

The Seventh Day Sabbath

Pastor David F. Smith

www.CreationismOnline.com

Introduction

How it all began! Mr. Smith places an ad in the newspaper to which Mr. Frost replies.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL Wednesday, December 14, 1949

\$200 FOR ONE TEXT

I hereby offer \$200 for one Bible text from the Bible - either the King James (Protestant) Version or the Douay (Catholic) Version - stating that Sunday - the first day of the week should be observed by Christians as a day of rest and worship. A text meeting any one of the 7 specifications below will be sufficient to claim the \$200.

SIGNED:

DAVID F. SMITH, Pastor Seventh-day Adventist Church

1. ONE TEXT stating that SUNDAY is the SABBATH or the Lord's day.
2. ONE TEXT that says the WEEKLY SABBATH has been changed.
3. ONE TEXT that commands Christians to keep the FIRST day as a day of rest and worship.
4. ONE TEXT that says JESUS ever kept the FIRST day, or SUNDAY, as the SABBATH, or enjoined anyone else to do so.
5. ONE TEXT that shows he EVER MENTIONED the day when on earth.
6. ONE TEXT that applies to the FIRST DAY of the week any sacred title or pronounces any penalty for its non-observance.
7. ONE TEXT that states, WHEN, WHERE, and by WHOM the weekly Sabbath was ABOLISHED.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH SUNDAY NITE DEC. 18!

Every text in the Bible mentioning the first day of the week or Sunday will be read at this meeting! Supporting musical program includes PIANIST JOHN FLETCHER. LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL Thursday, December 22, 1949

Sunday Keeping Minister Responds To Adventists

In Wednesday's (December 14, 1949) issue of the Review-Journal there was an attractive ad placed by Mr. David F. Smith of the Seventh-day Adventist Church offering \$200 for one text meeting any one of seven specifications. I hereby submit the requested text in the same public way in which the offer was made and make some observations of the Sabbath (with no additional charge) to claim the \$200. I shall give the text from the King James version to meet specification number seven: "One TEXT that states, WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the weekly Sabbath was ABOLISHED."

"Abolish" means "to do away with wholly; to annul; to make void; as to abolish a law or custom, taxes, or folly." (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary) Before I give the \$200 text showing WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM abolished, let us first notice WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the Sabbath was GIVEN. Study the following texts:

Exodus 31:13 (17), "Speak thou (Moses) also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths shall you keep: for it is a sign between me and your generations; that you may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you."

Deuteronomy 5:15, "And remember that thou was a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Nehemiah 9:13-14, "Thou (God) came down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gave them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and made known unto them thy holy Sabbath. . . by the hand of Moses thy servant."

The Sabbath was GIVEN:

WHEN -After the children of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage, they came unto Mount Sinai where God gave them the law (Exodus 20) in which He MADE KNOWN unto them the holy Sabbath. In Exodus 16, as they came unto the wilderness of Sin, it is evident that they had not previously observed a Sabbath because Moses had to explain, "Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath." The next day he instructed, "Today is a Sabbath unto the Lord." There is no record of the Sabbath being MADE KNOWN unto any people before this time!

WHERE - "Thou came down also upon MOUNT SINAI. . . and made known unto them thy holy Sabbath."

BY WHOM - "THOU (God) . . . made known unto them thy holy Sabbath. . . by the hand of Moses thy servant."

Let us also ask TO WHOM and WHY:

TO WHOM - "Verily my Sabbaths shall you (children of Israel) keep: for it is a sign between me and your generations." "It is a sign between ME and the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL."

WHY - "It is a SIGN between me and your generations; THAT YE MAY KNOW THAT I AM THE LORD THAT DOTHTH SANCTIFY YOU."

Now we shall see what happened to the law given to the children of Israel on Mount Sinai, graven in stones, by which God MADE KNOWN His holy Sabbath. What happened to the law happened to all of its parts, including every part - including the Sabbath!

Here Is The Text Worth \$200

2 Corinthians 3:7-11, 14, "If the ministration of death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect by reason of the glory that excels. For if that which IS DONE AWAY was glorious, much more that which remains is glorious. Their minds were blinded: for until this day remains the same veil untaken away in reading of the Old Testament; which veil IS DONE AWAY IN CHRIST."

When any law is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity. For any part of the previous law to be of power it must be re-enacted into the new law. It cannot remain by reason of the old! The Sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN.

Will Mr. Smith please remit the \$200? His honesty and the integrity of the Seventh-day Adventist Church are now at stake. Let's not have him say that the words "Sabbath," "when," "where," "by whom," and "abolished" are not in the text and excuse himself of his obligation. He did not ask for a text using the words, but that "states" (To set; settle; fix. To set forth in detail or in gross; to narrate. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary) those points.

In the event he cannot see the points, let us examine the text and see what it "sets forth."

ABOLISHED - The text uses the expressions "done away" speaking of the whole law of which the Sabbath is apart. So if "done away" in whole, "done away" in part - out goes the Sabbath! The text quoted next will "settle" this point even more firmly.

BY WHOM - "Done away in CHRIST."

WHEN - The expression "IN CHRIST" begs the time. Paul shows this to be his death in Hebrews 8:7; 9:16 17. Thus he speaks in Colossians 2:14-16, "nailed to the cross." That is when!

2 Corinthians 3:7-14 "states" WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the Sabbath was ABOLISHED! It therefore satisfies the specification and claims the \$200.

The Clincher At No Additional Cost

Colossians 2:14-16, "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

The text mentions "Sabbath" and "nailed to his cross," satisfying the inquiries of

WHEN - The time of "his cross," AD 33.

WHERE - "his cross" was just out of Jerusalem. BY WHOM - "his" is Christ (verse 11 and 17).

The \$200 well-earned!

Notice that the Sabbath has not only been "nailed to his cross," but "let no man therefore judge you in respect of an holy day"!

Demonstrating fair sportsmanship, I'll give Mr. Smith a chance to earn back the \$200 which should be forthcoming. I'll return the \$200 for the text

1. That names the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
2. That commands a Christian to keep the Sabbath.

P.S. Please send the \$200 to:

Gene Frost, Minister CHURCH OF CHRIST

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL Sunday, January 1, 1950

THE \$200 TEXT

Planning an audience participation at my church, I offered \$200 for a text. The date, time and place for this meeting when claims for the money would be considered were printed plainly in the newspaper advertisement. A number of my own congregation, plus a number of friends of different faiths attended this meeting. During the service I made a public call for any text to be suggested by the audience that might be considered for the reward money. NO TEXTS WERE OFFERED BY THE AUDIENCE.

Three days after the announced time for this meeting had passed a strange claim appeared in the newspaper ad, advanced by one, Gene Frost, who claimed a right to the reward money. It seems that if this party had honestly felt that he had a right to the reward money - then he would have ATTENDED THE MEETING WHEN IT WAS TO BE GIVEN AWAY.

I would not have troubled to reply, had the ad not contained several misstatements of fact, which should be answered.

Sabbath Before Sinai

Misstatement No. 1 implied that the Sabbath was not given before it was presented to the Jews at Mt. Sinai.

Obviously before a band of ignorant slaves could be made into a great nation for God, they needed instruction. But to imply that such principles of right were not in effect before this time is contrary to Scripture. In Romans 3:20 the Apostle Paul writes, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." In Romans 4:5, he states, "Where no law is there is no transgression."

In Romans 3:23 and 5:12 he states twice that all have sinned. Now if all have sinned, and yet where no law is there is no transgression; this indicates that the law has been in existence since the beginning of human life on this planet. He amplifies this further in Romans 3:23 by stating "For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed WHEN THERE IS NO LAW."

What law is the apostle talking about, which reveals sin? In Romans 7:7 he states, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shall not covet." What law is it that contains the rule against coveting? As every Sunday school child knows, this rule is a part of the TEN COMMANDMENTS - the law that at Sinai was graven in tables of stone by the finger of God.

The apostle states further in Romans 7:12, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good." The enemies of the Law of God are shown up in their true light where the Apostle writes in Romans 8:6,7. "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is ENMITY AGAINST GOD for it is NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD neither indeed can be."

Sabbath Made at Creation

Sabbath keeping was enjoined upon the ISRAELITES while they were traveling toward Sinai (Exodus 16) but it was made for MAN at the creation of the world. Gen. 2:2, 3: "And on the seventh day God, ended His work which He had created and made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and SANCTIFIED it: because in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." Mark 2:27: "And He said unto them, The Sabbath was MADE for MAN and not man for the Sabbath."

The two oldest religious institutions observed by man are marriage and the Sabbath. They are the twin institutions which come to us from the garden of Eden. The Sanctification of both, by God Himself, is recorded in the SECOND chapter of Genesis. This is even before the entrance of sin, which in the Genesis Narrative, takes place in the THIRD chapter.

Neither marriage or the Sabbath could have been abolished with the law that was done away at the cross, because this law was added "BECAUSE OF TRANSGRESSION." (Galatians 3:19) Marriage and the Sabbath were made for man BEFORE sin entered the world, hence obviously were not added because of transgression.

Sabbath Memorial

The Sabbath was made to be MEMORIAL of the creation of the world. "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 day of the Lord thy God FOR in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, WHEREFORE the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Exodus 20:5-11. The law which was abolished at the cross is positively identified in Colossians 2:14. "Blotting out the HANDWRITING OF ORDINANCES that was out of the way, nailing it to his cross. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME."

That the handwriting of ordinances is a different law from God's great moral law, the Ten Commandments, is obvious from the

following texts:

LAW OF GOD

Spoken by God.	Deuteronomy 4:12, 1
Written with finger of God in tables of stone.	Exodus 31:18.
Placed in ark.	Deuteronomy 10:1-5.
Perfect.	Psalm 19:7.
Stand fast forever.	Psalm 111:7, 8.
Not destroyed by Christ.	Matthew 5:17.
Christ to magnify it.	Isaiah 42:21
Gives knowledge of sin.	Romans 3:20.
Law of liberty.	James 9:10-12.
Heart of new covenant.	Hebrews 8:10 and 10:16

HAND WRITING OF ORDINANCE

Spoken by Moses.	Leviticus 1:1-3.
Written by Moses in a book.	Deuteronomy 31:24.
Inside of ark.	Deuteronomy 31:24-26.
Made nothing perfect.	Hebrews 9:17.
Nailed to cross.	Colossians 2:14.
Abolished by Christ.	Ephesians 2:15.
Taken away by Christ.	Colossians 2:14.
Added because of sin.	Galatians 3:19.
Contrary to us.	Colossians 2:14.
Old covenant promises.	Hebrews 8:5-9.

Since the abolishment of the handwriting of ordinances we are to let no man judge us of the holydays or Sabbath days WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME. The Hebrew festival of the Passover was a Sabbath which POINTED FORWARD to Christ. After Christ came there was no point in observing it further. He instituted the communion to be observed by Christians from henceforth. In 1 Corinthians 5:7 the Apostle Paul shows how it pointed forward to Christ, when he states its fulfillment: "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." There were many other ceremonial Sabbaths which similarly pointed forward to Christ. They were MONTHLY Sabbaths and YEARLY Sabbaths. These were a part of the handwriting of ordinances and were abolished at the cross.

However the WEEKLY Sabbath was not a shadow of things to come. It is a memorial of an event in the PAST - the creation of this world, as shown above with proof. Hence even though I can quote 2 Colossians 2:14-6 by memory, still I am looking for a text that states where and by whom the weekly Sabbath was abolished. Even though the time limit in the text contest has long since expired, I would be happy to pay \$200 for such a text.

Ministration of Death

2 Corinthians 3:7, "But the ministration of death, written and graven in stones, was glorious. . . how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?" This, as Mr. Frost supposed, DOES refer to the Ten Commandments. The giving of the law was the ministration of death to sin and sinners. For, "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4 and "The wages of sin is death." Romans 6:23.

This ministration of death IS to BE DONE AWAY in the experience of all who accept Jesus and allow Him to save them from sin. But Matthew 1:21 does not say that Jesus will save His people IN their sins. It says FROM their sins. To be saved from drowning means actually escape the watery death. To be saved from prison means actually to be released from behind its iron bars. As the Apostle Paul aptly argues, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? GOD FORBID. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" Romans 6:1, 2.

The ministration of death, graven in stones, is abolished every time a sinner comes to Christ, accepts his saving power and STOPS SINNING. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: Yea we ESTABLISH THE LAW." Romans 3:31.

The penalty - the ministration of death - is abolished when we accept Christ's sacrifice for sins, but by what streak of presumption could we go ahead and continue to break those commandments, and make of none effect the blood of the Son of God. (Hebrews 10:28, 29) If the ministration of death was glorious, should not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?

When this divine miracle takes place in us and we become TRUE followers of Christ and his apostles, then the law is "Written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the HEART." 2 Corinthians 3:3.

Anti-law Teachers

John Wesley, noted founder of the Methodist Church, says: 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, but all the commandments at a stroke. 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, "Betrayest 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 pretense of advancing His gospel. Nor indeed can anyone escape this charge, who preaches faith in any such manner as either directly or indirectly sets aside any branch of obedience: who preaches Christ so as to annul, or weaken in any wise, the least of the commandments of God." Wesley's Works, Sermon 95.

As To The Future

While, after prayerful consideration, I have decided that it would be best to answer, in a respectful manner, the charges published in the paper on December 21 -I am not at all convinced that the cause of Christ would be advanced, by having this discussion continue in print from week to week. While men of good will everywhere are praying for "peace on earth" I do not think it would be fitting or proper for two ministers who are striving to preach the gospel, to carry on a private war through the public press.

However, any who are interested in pursuing this subject are cordially invited to attend the announced services at the Seventh-day Adventist church, and to read the following books on the subject:

M. L. ANDREASON, The Sabbath - Which Day and Why?

CHARLES L. TAYLOR, The Marked Bible

FRANK H. YOST, Ph.D. The Early Christian Sabbath

ROBERT LEE ODOM, The Lord's Day on a Round World

David F. Smith, Pastor,
Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Defending The Sabbath

Some law is binding on Christians since the death of Christ, for James in his epistle written A.D. 60 urges us to keep it. (Read Chapters 1 and 2) Whatever law this is, James insists that EVERY PART OF IT is binding. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10.

What law was binding on Christians in the time when James wrote his epistle? If the Ten Commandments recorded in Exodus 20 are binding, then the fourth one, which is the Sabbath commandment, is binding. If the Ten Commandments have been abolished prior to A.D. 60; then we must seek out the new law for Christians to see whether the Sabbath is included.

The New Testament plainly indicates that there are some Old Testament requirements that are binding on Christians since the cross. "And that from a child thou hast learned the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ." 2 Timothy 3:15. Paul is writing to Timothy, the young minister at the church of Ephesus. (1 Timothy 1:2 and 4:6) This second letter was written from Rome when Paul was about to be brought before Nero the second time, about A.D. 66. All authorities agree that the earliest of the New Testament Books were not written before about 54 A.D.

This means that the Scriptures Timothy was taught out of as a child, could be none other than the Old Testament. Christ called the Old Testament "Scripture" when He said to the Jewish leaders, "Search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." John 5:39. Under the word "Scripture" in Cruden's concordance we read:

The word as used in the Bible refers almost invariably to the sacred writings, which at that time consisted of the Old Testament. It is also used of a part of it, especially when that part is to be quoted in a later passage. The Old Testament, which Timothy was taught as a child is able to make him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, says Paul. Now let us read the verse which follows, "ALL SCRIPTURE is given by inspiration of God, and is PROFITABLE for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Timothy 3:16.

What could the apostle mean here when he tells us that ALL scripture is profitable? Could we by any twist of the imagination think that he means only part of it? Some would say, yes the Old Testament is all right for the stories it has, and for the inspiration of Psalms. We can learn things by reading it, but we do not have to follow it in New Testament times. But is this what the BIBLE SAYS here in 2 Timothy 3:16? It says ALL scripture is profitable for DOCTRINE.

What is doctrine? Webster's dictionary says, "That which is taught, the principles, belief, or dogma, of any church, sect or party." According to this text written by Paul ALL scripture is profitable then to give us the principles of belief of the Christian church. It is not only profitable for doctrine, but also for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, as mentioned in this text.

How could Paul tell us any plainer than in these words that the Old Testament is the guide book of the Christian as well as the new? He states that it is profitable for all these phases of Christian teaching. He says it can make one wise unto salvation.

Peter warns us that Paul has written some things hard to be understood, and that some who are unstable, wrest these and other scriptures to their own destruction. (2 Peter 3:15,16) What should we do with the parts of scripture that we cannot understand? "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are REVEALED belong unto us and to our children for ever." Deuteronomy 29:29

There is no statement of Paul's which is plainer nor easier to understand than verses 15 and 16 of 2 Timothy, chapter 3. So we KNOW that there are things in the Old Testament that are profitable for doctrine, etc., under the new covenant. Paul has specifically and plainly told us the forms of worship which are no longer to be observed, also. So why not put the two together? Is not this the wise plan to take exactly what the Bible tells us, rather than to read into it something that is not there?

Now what are these old Testament forms of worship which are not required in the new? Paul specifically points them out so that there need be no question. CIRCUMCISION is one. (Galatians 6:15) In fact the arguments about the law in Galatians were given because someone was urging circumcision upon the Galatian church. "They constrain you to be circumcised." Galatians 6:12

THE AARONIC PRIESTHOOD was also not to be continued. (Hebrews 7:11, 12) And of course the change in the priesthood indicated a change in the law which regulated the priesthood. However the Ten Commandments say nothing about the priesthood, so there is no indication here of a change in the Ten Commandments.

THE HANDWRITING OF ORDINANCES, which were a shadow of things to come, were also abolished. Colossians 2:14-16. In this list all forms of worship involving meat, drink, holyday, new moon, and Sabbath days WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME are abolished. (Verses 17).

The Levitical law tells of many ceremonial MEAT and DRINK offerings. These pointed forward to Christ, and therefore come under the list mentioned in Colossians 2 which are "Shadows of things to come." See Hebrews 9:9-12. An illustration in point is THE PASSOVER LAMB which was to be eaten with bitter herbs. This pointed forward to Christ, as indicated in 1 Corinthians 5:7, "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us."

But does the, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink" statement of Colossians 2 abolish ALL regulations regarding eating and drinking? No. We find that there are OTHER OLD TESTAMENT REGULATIONS that are still in force in the New. The Bible mentions some specifically in Acts 21:25. Abstain from THINGS STRANGLED, from things OFFERED TO IDOLS and from BLOOD. These are Old Testament regulations which Acts definitely mentions as being in force in the New!

Because of the law against the use of blood, the Jews were careful to kill animals in such a manner as to permit free bleeding. We find this idea in the warning given by the church council against things strangled. The law against eating blood is found in Deuteronomy 12:23, 24, as well as in a number of other places in the Old Testament.

Why do I mention this about meats in seeking to prove that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is still binding? The above mentioned text (Colossians 2:14-17) is used repeatedly as an evidence by those who think the Sabbath is abolished, and so we must consider the text as a whole to see what it teaches. The above scriptures prove conclusively that the reference to meat and drink does not abolish all Old Testament regulations regarding eating and drinking. AND DOES IT NOT FOLLOW as the night the day that NEITHER does the reference to a holyday and Sabbath days in the same verse abolish ALL SABBATH REGULATIONS of the Old Testament!

It merely abolishes those that it SAYS it abolishes: Those which are a shadow of things to come! (verse 17)

Now let us candidly compare these ceremonial Sabbaths, which were shadows of things to come with the Sabbath of the 4th commandment. Three typical ones are the Passover Sabbath (treated above), The Feast of Tabernacles, and the Day of Atonement. At the feast of tabernacles the people offered the first-fruits of their crops to the Lord. It pointed forward to Christ in that He became the "First-fruits of them that slept." (1 Corinthians 15:20, 23) On the day of atonement, the high priest entered the most holy place of the sanctuary, and sprinkled the blood of a lamb before the ark of God to make an atonement for the sins of the people. That this pointed forward to the sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God, is indicated in Romans 5:11. " Our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement."

By way of contrast let us now consider the weekly Sabbath - the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. "And God blessed the Sabbath day and sanctified it BECAUSE in it he HAD RESTED from all his work which he had created and made." At the Sabbath's first mention it points BACKWARD to a completed task. In the fourth commandment again a pointing backward is indicated: "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy GOD. . . FOR in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."

The Sabbath is a memorial. When we erect a memorial of some great statesman it POINTS BACKWARD reminding us of the life he lived for his country. The inscription gives dates of the past, his birth and death, and perhaps a mention of some of his most famous deeds. The Sabbath is not a memorial of the dead but of the living, it is to turn our thoughts to him every time we REMEMBER that in six days he created the heavens and the earth. The fourth is the only commandment that begins with the word REMEMBER. The Sabbath command is the only one that gives a reason for keeping it, the fact that God created the heavens and the earth.

It has been shown conclusively that there are Old Testament teachings which are PROFITABLE FOR DOCTRINE under the new covenant. (2 Timothy 3:15,16) It has been proven that Colossians 2:14-17 does not abolish all Old Testament commands even regarding eating and drinking for New Testament Christians. (Acts 21 :25) It not only does not abolish all commands in the respects listed in the text but SPECIFICALLY LIMITS ITSELF to those things pointing forward to Christ.

Thus the Sabbath of the fourth commandment escapes the abolishment of Colossians 2:14-17 on THREE COUNTS.

- (1) That this text does not abolish all Old Testament commands.
- (2) That this text does not even abolish all Old Testament commands regarding the activities which it specifically mentions (as in meat and drink).
- (3) It specifically limits its abolishment to those things which were shadows of things to come, while the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is to be remembered because of THE CREATION OF THIS EARTH which is in the past. (Exodus 20:8-11)

It has been argued that in the phrase "Sabbath days" in Colossians 2:16, that the word "days" is in italics, and that the text should read, "Or of the Sabbath." Such an argument is merely a play on words and an insult to the intelligence of any scholarly audience. The original

Greek here is. The form is the genitive plural, and is translated literally, "or of Sabbaths." See any diatome or analytical Greek lexicon. THEREFORE, in no sense does the weekly Sabbath find itself included under the items named abolished in Colossians 2:14-17.

Now let us continue with our list of Old Testament forms of worship which are abolished in the New Testament. CEREMONIAL WASHINGS AND ANIMAL SACRIFICES are mentioned specifically as no longer necessary. (Hebrews 9:10-14) Also the SANCTUARY built on the plan given to Moses is called a figure of the true one in heaven, where Jesus now ministers as our high priest in this dispensation. (Hebrews 9:24, 8:1,2)

The teachings of the Bible are specific. God does not leave his will for us to be learned by guesswork. All Old Testament rules no longer binding under the old covenant are SPECIFICALLY POINTED OUT in the New Testament. Even such a minor ordinance as circumcision, we find discussed repeatedly, so that there will be no mistake. The end of the priesthood, (Levitical) the end of ceremonial washings, the end of those things having to do with meats, drinks, holydays and Sabbaths which were a shadow of things to come, the end of the sanctuary service, the end of animal sacrifices.

BUT WHERE in all this do we find the end of the SABBATH of the fourth commandment? It is conspicuous by its absence. ALL these minor details of worship are SPECIFICALLY ENUMERATED. Does it not follow that if the SABBATH was to have been abolished, it would have been MENTIONED?

God is not the author of confusion. Can we accuse him now of being so inconsistent as to abolish the Sabbath and not even REFER to it, with its honored place among the ten great rules graven in stone by the finger of God; and at the same time to take great space to enumerate all these OTHER things which did not even merit being included with the Ten Commandments?

WHERE IS IT??? I sincerely want to know. I will still give \$200 for a text stating when, where, and by whom the weekly Sabbath was abolished.

What has been said of the Sabbath is true of the OTHER COMMANDMENTS of the ten. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find that the rule against idolatry, or graven images, or blasphemy, or dishonor to parents, or murder, or adultery, or theft, or false witness, or coveting is no longer to be observed. While WHOLE CHAPTERS and BOOKS of the New Testament are given to discussing the items of the ceremonial law which are no longer in effect: WHY - if the Ten Commandments were abolished - is there not a single mention of the least item of these great principles being done away?

The absence of any New Testament evidence that the Sabbath has been done away is a powerful argument for its continued existence. Those who would put forward a new day for the veneration of Christians, must first show where the old came to an end. This they are unable to do.

But how about its importance? This is the next question that comes to our minds. Suppose that it does exist as a forgotten law - still in force on the statute books of God, but forgotten by man. Is it important enough that he should turn against present day customs and usage, and order his life by the pure faith once delivered to the saints?

If this rule had been forgotten by all New Testament characters, we might well question its importance. But the fact that we have INSTRUCTION in the NEW TESTAMENT on HOW TO KEEP IT indicates that the Lord did consider it important for the New Testament Christians. In fact the Sabbath comes in for more than its share of comment on how to keep it, compared with the amount of space given to the keeping of the other 9 commandments.

(1)"It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Jesus heals a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath, and justifies his deed with these words. He also indicates that it is proper to act in cases of emergency to relieve suffering, by giving the example of the ox in the ditch. (See Matthew 12:10-12)

(2)It is proper to attend religious services. "And Jesus. . . came to Nazareth where he had been brought up, and AS HIS CUSTOM WAS, he went into the synagogue on the SABBATH DAY and stood up for to read." (Luke 4:14-16) "And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." (Acts 18:4).

(3)"In it thou shall not do any work." (Exodus 20:8-11) "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT." (Luke 23:56)

(4)In emergency it is proper to take measures to relieve our own hunger or discomfort on the Sabbath. "And at that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through a field of corn; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat." Matthew

12:1. That Jesus considered this to be an emergency is indicated by the fact that he justified this deed to the Pharisees by quoting another emergency, when David, fleeing for his life ate of the showbread, which was for the priests only. (Matthew 12:3, 4)

(5)The day of preparation is for all work that can be taken care of before the Sabbath. (Luke 23:54)

(6)It is proper to go out among the beauties of nature. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a riverside, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spoke unto the women which resorted thither." (Acts 16:13)

It has been conclusively shown that there is no evidence that the weekly Sabbath is abolished. It has also become evident that the New Testament contains teaching on how to keep the Sabbath. It will now further indicate that the Bible "clearly teaches" that the Sabbath is binding if we find that the Ten Commandments in whose very heart the Sabbath rule is found, are binding on Christians under the new covenant.

A favorite text of those who would seek to show the Ten Commandments abolished is 2 Corinthians 3:7, "But if the ministration of death, written and graven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory IN THIS RESPECT, by reason of the glory that excels. For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remains is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: and not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." (2 Corinthians 3:7-13)

All that this long scripture plainly claims abolished is the glory of Moses' face. This was to be done away. He covered it with a veil so that the people could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. Some who are anxious to read into this that the law is done away, apparently would have us believe that because the passage ends with the word "abolished" therefore everything mentioned in the texts foregoing is abolished. But the scripture DOES NOT SAY SO. If we took this extreme view then the ministration of condemnation is abolished, in which case no one will be lost, everyone will be saved, John 3:16 is meaningless. Paul's missionary journeys were not necessary, and the people who take the trouble to be religious today are going through a lot of useless motions.

The scripture DOES plainly state that the ministration of death, written and engraved in stones is not as glorious as the ministration of the spirit. It further amplifies this truth by stating that if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.

What is the purpose of this ministration of death and condemnation by the Law? "Now we know that what things so ever the law said, it said to them that are under the law: that EVERY MOUTH may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." (Romans 3:19) The purpose of the law is to let us know that "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Romans 3:23) We must come to this place before we realize our need of a Savior. This is how the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. (Galatians 3:24)

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea we establish the law." Romans 3:31

The third chapter of 2 Corinthians, far from proving that we do not need to order our lives in harmony with the Ten Commandments, merely indicates the three steps in the Christian life, sometimes referred to as the three "R's" of Christianity. They are: (1) Ruin by the fall. (2) Redemption through the blood. (3) Regeneration by the spirit. The ministration of death has to do with the first "R." After the sinner knows that he is under condemnation, THEN he comes to Christ for redemption (the 2nd "R"). And if the ministration of death was glorious is not the ministration of the spirit rather glorious? After receiving forgiveness of sin he receives cleansing from sin the new birth, the regeneration of the spirit, (3rd "R") and if the ministration of condemnation was glorious is not the ministration of righteousness exceeding in glory?

Are we justified by the deeds of the law? According to Romans 3:19, 20 the law was given that every mouth may be stopped and ALL THE WORLD become guilty before God. THEREFORE by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Why? Because everyone has broken it. Paul is not making a rule, he is just stating a fact. Simple, isn't it? Everyone broke it, so naturally no one can be justified by keeping it. NO ONE EVER HAS kept it except Jesus.

The purpose of the law is to show us our sins. James compares the law to a mirror. (James 1:23-25) We look at it and it shows up the blemishes in our lives. But will my face be clean if I smash the mirror to bits? Not at all. The mirror is to help me. Neither will the

enemies of the law clean up their sinful hearts by trying to show it abolished. WE NEED IT. The law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.

"For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:20

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin (lawbreaking, 1 John 3:4) that grace may abound? GOD FORBID. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Romans 6:1, 2)

Some law is binding on Christians since the death of Christ. There is not one scrap of evidence in the New Testament proving that the Ten Commandments were abolished. The Bible makes plain the forms of worship which were done away, but THE WHOLE TENOR of New Testament teaching is to uphold the Ten Commandments. The Holy Spirit seems to exhaust human vocabulary, using comparison, and admonition, and precept and example and illustration to make these things plain.

Some law is binding on Christians in the new covenant. Whatever law this is James says that every PART of it is binding. We have found many parts of the ceremonial law not binding, so this could not be it. THE ONLY LAW - containing the commands against murder and adultery, of which NO PART is said to be abolished in the New Testament, is the TEN COMMANDMENTS. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. FOR HE that said DO NOT COMMIT ADULTERY said also DO NOT KILL." James 2:10-12

What law was binding on Christians in the time when James wrote his epistle? There can be no doubt. There is no question about it. That law, which is Christ said He came not to destroy; that law, which Paul tells us is holy, just and good ; that law, which James tells us we will be judged by is none other than the Ten Commandments, graven in stone by the finger of God.

If the Ten Commandments are binding on Christians today, then the Sabbath command of the fourth commandment is binding also. If we break the Sabbath we commit sin. We are sinners and stand condemned, and the wages of sin is death. (Romans 6:23)

"TURN away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable. . ." Isaiah 58:13.

God's Holy Day

The third paragraph of Mr. Frost's First Negative says, "My opponent, knowing that the Sabbath is nowhere commanded under the new covenant, must resort to the old." Here I have received credit for knowing something which I do not know. If this is the case someone should enlighten me.

We read in the book of Hebrews about the new covenant, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second. For finding fault with them he said, "Behold the days come said the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ... For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, said the Lord; I will PUT MY LAWS INTO THEIR MINDS, AND WRITE THEM IN THEIR HEARTS: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." Hebrews 8:7-10.

Far from failing to find the Sabbath under the new covenant, I find that man's relation to the law of God is more intimate and personal under the new than it was under the old, "Not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." (See 2 Corinthians 3:3)

Also in paragraph 3 Mr. Frost states that it will be necessary for me to, "Prove that the old law is the new or part thereof." This reference to the new law fills me with the greatest of curiosity. What is it? When was it given? I read on in Mr. Frost's First Negative searching for clues as to its identity.

In paragraph 8 these words appear, "Hence the testament of Christ, or the New Testament, is the law that went forth after his death." Here Mr. Frost indicates that a law went forth after Christ's death. Perhaps this is the "new law" which means so much to him

But if so, where, when, and by whom was it given? There is no question as to the essence and authorship of the Ten Commandments, proclaimed by God to the Israelites from Mt. Sinai amid heaven's thunder and smoke, and engraved by the finger of God in tables of stone for Moses to carry down from the mount. There is no question as to the essence and authorship of the Sermon on the Mount, enunciated in beautiful simplicity by Jesus before the multitudes on the grassy hillside, and recorded by his disciple Matthew. Nor is it difficult to find the disciple John's "new" commandment which is really just a restating of the old. See 1 John 2:7, "Brethren I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which you had from the beginning. . ." See also Leviticus 19:18 . . ." Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself."

So now WHERE is the "new law" given, which according to Mr. Frost's arguments was given after the death of Christ, and which contains all of the Ten Commandments but the Sabbath command? "Surely if the ministration of death was glorious, shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" If the old law was given from a mountain top by the voice of God, with thunder and lightning, should not at least an equally noticeable manifestation be given at the presentation of the new? Jesus said, "These things were not done in a corner."

A few random quotes from the Old Testament scattered here and there in the New, certainly will not suffice. In fact these only serve to indicate that the Old Testament law was considered binding by New Testament writers or they would not have quoted from it.

We shall wait respectfully now for the chapter and verses containing the presentation of the "new law" en total. We would also like to know when and by whom it was presented, with chapter and verse. In paragraph 8 of his first negative Frost says, "Nothing is in a will unless so stated." SO WILL HE FIND THE NEW LAW FOR US IN THE WILL OF CHRIST?

I will accept Mr. Frost's definition that a testament is a will. "For a testament is of force after men are dead." True. If a wealthy uncle leaves you \$5000 you do not get it until after his death. It is of no strength at all while the testator lives." Even if the relatives sit around the dying man's bed like hungry vultures, the will, giving them the money, does not go into effect until the man dies.

But when was the will MADE? It had to be made BEFORE the rich man died, or else no court in the land would hear it. "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannuls, or adds thereto." Galatians 3:15. Christ's will was confirmed and went into effect at the time of his death. To add anything to it later would be forgery of the basest sort.

Even if the Apostle Paul had added anything later - which he didn't - it would have been forgery. "For other foundation can no man lay than that which IS LAID which is Jesus Christ." Therefore on the basis of whether it is a part of the last will and testament of Jesus Christ: Sunday observance was THREE DAYS TOO LATE ever to become a part of the Christian religion. Even if the disciples had observed that first Sunday - which they didn't - Sunday observance would still have been three days too late to ever become a part of the will of Christ, because it was not written into the will of Christ before He died.

To fulfill the specifications necessary for a will - the testament of Christ should have been given in the presence of witnesses BEFORE his death, and its provisions followed AFTER his death. However as far as a new law, or revoking of the weekly Sabbath, or the introduction of this Sunday business - WHERE is it? We do not find it given before Christ's death, neither do we find it observed by apostles after his death. Neither Sunday-keeping nor Sabbath-breaking have a leg to stand on if they seek for it in the will of Christ. There is not one scrap of Bible evidence to support such a contention.

In paragraph 3 again quoting Mr. Frost, "However all that is necessary to refute his assumption is to prove that the old law is done away. If the old law is done away it is impossible to make it the authority in the new." Shall we not pause here for sober reflection? A house of argument built upon these "if's" is worse than on a sandy foundation. And about it being authority for the new. Suppose there isn't any new? Will not my most able opponent be embarrassed if he seeks to outline my task of proving that the old law is in the new law when there isn't any new? Well, at any rate I shall be waiting word as to when, where, and by whom it was proclaimed. Also for the context of this new law.

It has been requested that I present something as to the historical significance of the law. Evidently the proofs presented in the newspaper article in which I answered the first challenge, were not deemed sufficient by my opponent. I would like to request that the reader go over the points in that article, so that I will not have to repeat them here. This will allow me space to provide the following additional proofs.

"Thou came down also upon Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and made known unto them thy holy Sabbath.. . by the hand of Moses thy servant." Nehemiah 9:13-14.

Those of the Campbellite persuasion seek here to place great emphasis on the two words "Made Known." They feel that this indicates that no Sabbath law was in existence prior to Sinai. And they conclude that it was a temporary provision for the benefit of Jews only, rather than for the whole human race for all time.

In Ezekiel 20:5 we find these words: "And made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt." Does that mean that before he made Himself known to the Hebrews in the land of Egypt God had no existence? It is just as reasonable as to conclude from the other "made known" phrase above, that before Sinai the Sabbath had no existence.

The argument is also advanced that Sabbath observance is not specifically mentioned until Exodus 16. Therefore it was not kept before that time. Exodus 16 is 1 month before the Law given on Mt. Sinai as recorded in Exodus 20. In the book of Acts there is no

record of meeting to break bread after Pentecost until the one mentioned in Acts 20. Therefore according to this kind of reasoning there was no meeting to celebrate the communion for a space of about 27 years.

Jesus himself overthrows the argument that the Sabbath did not exist before Sinai, with the statement, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. We read in Genesis 2:7 that Adam was a man. We read in Genesis 2:1-3 the record of the creation of the Sabbath.

The law of the Ten Commandments existed before sin came into the world. If there had been no law there could have been no sin. "For where no law is there is no transgression." Romans 4:15. "Sin is not imputed when there is no law." Romans 5:13. "Sin is the transgression of the law." John 3:4. The law is the agency which points out sin, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:20. What law gives this knowledge of sin? Paul answers, "Nay I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, "Thou shall not covet." Romans 7:7. What law contains the commandment against coveting? It is the Ten Commandments. James tells us that if we break one of those commandments we break all. James 2:10-12.

It has also been alleged by my opponent in a previous statement that no Gentile was ever commanded to keep the Sabbath. In Isaiah 56:2, 6, 7 we read, "Blessed is the man that doeth this and the son of man that lays hold on it; that keeps the Sabbath from polluting it, and keeps his hand from doing evil. . . also the son of the stranger [foreigners, A.R.V.] that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, everyone that keeps the Sabbath from polluting it, and takes hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer."

This is speaking of strangers - gentiles - not those that join themselves to the Jews, but those that join themselves to the Lord. Well here is the text. Also in Acts 13:42, 44 and 17:1-4, and 18:4, 11 we have specific instances of Gentiles observing the Sabbath in New Testament times. The next question is, "If we are honest what shall we do about it?"

Which law was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made? There was obviously more than one law given in the Old Testament, because God said, "How long refuse you to keep my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." That there was a law in existence before sin entered, and that that law was the Ten Commandments, I have already shown with proof texts.

Now what law is it that came later, which was added because of transgression? This is the ceremonial law. That this is a separate law is indicated in Lev, 7:1, "Likewise THIS IS THE LAW of the trespass offering: it is most holy." See also verse 11, "AND THIS IS THE LAW of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which he shall offer unto the Lord." See also verse 37, "THIS IS THE LAW of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering, and of the trespass offering, and of the consecrations, and of the sacrifice of the peace offerings." Compare this with the law of Colossians 2:14-17 for a striking identification of the handwriting of ordinances! Part of this law said that a lamb or other animal must be sacrificed when man confessed his sins. We find this law in effect very soon after sin entered. God commanded Cain and Abel to offer a lamb as a sacrifice.

The sacrifice system, added because of transgression, continued until the promised seed should come. When John the Baptist saw Jesus coming down to the water where he was preaching, he announced the fulfillment of all these ceremonies which pointed forward to Christ. He said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world." When Christ died on Calvary He cried, "It is finished" and an unseen hand tore the veil in the temple from top to bottom. Matthew 27:50,51.

This veil separated the holy from the "most holy" place in the temple. Only the high priest could go into this most holy place, and then only once a year on the day of atonement. The rending of the veil indicated that these things all pointed forward to the true sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and that at the time of his death the most holy place came to an end of its usefulness.

We read in Daniel 9:26, 27, "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease."

However much of Daniel's book might be difficult for the average reader to understand, this much is beyond cavil, that Messiah was to be cut off, but not for himself, and that he was to cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.

The apostle Paul enunciates the same truth in Colossians 2:11, 16, 17.

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances, which was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat (offerings) or in drink (offerings) or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME, but the body is of Christ. Notice carefully the following:

These are the feasts of the Lord which you shall claim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day: BESIDE THE SABBATHS OF THE LORD, and beside your gifts, and beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which you give unto the Lord. Leviticus 23:37, 38.

Compare this verse 37 with Colossians 2:16, and we find it quoted almost word for word. Here the book of Leviticus mentions these things BESIDE the Sabbaths of the Lord and offerings as if they are two separate commands! We find the type of Sabbath which will be feasts illustrated in the next verse, Leviticus 23:39 -

Also in the 15th day of the seventh month when you have gathered in the fruit of the land, you shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days: on the first day shall be A SABBATH, and on the eighth day shall be a SABBATH.

Mr. Frost's contention that holyday represents yearly, new moon represents monthly, and Sabbath days represents the weekly Sabbath, is partially true but not all true. Note Leviticus 25 :8. "And thou shall number seven Sabbaths of YEARS unto thee, seven times seven years, and the space of the seven Sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years." Far, far from the word "Sabbaths" referring only to the weekly rest day, we find it here referring to SEVEN YEAR PERIODS! Which means that Mr. Frost's contention that the weekly Sabbath is pointed out in Colossians 2:14-17 is based on a faulty premise and cannot be true. Also, I would like to ask my opponent what future event the weekly Sabbath is a shadow of, if it is a shadow of thing to come.

This ceremonial system was filled with many Sabbaths and holy days which came on monthly dates, and commemorated feasts and ceremonies which pointed forward to Christ. Many types of food and drink offerings were included in the ceremonial system. That "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink" applies only to these things which were shadows of things to come, is proven by the fact that the Apostolic council warned us against Blood and things strangled, and that Paul states that a drunkard shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.

The ten commandment law cannot be confused with this handwriting of ordinances. They are two separate and distinct laws. Note the following comparison:

Moral Law

Written by God in tables of stone. Exodus 32:16
Placed inside the ark. 1 Kings 8:9 To point out sin. Romans 7:12

Do we make void the law through faith? Go forbid yea we establish the law. Romans 3:33 I, myself, with the mind, obey the law of God. Romans 7:25 For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. Romans 7:14 It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail. Luke 16:17

For he spoke in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. There remains therefore a rest (Margin, keeping of a Sabbath) unto the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works AS GOD DID FROM HIS! Hebrews 4:4,9,10

If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. Matthew 19:17

Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure conscience, and of faith unfeigned: from which some having swerved have turned aside unto VAIN JANGLING; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm. But WE KNOW THAT THE LAW IS GOOD if a man use it lawfully. 1 Timothy 1:5-8

Ceremonial Law

Written by Moses in a book. Deuteronomy 31:24
Placed in a pocket in the side of the ark. Deuteronomy 31:26 Added because of sin. Galatians 3:19

How turn you back again to the weak and beggarly elements? Galatians 4:9 Be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage. Galatians 2:16

Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. Hebrews 7:1

For there is verily a disannulling of the commandments going before for the weakness and unprofitable-ness thereof. Hebrews 7:18

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the Sabbath days WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME. Colossians 2:16, 17

For the law made nothing perfect. Hebrews 7:19

Mr. Frost has tempted me to use valuable space to repeat a comparison of the moral and ceremonial laws, by accusing me of abandoning this line of argument. I have fallen for this seduction in the hope that a second look at the truth might help to clear the cobwebs of confusion from his mind. He makes a cavil as to the number of laws in existence. There are certainly more than two. The civil law of Israel would make a third. The purpose of this comparison is to indicate that Paul MUST be talking about at least two different laws or else he clearly contradicts himself. If he is then we cannot take what he says about one law and apply it to the other one.

Seeking to add confusion to the plain truth about the covenants, Mr. Frost raises a question as to how many covenants there are in the Bible. He states with great assurance that Adventists maintain that there are three. Well there are three, but there are also more than three. Even a most superficial reading of the Bible indicates many covenants.

A few are God's covenant with Noah, that he would not destroy the earth with a flood. His covenant with Abraham, that in his seed would all nations of the earth be blessed. His covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai, his covenant with David that the rulers on the throne would be of his seed until Messiah should come.

Friend Frost also wastes space on "Smith's" rule that things in the Bible which we are to follow should be specifically pointed out. He wants chapter and verse for this which any child should know without being told. But if it will help any, how about Deuteronomy 29:29? "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the THINGS WHICH ARE REVEALED belong to us and to our children forever."

The comparison presented by my opponent as regards the laws of England, and the United States is irrelevant, and makes no point at all. Mr. Frost states that, "When we broke relationship with that country, we severed responsibility to her law."

There is no indication in Scripture of this type of break with the true Jews, or with the Ten Commandments. Paul tells us, "If you are Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Revelation 3:9 states that those who say they are Jews but are not, will have to kneel before the feet of the members of the Christian Philadelphian church. Paul tells us that the new covenant will be made with the "House of Israel." Hebrews 8:8-10 Is not cutting ourselves off from the house of Israel and from God's ten commandment law, cutting us off also from the benefits of the new covenant promises? Paul in Romans 11 presents the Gentiles as being grafted into the Israelite tree. And in verse 21, we have this warning, "For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee."

And they also if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graft them in again. For if THOU wert out of the olive tree which is WILD BY NATURE, and wert GRAFFED contrary to nature into a GOOD OLIVE TREE: How much more shall these WHICH BE THE NATURAL BRANCHES be grafted into their own olive tree?

For I would not brethren, that you should be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness IN PART is happened to Israel. UNTIL the fullness of the GENTILES be COME IN. And so all ISRAEL shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of ZION the deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from JACOB. For THIS IS MY COVENANT unto them WHEN I shall TAKE AWAY THEIR SINS. Romans 11:23-27.

God's covenant is an everlasting covenant. Hebrews 13:20. He tells us in Psalm 89:34, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." It is impossible for God to lie. Hebrews 6:18. God confirmed his covenant by an oath. Hebrews 6:13, 17.

In verse 13 we are told that God swore unto Abraham. In making his covenant with Abraham, we read that the Lord and Abraham each passed between the cut carcasses of animals in confirming the oath. This was a custom of those times to indicate that the person making it would die before he should change or break the covenant.

Surely in all these texts there is sufficient evidence for anyone, that God did not and will not change or abolish HIS covenant. Now WHOSE COVENANT is it that has been abolished?

"But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon BETTER PROMISES." Hebrews 8:6. Whose promises were at fault? The covenant was a contract or agreement between God and Israel. Surely God's promises were not at fault. It is impossible for God to lie.

Then whose promises WERE at fault? Israel's of course. And we read this in verse 8 of the same chapter. "For finding fault with THEM he said, behold the days come said the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the HOUSE OF ISRAEL and with the HOUSE OF JUDAH."

What was this promise which the Jews failed to keep which necessitated the drawing up of a new contract or covenant?

And he (Moses) took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and THEY SAID, ALL THAT THE LORD HATH SAID WILL WE DO AND BE OBEDIENT. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it upon the people, and said, "Behold the BLOOD OF THE COVENANT, which the LORD hath made with YOU concerning all these words. Exodus 24:7, 8. Now, which are the BETTER PROMISES upon which the new covenant is based?

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, said the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. The fault of the old covenant is that it was based upon the people's promises. The contract became of no effect, when they broke them. "Because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not said the Lord." Hebrews 8:9. Last Part.

God has never changed His part of the agreement. He merely wishes the people to enter into covenant relationship with him again. And this time, instead of being based upon the people's promises to keep his law, it will be based upon his promise to write it in our hearts. He will enter into this covenant with us as soon as he forgives our sins. Romans 11:27. Herein we will find perfection in Christ.

Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the EVERLASTING COVENANT, make you perfect in every good work to do his will ... Hebrews 13:20, 21. Every one that has ever been saved, Old Testament or New, has been saved under the NEW COVENANT provisions. We read about the old in Hebrews 8:7 and 7:19 indicating that it had faults, and that it made nothing perfect. The new covenant was also recorded in the Old Testament. See Jeremiah 31:31-33.

Those saved in Old Testament times were saved by FAITH. Read the 11th chapter of Hebrews. David the Psalmist was saved by GRACE. Read Romans 4:6 also 4:13, For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was NOT to Abraham or to his seed THROUGH THE LAW, but through the righteousness of FAITH! Jesus said, "Search the Scriptures (What Scriptures? New Testament was not yet written) and they which testify of me." John 5:39. Also in Luke 24:44-48 Jesus mentions things in the Old Testament which were written concerning him. Acts 8 :34-37: Philip preached from Old Testament scriptures (Isaiah 53) to the eunuch, and then baptized him.

Let me ask, where do our anti-sabbatarian friends go for doctrine? 2 Timothy 2:15-17 says that ALL Scripture is profitable for DOCTRINE. While referring specifically to Old Testament Scriptures (See verse 15) Paul in verse 16 dogmatically includes all. He doesn't say for ensamples only he says for DOCTRINE.

It is that spirit of antichrist which will, "Seek to change times and the law." Dan. 7:25. Shall we not return to the pure faith once given to the saints, and have the Bible and the Bible only as our rule of faith and practice?

Argument often does not help us as we seek to learn new truths because of the spirit of strife that is so easily engendered. But I would plead with my brethren of all anti-Sabbath persuasions to examine this and all other evidence on the topic prayerfully. Be willing to do His will no matter what it might be, or what inconvenience it might cause, and in the end you will understand it the way Christ would have you, for "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine. . ." John 7:17.

The Law Of God

Friend Frost is clever at finding difficulties which do not exist, by pretending to misunderstand my statements. This is the old "straw man" technique. Build an imaginary fallacy out of something you pretend to see in the other man's argument: then mercilessly tear it to pieces. Such reasoning is fallacious, of course, but an old debater's trick.

A good example of this is Mr. Frost's play on words regarding, "Things specifically pointed out." Every Bible student follows this rule in the general intent including Frost himself. If the good Book doesn't say it, we don't believe it. But friend Frost a la the old straw man trick has wasted two pages of his manuscript space trying to prove that Smith would establish a new rule for Bible study.

Another favorite of debaters who can't answer an argument, is to sneer at it as if it is unworthy of notice, and then to say in a loud voice. "I DEMAND an answer to the following questions!" This of course is an attempt to lead the minds of his readers away from the argument he is afraid of, and transfer their attention to his questions. I invite the reader to candidly examine Frost's first and second negatives to see how many times he has employed this trick. He even repeats questions already answered hoping they will be answered two or three times while his opponent wastes valuable space. The affirmative has asked very few questions, seeking not to take advantage in any way, but evidently the opposition doesn't think questions important, as even these few have not all been answered.

While this debate is stated in the proposition to be on the Sabbath issue, friend Frost digresses to introduce new topics. He seeks also to debate on whether Mrs. E. G. White is a true prophet, and to poke fun at Wm. Miller's prophecies of the end of the world. Evidently

he cannot find sufficient material to support his contentions by staying with the subject of the proposition, and in his desperation must go far afield.

Frost's statement that Seventh-day Adventists received the Sabbath doctrine from Mrs. E. G. White is false. I hope this false statement stems from ignorance rather than a desire to deceive. The facts happen to be that the group who later were called Seventh-day Adventists, learned the Sabbath truth from the Seventh-day Baptists, who in turn, trace their origin to some of the Moravian and Waldensian groups who had kept the Sabbath since apostolic times.

Rachel Preston, a Seventh-day Baptist, first introduced the Sabbath idea among the Adventists. Among the first of these to believe the Sabbath binding on Christians under the new covenant, was Joseph Bates, a retired sea captain. He and many others believed and taught it before it was accepted by Mrs. White. The Bible prophets did not have everything revealed to them at once, but learned God's will a step at a time. You will recall that Peter and Paul were in sharp disagreement at one time, and Peter was wrong - and this after Pentecost, too. And so it was with Mrs. White and the Sabbath. She did not see it until after others had been teaching it for many months.

The statement that the end of the world was predicted by Seventh-day Adventists is another false statement. They were organized in 1860 and have never set a date for the end of the world. They trace their ancestry through the ancient Christians of Europe to the times of the apostles, and are calling the world to return to the original faith once given to the saints. The organization in 1860 as a holy society dedicated to the carrying of the gospel to all the world is in harmony with the instruction of Matthew 28:18-20.

At the time of the first expected end of the world in 1843 Mrs. White was still a young girl, who would reach the age of 16 in November of that year. At the second disappointment in November of '44 she had barely turned 17. Mrs. White (then Ellen Harmon) made no claims as to receiving visions from heaven until after this time. The Harmon family had been members of the METHODIST church until 1843. They were influenced by Wm. Miller's teaching, and were disappointed when Christ did not come as expected. LATER when Mrs. White began to have visions and to write and teach she taught and wrote extensively against date setting, saying that no man knows the day or hour of Christ's return. (Matthew 24:36)

Wm. Miller, who predicted the end of the world in 1843 and 1844 was in no sense a Seventh-day Adventist. He rejected the teaching of Joseph Bates and others about the Sabbath. Wm. Miller died believing Sunday to be the only day of religious significance. In this sense we might say he was a bit akin to Mr. Frost and his fellow believers, BUT - can we blame them - or any other religious group - for HIS predictions about the end of the world?

It is disappointing that friend Frost ignores and sneers at the plainest Bible texts, and resorts to personal attacks and malignments and scurrilous statements instead. It has made me feel that the debate wasn't worth continuing on that sort of a basis. However he has cried so loud that the integrity of Adventism is at stake, that I have decided to write this one more article.

Really it is difficult to see that anything is at stake. No one is excited except Frost. And why he should be is a matter of wonder unless it is because he is uncertain of his own position. Grandly he wrote that before the last article I had opportunity to consult the ablest leaders of Adventism, and 7 months for most labored preparation. What makes him think his attacks are worthy of such notice or concern, I do not know.

The writer of the affirmative happens to be a busy person with many more things to do than preach once or twice a week and argue with other ministers. In order to carry on this debate in even as tardy a manner as I have done, I have had to hold back work which I am far more interested in. I have articles waiting which were started before this debate, and the editor of the religious magazine who requested them is still waiting, while I spend time on this business. I pray to God that it may be of some service somewhere, and that some honest person may read all three of my articles supporting the Sabbath prayerfully, not taking what Frost tries to make me say in his attacks, but what is actually stated in the context of the articles themselves.

In my second affirmative I gave the New Testament regulations as to how a Christian should keep the Sabbath now. In Frost's second negative he again asks this question. Evidently here was at least two pages of my argument that he skipped reading.

Frost cries that his "conclusive" arguments that the Old Testament has been done away have not been replied to. He forgets among other things 2 Timothy 3:15-17. He acknowledged it in his first negative with, "Smith makes a feeble attempt with 2 Timothy 3:16." Well Smith may make a feeble attempt but 2 Timothy 3:16 is a MIGHTY text. It stands as an impassable barrier against the teachings of Alexander Campbell and his followers.

Shall we not notice again what it says? ALL SCRIPTURE is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for DOCTRINE . . . (Mr. Frost gets his doctrines from the New Testament only) FOR REPROOF, for CORRECTION, for INSTRUCTION IN RIGHTEOUSNESS." Do you, Mr. Frost, get any instruction in righteousness from the Old Testament?

No, you don't. You use it for "ensamples" for inspiration and information only. But this isn't what the BIBLE SAYS you should do. **WHEN WILL YOU START FOLLOWING THE BIBLE?**

Friend Frost feels that Hebrews 8 is a barrier to Seventh-day Adventists. Let me enlighten him. Not only is it not a barrier - it is part of our doctrine. We teach it and preach it. We find no barriers in the Bible: it is our creed book. We are not like other churches who have trouble with this text or that one. We teach what the good Book SAYS even if it is inconvenient. This is the reason why we are willing to be different from the rest of the world and go to the inconvenience of observing the seventh day of the week, or Saturday as the Sabbath.

And the reason other ministers malign us and misrepresent us I sometimes think is because they are afraid we might be right, and **IT BOTHERS THEM.**

I eliminated verse 9 of Hebrews 8 in my former argument to save space, and not because I found anything damaging in it. If we included every verse in the chapters we are discussing this argument would take many volumes. But simply because I skipped it Frost feels there must be something in it that I am afraid of, and has seized upon it gleefully, boastfully hoping that somewhere in it is a barrier to Adventism.

But where is it? Certainly not in the phrase, "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, etc." This is simply a continuation of the explanation in the foregoing verses, which state that a better covenant would be made upon better promises and that God found fault with them, the Children of Israel. This in no way effects my original contention that a covenant is an agreement, and that the Lord sought to make a new covenant or agreement with the children of Israel.

Frost continues to play on words saying, God said, "If you will keep my covenant." He did not say, "If you will keep your agreement." This argument is absolutely laughable. Has friend Frost never looked up the word "covenant" in the dictionary? Mine says, "An agreement entered into by two or more persons or parties: a compact." God said, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." God keeps his agreements with people. But the people broke theirs with God. "Finding fault with **THEM** he said I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel," etc. Verse 6 says Jesus is the mediator of a better covenant established upon better **PROMISES.**

This word "promises" is the clue to the difference in the covenants according to the Bible itself. The new one was to be established upon better promises. Whose promises had to do with the old covenant? Exodus 24:7, "AND he took the book of the **COVENANT** and read in the audience of the people: and they said **ALL THAT THE LORD HATH SAID WILL WE DO AND BE OBEDIENT.** And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said behold the blood of the **COVENANT WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE WITH YOU** concerning **THESE WORDS.**"

Here is the people's promise and you know that they broke it. Now the Lord said the new Covenant would be established upon **BETTER PROMISES.** Who makes the promises of the new covenant? Hebrews 8:10 "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days **SAITH THE LORD:** I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." The first covenant was on the **PEOPLE'S** promise. The second covenant is **GOD'S** promise. So it is a better covenant based upon better promises as Hebrews 8:6 says.

Friend Frost tells us that the law was given for the Jews only, and that Gentiles were not bound to keep the Sabbath. Has he noticed Romans, chapters 3 and 4? Romans 4:15 tells us that where no law is there is no transgression. And yet Romans 3:9 tells us that both Jews and Gentiles are under sin, and verse 19 says, "Now we know that what things so ever the law says it says to them that are under the law: that **EVERY** mouth may become stopped, and **ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD.**"

"Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shall not covet." Romans 7:7. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Romans 6:23. Do we see now how the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ? Without it there would be no sin, no death penalty, no need of a Savior. Everyone who admits that he needs Jesus for salvation admits that the law is still binding. Everyone who thinks sinners are lost admits that the law is still binding. The law shows us that we are sinners under the death penalty, then we turn to Jesus for the Salvation he offers.

Mr. Frost uses the terms "old law" and "new law." Where does he find these in Scripture? Is he not speaking where the Bible is silent? Now for the question on the greatest commandment in the law. Can it be that Mr. Frost does not know that to love God with all our hearts is the summing up of the first four commandments -for these have to do with our duty to God -and loving our neighbor with all our hearts is the summing up of the last six? On the last six we find this pointed out specifically in Romans 13:8-10.

It has been asked which commandment Adam broke. How about number eight, "Thou shall not steal?" Gen. 2: 16, 17 God told Adam he could eat of all the other trees, but this one was forbidden. He wasn't even to touch it. How about also the sixth commandment,

"Thou shall not kill?" God had said that they would die if they should eat of this tree. By disobeying they brought death upon themselves and the human race. Is not suicide - even slow suicide - a breaking of the sixth commandment?

How about the first commandment which says, "Thou shall have no other gods before me?" Satan had told them to eat the fruit. God had said not to eat of it. They obeyed Satan in preference to God. Was this not having other gods BEFORE Him? So here we see 3 of the commandments plainly transgressed by Adam and Eve. This is in harmony with what Paul tells us in Romans 5:13 "For until the law sin was in the world, BUT SIN IS NOT IMPUTED WHEN THERE IS NO LAW." Verse 14 refers to "Adam's transgression." Adam could not have had a transgression if there were no law for, "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4.

Another question asked by Frost is, "If man breaks any stated command of God other than the decalogue, is he guilty, or only if he breaks the ten?" One cannot break any other stated command of God without breaking one of the ten. These ten rules stated in the briefest form, cover the whole field of human conduct. It is not just the bare latter (sic) of the law that we are to keep, but the spirit of it. Jesus indicated this in his sermon on the mount. As in the seventh commandment, he said even one who should look upon a woman lustfully commits adultery in his heart. As to the 6th against murder, he said even he that hates his brother is a murderer. The prohibitions against swearing did not just include use of God's name as such. "Swear not by the heaven for it is God's throne, neither by the earth for it is his footstool." Matthew 5:34, 35.

Eating too much or otherwise abusing one's stomach might be the breaking of the first commandment according to Paul in Philippians 3:19, "Whose god is their belly." Sometimes we break more than one commandment at a time as Proverbs 30:9 states. "Lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." Surely a person who calls himself a Christian and then steals, is taking God's name in vain. James 2:10 tells us that if we break one commandment we break all.

And how could one hold back in tithes and offerings without being guilty of breaking commandment number 8? Malachi 3:8 "Will a man rob God? Yet you have robbed me. But you say, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings." How could we disobey any command of God without breaking commandment number 1? Would we not be having other gods before him, even if that god was our own self-will? Could that not be a god as easily as our stomach as Paul mentions in Philippians 3:19?

Mr. Frost asks for the command for the Gentiles to keep the Sabbath. He got it. Isaiah 56:2-7. He makes a quibble about the word "strangers" but admits it is used of Gentiles. Enough said. He got his text. Mr. Frost complains that his argument on Colossians 2:14-17 remains untouched. I didn't know he had an argument. The things I said about this text still stand, too. Go back and read them in affirmatives one and two. Perhaps friend Frost thinks he had something where he wrote in, "Holydays (yearly) or of the new moon (monthly) or of the Sabbath days (weekly)." But this is interpolation. Would he add to the sacred words of Scripture and risk the plagues of Revelation 22:18? Actually as all Bible students know the yearly, monthly, and weekly feasts were all called "Sabbaths." The day of atonement (yearly) was a Sabbath. Leviticus 23:23-32. Friend Frost is aghast because I refer to the civil, ceremonial, and moral laws. It is too bad that he hasn't an analytical enough mind to notice this. He informs me that the Pentateuch is referred to as the law. Correct! Sometimes even more than the Five books of Moses is referred to as the law. Note where Jesus says, "Is it not written in your law, I said you are gods?" Here he quotes from Psalm 82:6, which would also include Psalms in the law. The whole Old Testament is referred to as the law and the prophets.

But there are also many laws in the law which is the five books of Moses. Note this statement, "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse you to keep my commandments and my LAWS?" (plural) Well, do I have Bible for it, or don't I? (Exodus 16:28) Oh yes, another question on Colossians 2:16. Mr. Frost wishes to know the significance of the word "days" in italics. The text should read literally according to Robertson, the great Greek scholar, "Or of Sabbaths."

That these things mentioned in Colossians 2:14-17 are limited, I have already proven in former arguments. It does not finish the sentence at the end of verse 16 but goes on, "or of the Sabbath days which are a shadow of things to come." The handwriting of ordinances having to do with all those things which were a shadow of things to come were abolished. They are still useful to us to study as they are some of the proofs of the divinity of Christ. But since they were no longer pointing forward at the time of his death, they came to an end, and the veil in the temple was rent from top to bottom.

The Ten Commandments were not shadows of things to come. They are simply a summing up of the law of God's government. They indicate a situation which will always exist. We will even keep the Sabbath in heaven according to Isaiah 66:22, 23. 1 John 5:2, 3 tells us, By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." The same text next shows that this can only be done through faith in Christ. See verses 4 and 5. Revelation 14:12 tells us, "Here is the patience of the saints, here are they that keep the commandments of God, and have the faith of Jesus."

2 Corinthians 3 is mentioned again, and this is the text with which friend Frost claims he has a right to the \$200. (However I wonder if he really thinks he has a claim to this money, since he did not show his face at the meeting at which I advertised I would give it away.) He states in his first negative, "The ministration of death, written and graven in stones was glorious." What happened to it? Is done

away. The ministration of death is done away WHENEVER the ministration of the spirit, which is more glorious takes over. Here is the experience of every Christian, his life before the new birth is compared to Old Testament glory; the converted life to the glory of the gospel dispensation.

That Paul is using this to refer to personal experience is indicated in verse 4, "And such trust have WE through Christ to God-ward" and in verse 12, "Seeing then that we have such hope we use great plainness of speech," and verse 18, "But we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory. Do you see it? We are changed from the lesser glory of condemnation to the greater glory of the ministration of the spirit. It is not something back in history, it is something that happens to us now. We ARE CHANGED (present tense) from glory to glory.

Let me ask Mr. Frost where in 2 Corinthians 3 does it say that the Ten Commandments are abolished or done away? Read it 100 times and see if you can find it. If it said that I not only would hand over the \$200, I would quit being a Seventh-day Adventist today. It only indicates that the ministration of death was to be done away. Let me ask has the ministration of death been done away? People are still dying. It is done away by promise when the ministration of the spirit takes over in our hearts.

WHEN is the ministration of death done away once and for all? "SO when this corruptible shall have put on INCORRUPTION and this mortal shall have put on IMMORTALITY, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Corinthians 15:54. Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." In this text the words destroy and fulfill are used in contrast to one another as if they have opposite meanings. But some would have us believe they mean the same thing, that when Christ fulfilled the law he destroyed it, but He says, I am NOT come to destroy.

How is the law fulfilled? By keeping it. But someone asks, can you prove that Jesus kept the law? Yes I can. Note this, "If you keep my commandments you shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love." John 15:10. Is fulfilling the law keeping the law? Note Romans 13:8-10. Here Paul is listing some commandments that have to do with our duty to our neighbor. Those against killing, stealing, false witness, and coveting are mentioned in verse 9. In verse 10 he says, love works no ill to his neighbor THEREFORE love is the fulfilling of the law.

In other words if we love our neighbor, we won't kill him, we won't run off with his wife, we won't steal his money. If we love him we will fulfill the law. And Jesus said he was not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it. That puts it in a new light, doesn't it? (Matthew 5:17) "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

Jesus expected that the Sabbath would still be a Christian institution, to be enjoyed by his followers 40 years after his death. It was to be a blessing and not a burden. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." And that the happiness of this day should not be marred by the terrors of war, he advised his disciples in his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, "Pray you that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Matthew 24:20.

The city of Jerusalem was not destroyed until 70 A.D. Some years ago a minister of another faith argued that the gates would be locked on the Sabbath, and that this was the reason for Christ's words. He quoted from Nehemiah, at whose insistence the gates were locked for a time to hinder commercial traffic on the Sabbath.

There is nothing to indicate that the gates were locked in Christ's time. We find He and the disciples entering and leaving the city at will, but just to make certain, I asked Rabbi David Cohen of Las Vegas if the Jews were imprisoned in the city, and could not escape if an attack came on the Sabbath. He stated that this was not the case, and that even if trade were forbidden, individuals would be permitted to enter and leave the city. So in Matthew 24:20 we have evidence that the Sabbath should continue to be a day of meaning to Christians 40 years after his death. In Luke 23:54-56 we have an example of the Sabbath being observed by his followers after his death. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment."

In Hebrews 4 we find a direct command for Sabbath observance. It is not in verses 7 and 8 as some believe. I have known people to start keeping the Sabbath because they understood it to read, "for if Jesus had given them rest, then would he NOT afterward have spoken of another day." But of course this is evidently not the intent of the text unless it has a double meaning. In the Greek language, Jesus and Joshua are the same name, Joshua merely being the Hebrew form. Most Bible scholars believe that it should read "Joshua" here instead of "Jesus."

The children of Israel entered the land of Canaan in Joshua's time, and they thought that they would here find rest from their wanderings. But Paul says they did not find the spiritual soul rest which they should have found. "Again he limits a certain day, saying in David, Today, after so long a time; as it is said, Today if you will hear his voice harden not your hearts. For if Joshua had given them rest, then would he (David) not afterward have spoken of another day." When did he do this? By saying "Today, if you will hear his voice, etc."

Now for the text which DOES command Christians to observe the Sabbath: Hebrews 4:10, 11. For he that is entered into His rest, he also hath ceased from his own works AS GOD DID FROM HIS!" How did God cease from his? Verse 4 "For he spoke in a certain place of the 7th day on this wise, AND GOD DID REST THE SEVENTH DAY FROM ALL HIS WORKS." Where is our definite command? Hebrews 4:11 "LET US LABOR THEREFORE TO ENTER INTO THAT REST!" What rest? "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his." Verse 10. "If they believe not Moses and the Prophets they WOULD not believe even though one rose from the dead." Luke 16:31.

In view of the foregoing texts, as well as the whole tenor of Scripture teaching, I must continue to affirm that the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, is the Sabbath which is binding upon Christians under the new covenant.

www.CreationismOnline.com