. If Adam had worked on the seventh day it would have been a sin.

Priests	Genesis 14:18-20 , Exodus 2:16, 3:1, Heb 6:20
Altars	Genesis 8:20, 12:7,8, 13:4,18, 26:25, 33:20, 35:1,3, 35:7
Visions	Genesis 4:6, 6:13, 7:9, 8:15, 9:1, 9:8,12,17, 17:1-9, 20:3,6, 21:12, Jude 1:14,15
Laws	Genesis 26:5, Job 22:22