

**A DEBATE  
ON THE  
SABBATH AND LORD'S DAY,**

**HELD AT RAMONA, S. D.**

**FROM THE 20TH OF JULY, A.D., 1893**

---

PRICE, 25 CENTS

---

1893

PRINTED AT THE DAILY LEADER OFFICE  
MADISON, S. D.

**A DEBATE  
ON THE  
SABBATH AND LORD'S DAY,**

**HELD AT RAMONA, S. D.**

**FROM THE 20TH OF JULY, A.D., 1893**

**BETWEEN  
G. W. ELLIOTT  
PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST  
RAMONA, S. D.  
AND  
N .W. KAUBLE  
MADISON, S.D  
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST EVANGELIST**

**MODERATORS  
C. R. GALVIN, F. G. BALL, M.M. REITER  
C. R. GALVIN, CHAIRMAN**

## INTRODUCTION.

On July 6, 1893, Elder N. W. Kauble, a Seventh Day Adventist evangelist, pitched his tent and began a series of meetings in Ramona, S. D. After the meeting had continued for some time, many of the citizens of Ramona and vicinity earnestly requested that the Sabbath and Lord's day questions be discussed in oral debate between Mr. Kauble and G. W. Elliott, pastor of the Church of Christ, at Ramona, S. D. The discussion was entered into July 20, 1893, and continued seven days. A stenographer was employed to take the discussion. Both disputants were heartily endorsed as representative men among their people. We believe this to be the most thorough investigation ever made of the subjects in South Dakota.

We send this work out in hopes that it may be the means of helping many in their investigation for the truth.

G. W. ELLIOTT.

## ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT.

RAMONA, S. D. July 14, 1893. We, the undersigned, hereby agree to meet in Ramona, S. D., July 20, 1893, and discuss the following questions, for a period of seven evenings of two hours each, subject to the appended rules:

Question I. Do the Scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, is the Sabbath, and is now binding upon Christians?

KAUBLE affirms.

ELLIOTT denies.

Question II. Does the New Testament teach that the First day of the week, commonly

called Sunday, was observed by Christians as a day of worship under the direction of the Apostles and should be observed in the same manner at the present time?

ELLIOTT affirms.

KAUBLE denies.

RULE I. Each speaker selects one person to act as moderator, these two to select a third.

RULE II. It shall be the duty of the moderators to look after the opening exercises, preserve order, and hold the speakers to the question under discussion.

RULE III. Each speaker shall have two alternate speeches of thirty minutes each evening.

RULE IV. The first four evenings shall be devoted to the discussion of question 1. The last three evenings to question 2.

RULE V. Each meeting shall be opened with singing and prayer.

(Signed)

N. W. KAUBLE.

G. W. ELLIOTT.

## ON THE SABBATH AND LORD'S DAY

JULY 20, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR--KAUBLE.

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:* The subject of discussion is expressed in the question here written on the board, "Do the Scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, and now binding upon Christians?"

The word, Sabbath, is a Hebrew word transplanted, meaning, Rest. The Sabbath under discussion is the Lord's Sabbath, so says the commandment, Ex. 20:8-11. The commandment says, keep it holy; which cannot be done unless the day is holy. We can no more keep a day holy that is not holy than we can keep a black horse white. Neither you nor I can make a day holy though we try ever so hard. Who made the Sabbath day? Gen. 2:3, Ex. 20:8-11. God blessed the Sabbath day and he commanded us to keep it: so he also sanctified it; and the word, sanctified, means, appointed. Then he appointed it for man's use, Mark 2:27. He says this in speaking of keeping holy that day: "He looked over his work that was stamped with his character and was pleased with it, and he gave the Sabbath as a memorial of his pleasure in his work." As the scripture says, he was refreshed, Ex. 31:17. And that word, refreshed, means, delighted. There is nothing in nature to show the cycle of seven days; while it is true that our cycle of months is shown to be the motions of the moon, and the cycles of years, by the seasons, yet there is nothing to indicate the cycle of seven days except the commandment of God. How are you to keep this day holy? Ex. 20:8-11, Isa. 58:13,14, answers the question. God has once said that we should thus keep it holy, and that law stands unrepealed to-day, and no man can change it. No man can find the repeal of those laws. That a law stands in binding force until repealed, is a known fact, and when that is done word is given to the people that such is the case. Now if the fourth commandment has not been repealed, it is binding on Christians to-day. Read Col. 2:16-17. Here it is distinctly stated that some Sabbaths are not any

more binding, but the ones are plainly pointed out, "which are a shadow of things to come, the body is of Christ," which implies that those which are not shadows, etc., are not herein included.

Now until it can be shown that the seven-day Sabbath, which points back to creation, is a shadow, it is not proven by this text to be abolished. Now I appeal to this intelligent audience to-night to find anything concerning the fourth commandment being a shadow in the bible.

In regard to the Lord's work in creating, this statement is made in Rev. 4:11: "Thou art worthy, O, Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Now when God worked during the six days he worked for his own pleasure and that God created was a pleasure to him. Turn to Exodus 31:17. After God created the heaven and the earth, he looked back upon it and his soul was filled with delight at seeing it. He was delighted with his work. And on the seventh day he rested. After resting upon that day he gave it to us, and he says, "Take it for a perpetual covenant" In six days I did this perfect work, and when you look at it you think of this perfect work, then of the covenant which I gave you for a memorial. When God rested on the seventh day he did not rest because he was tired. Now that the Lord was not tired I will prove to you from Isa. 40:28. Another thought: Some individuals will say that the Lord gave us this day because we needed a physical rest. That is not the case. It was given to us because God created the heaven and earth, and not because we needed a day of physical rest. And the same reason exists for this day. When an individual once thinks that it is because it is a physical necessity of man, he is easily persuaded to think that the day is abolished. But I want to tell you to-night that there are individuals to-day who tell you that there is no difference which day you keep. But look here: God says that he blessed that day and sanctified it for man. He set it apart for a holy use. The seventh day was the day he sanctified.

Let me read from Exo. 20:16 20. I submit to you that those words are just as effective to-night as when Ezekiel spoke those

words. There is a day that God says is a holy day. but there is a class of individuals who say there is no difference what day you keep. He says "They have made void my law have that done this." Now who made the seventh day holy? It was not man for he had not the power. Moses said, by inspiration, it was God that made it holy. How could he make it holy? Just as he made the ground holy at the burning bush. Perhaps you cannot understand how he made the ground holy, but it is nevertheless a fact that he made the ground holy, and he made the day holy in the same way by putting into it his presence, and he said, "remember that you keep the Sabbath holy." In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, etc. John, the first chapter, says it was Jesus who made heaven and earth. All things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made. And then listen to what the Apostle Paul says in speaking of Jesus: Col. 1:16, "For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth." It was the same individual that created and rested, and blessed the Sabbath and commanded us to keep it holy. (See Ex. 20:18-11.) Now if that is not a Christian institution I would like to have you define what a Christian institution is.

Jesus rested on the seventh day and delighted in the work of his hand. After having been delighted with his work, he blessed the day and made it holy, and then he sanctified it. He rested upon this day and made it his rest day, then he blessed it and made it his blessed rest day; then after he blessed it he made it holy and it was his holy blessed rest day. Then he sanctified or appointed it for the use of man, then it was his sanctified holy blessed rest day. We should remember it as the day of the Lord. Jesus says the Sabbath was made for man. Mark 2:27, "And he said unto them, the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The Greek says, "the man." The man Adam, the representative head of the human family, though every individual member of the human race is subject to it. That text in Mark says that the Sabbath was made for man. It was made in the Garden of Eden although the position is taken by some that it was not made in Eden. The Sabbath and the institution of marriage God gave in the Garden of



Eden. The institution was made in the Garden of Eden before man fell, and was as wrong to disobey that command then as it is now. It is wrong to break any of the ten commandments, and if you break one out of the ten, though you keep the other nine, you are guilty of all. Jas. 2:10. But now I wish to read another passage, Eze. 20:12. Now then, was the Sabbath a binding obligation before the commandments were given to Moses on Sinai? Everything was done for the Sabbath hundreds of years before Sinai. Do you suppose that God would sanctify a day for the use of man and then not have man use it? Nonsense. Now that I have brought you out of the house of bondage where you could not keep my Sabbath, see that you remember to keep it holy. And further, when some of the Israelites transgressed this law, the Lord says to Moses, "How long will you refuse to keep my commandments?" They had been refusing to keep them for a long time, it seems, and the refusing to do a thing implies that they have a knowledge of the obligation to do it. Ex. 16. But now then, we come along down to Christ.

## **JULY 20, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR—ELLIOTT.**

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am pleased to stand before you this evening in this discussion, for various reasons. One reason is, that truth is never injured by investigation, and another reason is that we all want to know the truth: hence, I stand before you. As you notice, the question on the board, which is brought up to-night, is an important one. It is an important question to one who does not keep the Sabbath holy. By the Sabbath I mean the seventh day of the week. It is made a test of fellowship. This is one of the things that he must do to be fellowshipped. When a man understands this question, and he refuses to observe it, there is no hope for that man. And when a man once understands that, he would be unchristianized if he failed to observe that day. If this be true, then I believe that the majority of the people, both Protestant and Catholic, would hasten to make the change. If it is a fact that the whole Christian world is wrong on this point, it is high time, I say, that we change our course. When we find that we are wrong, then I am satisfied that every Christian in this country would keep the next Sabbath day. They would observe the seventh day as the holy day. No man can be saved if he violates this law. Now what I mean when I make this statement, is this: that when man understand it as given here, as binding upon Christians, he is bound to observe it. No matter how much you have clone for the cause of God, if you have broken this one, commandment, you violate all. If it be true that it is a Mark of the Beast, as Sabbath keepers state, it is high time that you and I rectify the mistake that we nave made. This is a very important question, the most important question that was ever brought before this people. The Sabbath is binding upon us as Christians, when we once understand it.

Now, our Adventist friends believe that we are mistaken on this subject. They are aggressive, very aggressive; they are very zealous for their cause. They come to our town to spread the light as they see it. They are putting forth great effort to correct this mistake and their zeal is worthy of our imitation. But, on the other hand, if they are mistaken then we are vastly more interested in this question than they are. I know of no religious body who pretend to be Christians who would unchristianize a person for keeping the Sabbath. But, on the other hand, if we do not observe the Sabbath we are unchristianized. No man would think of unchristianizing any person for not doing work on the seventh day if he believed he ought observe that day. I do not believe that any man, if he were living a Christian life, would be unchristianized among the Protestant churches for keeping the seventh day. But, if our cause is false and theirs is right, then the whole Christian world is observing the wrong day. It does not unchristianize them to keep the Sabbath. Now you will notice (pointing to his chart) that the Sabbath is binding upon you; that it was given to man is not questioned, but you will notice further that these ten commandments as they are given on this chart were given twenty-five hundred years after the creation.

You have heard my opponent say that Adam kept the Sabbath, but the proof is what we want. The very fact that they were given twenty-five hundred years after the creation gives reason for supposing that they were not given before. Now I am going to call it a Jewish institution, simply because it was given to the Jews. Now to illustrate this further, that it is peculiar to the Jewish customs: Christian baptism was not a law under the Jewish dispensation, but it is under the Christian dispensation. In like manner a man can properly say that the Lord's supper is a Christian institution just as the Sabbath is a Jewish institution. We know that it never was observed by man until after the Christian dispensation was given, and therefore it is a Christian institution. I wish to call your attention for a moment to the chart of ten commandments. It was always wrong to violate the first commandment whether it was commanded or not. Nature showed that it was wrong that man

should make anything to worship as God. The heaven and earth declare that there is a Supreme Creator to whom we owe our allegiance and adoration. It is wrong for a man to take the Lord's name in vain for the same reason. It was just as wrong to kill a man before as after the commandment was given. It is so everywhere. That is what we call a moral commandment. The moral institutions when commanded became positive institutions. There is a commandment that was not binding before the Christian dispensation, and that commandment is baptism. And when Jesus Christ gave that commandment it became binding upon those who wished to become Christians. Baptism is a positive institution just as binding after he gave it as any of the moral commandments. Moral laws are right in themselves and positive laws are right only because they are commanded. We are just as much obliged to obey a positive commandment as a moral commandment. A positive institution must necessarily draw to a close in the dispensation in which it has been given, and so you see the commandments that are binding on Christians today simply were carried over by positive enactment. The fourth commandment was given to the Jews as a positive commandment, and therefore it is a Jewish institution and ended with that dispensation. If this law was carried to the Christian dispensation it would now be binding. This law was given to the Israelites, given to them as a memorial of their deliverance from bondage. And we find that this will apply to no other people. If it was observed before that time, we would not be able to call it a Jewish institution. In the 5th chapter, 15th verse of Deuteronomy we find the reason given why they should observe it: "And remember that thou wast 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."

The position I take is this: The Sabbath was not given as a commandment before it was given to the Israelites when they were brought out of Egypt. Ex. 16th ch. God finished the heaven and earth in six days and on the seventh he rested. Well, he is resting yet, so far as creation is concerned. He rested on the

seventh day and made it a day of rest, but he never gave it to the seed of Abraham prior to the time of which I speak, and that one fact proven to me will settle the whole question of its not being a Jewish institution, then I am ready to keep the next Sabbath. But if it be a fact that it was not given as a law before that time (Ex. 16th ch.), or that Jesus the Great Teacher, when he instituted the new dispensation, did not incorporate it, then I say it is a Jewish institution, unless that institution has been re-enacted under the new dispensation. If it has re-enacted, it is now binding upon you and me. But, on the other hand, if it has not been re-enacted into the new dispensation, it is not binding upon us. When we come to the law of Moses there are many things which were binding; then that we do not observe now.

We could not make a living if we had to observe all of those ceremonies. The people could not keep track of all of them and so the result was that they kept a tribe of priests to do it for them. The priests duty was to keep track of these things. They would tell their people, "To-day is the day that you have to put on sackcloth and ashes;" "Today you must fast," etc: To keep track of these things there were twenty four priests, or thirty, in the temple all the time. So if you and I had to obey the law of Moses it would take all of our time to keep track of it.

But that old dispensation has passed away, for Jesus Christ has made a new will and testament and he called it his last will and testament. And that is all that is obligatory in this new dispensation. The old dispensation is not binding upon us. I admit that it was binding upon the Jews, but I deny that it is binding upon us. I say it never was given to any man prior to the time that it was given to the children of Israel when they were brought out of the land of Egypt. I can see why the children of the Israelites would keep that day. It stands to them as the Fourth of July stands to us commemorative of the Declaration of Independence. We teach it to our children, we tell them it is a memorial of our independence.

For four hundred and thirty years the children of Israel were slaves in Egypt and God brought them forth with a mighty hand

and an outstretched arm. (Refers to Deu. 5:15) "I did bring you out, therefore I command you to keep that day." A man could not forget such a thing in a week. Now why did he give the seventh instead of the fifth, or the sixth? Simply because he created heaven and earth in six days and rested on the seventh, and when he came to make a choice, he chose the day on which he rested from all the work he did in creating.

## LAST HALF HOUR—KAUBLE.

I take pleasure in discussing this question as it is being discussed to-night. I hope in God it will be discussed with equal fairness the entire seven nights. It is my privilege to review some of the things stated in the last speech. It is a fact as stated by the speaker before me that if our position is correct, then the Sabbath is the day of rest, and all should know it. That is what brought me here. I did not come here to try to teach people that they were all right on all questions nor that they were wrong on all questions. The position held by Seventh Day Adventists is, that those persons who live a Christian life according to the light they have they are accepted of God. But the faith of all must be tested by the light of the truth of God. And we as Seventh Day Adventists believe that when an individual hears this question and refuses the light, he will be rejected of God, and this is equally true of any doctrine. It will make no difference how good a life he has led, how much he may have done in the cause of Christ, how much money he may have spent to spread the gospel, if he reject the light, no matter how small it be, he will be rejected.

Now the statement has been made that "it makes no difference how much we try, if we do not keep the Sabbath we cannot be saved." We might say that that principle is equally true of baptism. Now, my brother believes as we do on that question, that immersion is baptism and sprinkling is not baptism. Now we both believe that if an individual has not the light on this subject that God will not condemn him for not obeying it. But if you have seen the light and rejected it, it will make no difference how much you have done. If you have given \$1,000,000 for Christ you will be lost. No, sir, you must walk in the light.

Now as to the Mark of the Beast: We do not hold that you who keep Sunday have necessarily the Mark of the Beast. We believe that when an individual, knowingly, bows in submission to a human power in opposition to God's command respecting the Sabbath, that he receives the Mark of the Beast. My opponent says

that he does not know of a denomination that would unchristianize a man for keeping the seventh day. Well, I must say I am surprised. I did not know that there was one who would not. I am glad to hear of one who does not. He calls the Sabbath a Jewish institution—and I want to know in all of God's word where there is a hint of such a thing. I want to know if it is not God's Sabbath? Is there one text in the bible that calls the fourth commandment a commandment for the Jews only, just one text within the lids of the bible. It is a very easy thing to call it a Jewish institution, but hard to prove. Another statement, "Never was known before it was given to the Jews." I ask the proof. But it is a terrible hard thing to prove when there is no proof. I might as well say that the first man that listened to the disciples was 47 years old. Just as well, there is an much proof of it. Now I want to know in the face of God's own word where it says that all of the other nine commandments were kept by Adam, and yet who doubts that they were. If the absence of proof on one point proves no obligation it must on all others which would prove no law to Adam. Now the statement was made that it "was wrong to break the other commandment because they were moral commandments." Another statement in regard to the first commandment, "You can see from nature that it is wrong to break the first commandment for nature reveals the creator." Well, the same thing can be said of the fourth commandment, it reveals the creator also. I am not going to notice this difference between moral and positive commandments. That position does not reflect on the question under discussion. God said we should keep that day, and if he has not repealed that law it is binding to-day. Another point, "No man condemned for not keeping the Sabbath before he has the light." That is true of every other commandment, nor is one condemned for violating the law if he does not know it.

I will read just one statement that will forever settle that question. In the epistle of Paul to the Romans 4:15, also in the third chapter and 31st verse. By the law is the knowledge of sin, where no law is there is no transgression.



I was a little surprised to hear the reason that was given to night for God's having given the 7th day to the Israelites because he had brought them out of the land of bondage. Do you suppose God would tell two stories about that? Don't you believe it. Ex. 20:8 11 is true. When the Lord gave that law on Sinai did he say remember to keep holy the Sabbath, six days shall thou labor, etc., because of bondage in Egypt. No, sir, God said when he spoke that law on Sinai, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, six days shalt thou labor and do thy work but the seventh day in the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shall do no work, etc., for in six days, etc. Ex. 20:8-11. Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. The people were in bondage down in Egypt where they could not keep the Sabbath and God heard their prayer and brought them out of Egypt, and then he says, "Now that I have brought you out of slavery you remember my Sabbath and see that you keep it holy. Now God himself said they should keep the Sabbath not because they were slaves, but because he blessed that day and sanctified it. Now turn to Leviticus 19:36. Now if the first case is correct that they were obliged to keep the Sabbath holy because the Lord brought them out of the land of Egypt, it is equally true that they were commanded to give just weights and balances because he delivered them from bondage, but this my opponent would say is right always because a moral obligation. Now another statement in regard to the creation says, "God is resting yet." Certainly, it was not alone because God rested that he made the Sabbath, but it is a fact that on the 7th day he rested because he had finished the work of creation. He also wants me to "show that Adam did keep the Jewish law." suppose he meant the fourth commandment for he calls the others moral commandments, and says they are binding in all ways. I want my brother to show the re-enactment of the other nine in the New Testament If he can find it I would like to see it. He says we could not make a living if we had to observe all of those ceremonies. I want you to remember that if God, the God who created heaven and earth, said we had to keep them, we would have to keep them or be lost. And we could keep them and make a living too. I will proceed with the review.

He says the Sabbath was to the Jewish people what the Fourth of July is to us. That is that the Sabbath was commemorative of the Jews release from bondage, and yet we see that day appointed in the Garden of Eden. Now notice in Mark 2. The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. The Sabbath was made for man; made how? (see Ex. 20:8-11.) Why made holy and sanctified? Now do you suppose that God would make a day holy for man and then not give it to him for 2500 years. No, sir, and now another point; turn to Ezekiel 20:12. "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbath to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." It was to be a sign to show that he was the Lord their God, the one who sanctifies. Now does that look as though it was a memorial of the bondage in Egypt? God says I give you this day an a sign that you may know that I am the Lord thy God.

## LAST HALF HOUR: ELLIOTT.

I am placed in rather a peculiar position so quickly. I am on the negative of the question, but my opponent in his second speech has spent all of his time in following me, and what am I to do? I am on the negative but I fail to find anything to reply to. Well I will launch out for myself and find something to fill up my time. But there was one thing that pleased me—I asked for the proof that the commandment was given to any man before it was given to Moses and he says, "You prove that it was not." Now supposing I say there were railroads and electric lights in the time of the Antedeluvians and you would say "prove that," then I would say you prove there was not. It is the same thing, same thing exactly. My friend is on the affirmative to prove that the Sabbath was binding upon man prior to the time that the command was given to Moses. But he cannot prove it for the same reason that I could not prove that there were railroads in the time of the Antedeluvians. The record is silent on the question and so you see the Sabbath was not observed by man during that time. There is not a monosyllable on the question. Well here I have a chart to help my brother out. I fixed it up for him.

I have only a part of the verse for there would not be room for all. Now God finished heaven and earth and on the 7th day he rested. Genesis 2:2. Now this was done 4004 years B. C. But did he give the law before the flight from Egypt, that is the question. God gave laws to Noah and God gave laws to Abraham at various times, but during all that time I challenge the world to find a word about keeping the Sabbath day holy until 2500 years after the creation according to our chronology. My opponent says the Sabbath was kept during this time. I leave this blank No. 1 for the benefit of my brother. Now if he is able to put a verse from any chapter in the bible, or even a line, or part of a line, that goes to prove that the Sabbath was kept during those 2500 years, I will keep

the next Sabbath. We want to settle this question and if my brother will find the verse I have some red ink and some letters which I will furnish him to fill out this blank. And, now, were the commandments as given here upon my brother's ten commandment chart engraven on tables of stone? I am going to call it in question. I will not say it is not so, but I will call upon my opponent for proof that they were engraven upon tables of stone. Now I want you all to read the 5th chapter of Deut. 1, 22nd verse. Now I admit that these commandments were engraven on tables of stone and I will call upon my opponent to prove that they were ever given to man before they were given to Moses on Mount Sinai. The Israelites were commanded to keep it because they had been bondmen in Egypt and the Lord brought them out of slavery. This was a great event, one of the greatest events that ever took place. After they had been there 430 years God brought them out through wonderful works, and then he told them to remember the Sabbath and keep it holy. What for? Why did he command them to take absolute rest on that day? That they might remember that God brought them out of the land of Egypt where they were slaves and that they might teach it to their children and to their children's children. And the Jews were very tenacious on that point Go to a Jew and ask him why he keeps the Sabbath. He will tell you that his forefathers were slaves in Egypt for 430 years and God brought them dry-shod across the Red sea and they crossed the Jordan on dry land; He delivered them into the land of Canaan. There was a penalty attached to the violation of the Sabbath and that penalty was death. They were forbidden to do any work on the Sabbath. They were not allowed to even kindle a fire or pick up sticks. The man who kindleth a fire on the Sabbath would be stoned by his fellows. Now my opponent said that a law was in force until it was repealed. If

it be true and that the fourth commandment is still binding the man who violates the Sabbath should he stoned to death.

Soon after the law was given to Moses a man was brought to him who had been found picking up sticks, Num. 15:32. 36. and they said to Moses, "what shall we do with him?" And Moses said he did not know, (You see it was a new thing this Sabbath breaking.) So Moses said he did not know what to do with him, but they had better shut him up for awhile. Now do you suppose that if a man were found violating a law of South Dakota that the civil authorities would not know what to do with him? But Moses had a very good reason for not knowing what to do with the man who violated the Sabbath law, for he had never been told what to do. Then Moses went to the Lord and asked him what he should do with the man who had broken life Sabbath, and the Lord said, "Put him to death." And they stoned *him* and he died. And yet my opponent says that commandment was kept by Adam in the garden of Eden and on down to the present time and will be kept through this dispensation, and will be carried clear over into the next. And so far as they who lived prior to the Jewish dispensation keeping the Sabbath we can settle that in one moment of time. If my brother will fill out this blank it will settle that part of the question. We want to settle in the first place the point upon its not being a Jewish institution. As I said before there is no record of any man keeping the Sabbath prior to the time when the law was given to Moses. You can not find one place where it tells of a man keeping the Sabbath or breaking the Sabbath, or perverting the Sabbath. The bible is as silent as the grave on that question prior to that time. I say that it is a Jewish institution the same as the Fourth of July is an American institution. When I say a Jewish institution I do not mean that there is anything bad about that, but that it never was binding upon any but the Jews. If I were

a Jew I could see some reason for keeping the Sabbath, but I can not for my life see any reason why a Gentile should keep it. It was given to the Jews to commemorate their freedom from Egyptian bondage. And God never commanded the Gentiles to keep the 7th day. It was for the Jews and it was simply to last until Jesus came. Gal. 3:24 25. That is the reason why it could not be anything but a Jewish institution.

We could not keep the fourth commandment as it was commanded for they were not to build a fire on the Sabbath—they were not to pick up sticks. And there are times when we would freeze to death in this country if we could not build a fire. A man once said to me in speaking of that, "Well, sir," said he, "that is a puzzler. I do not believe that the Lord knew of this cold country when he made that law." But, as my brother says, if it is commanded we must keep it. When our Adventist friends break the Sabbath by building a fire we will have to take them out and stone them. But I do not think that that law was ever given for us to keep. When that law was given which says you shall not kindle a fire in your habitation, it was never intended to be kept in South Dakota. It was given in a country where the people could get along without a fire and not freeze; to death or suffer. It was given as a memorial to the Jews and was to last only until Jesus came. And when he came and established the gospel, that gospel that is so plain that a child can understand it. There is no commandment in the gospel which can not be observed in the furthestmost parts of the world, and when Jesus Christ came from the grave all authority in heaven and earth was given to him. Matt. 28:18. He had more power than any man that ever lived up on this earth; more than Moses had or any of the prophets. And in his last will and testament we do not find one word where he tells us to keep the Sabbath. Now I asked for the proof that the fourth commandment was kept by Adam. And what does my brother do? He goes to the record 2500 years after the creation.

I left a blank for him to fill, but the space is blank yet, and I think I am perfectly safe in making the assertion that it will remain

a blank throughout this discussion. If my opponent can not fill it there is no man on the face of the earth who can. If it is there he will find it. But I will tell you beforehand he cannot find it, and I presume every Seventh Day Adventist has said to himself, time and time again, "Oh, if I could only find that verse, something, just a word or two to bridge those 2500 years." And so I take the position that it is a Jewish institution given for the first time to the Jews at Sinai to commemorate their deliverance from bondage, and ceased to be binding when Jesus of Nazareth instituted the new dispensation, and therefore is not binding upon us at the present time. To morrow night we will take up a new phase of this question.

## **JULY 21, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR-- KAUBLE.**

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:* It is with a great deal of pleasure that I come before you this evening to speak in behalf of the cause of truth. Before I advance on the line I have been carrying I wish to notice the last speech of my brother's last night. I do not know whether you took it or not, but the case is this, you cannot afford to be tricked. We cannot afford to be deceived when we are dealing with the word of God, the God who made the Sabbath in the Garden of Eden. Now about this "resting on the Sabbath day." The position was taken from this chart, that because there was no mention made of the Sabbath being kept until it was kept by the Israelites, that it was not kept. Now I want you to see that this is pure sophistry. In 1882 South Dakota made a law. In 1900 an individual violated that law. Now between the time the law was made until the time it was violated there was no mention made about that law in the history of the state. Does that necessarily imply that the law was not in force during that time? Now if there is anything in that chart business the same rule will apply to the law of South Dakota.

When I heard my brother make that statement I thought in my soul, "Consistency thou art a jewel," but thou dost not shine in my brother's logic. And the points that I brought up as affirmative argument and called his attention to, he never noticed, he never even touched them with his finger. The fact, the evidence that I gave that Jesus made the Sabbath and blessed and sanctified or appointed it, he never noticed at all, he avoided the question. And then he goes on to affirm that the Sabbath was not kept before the time of Moses and then says, "I have not one single word of proof for it." A man might as well go in court with a difficult case and say that he was sure of winning, but that he has not one word of evidence for it. Consistency thou art a jewel, but it did not shine in that argument.



But God says in the second of Genesis that he sanctified that day, and sanctified means appointed or made. Made for what? Made for man that he might keep it holy, for the sacred use of man. And now let me call your attention to another thing. He cannot legitimately call upon me to prove anything outside of the question at issue. I am not going to stop at side issues. He has affirmed that the Sabbath did not exist before Ex. 16 and asked for proof that it was binding on man before it was given to Moses, and I have given Genesis 2, and Mark 2.

Another question, about that stoning affair. But did he not know that it was a civil law and that there was a civil penalty attached to Sabbath breaking now, and that to-day the civil law is changed to fining them five or ten dollars. Some states

have it two and some one dollar. Men are punished to day for breaking the Sabbath, but the punishment is fining, not stoning. And now I insist that there be text read. I want him to read text from the bible. I want him to notice text when he reviews my position. And I want to show you that Christ kept the Sabbath day instead of destroying it. And this he tells us himself in his Sermon on the Mount, which we term his inaugural address. When one enters upon his duties as an officer it is expected that he will define his policy. This Christ did where he says, "Don't you think that I have come to destroy the law of the prophets." Turn to Matthew the 5th chapter, 17th, 18th and 19th verses and you may read the 20th verse also. Now if you say that Christ abolished the law you have to say it in the face of this statement: "I have not come to destroy." It is just the opposite to destroy. It is admitted that Jesus Christ lived under the dispensation of the ten commandments. "Look here," he says, "don't you think that I have come to destroy the law for I have not, I have come to meet the requirements of it." In Matthew 3:15 you find that word "fulfill" used in the same way. Another test where this word is used, James 2:8.

If you fulfill the law you do well. But now then another point on the question of changing the law. Jesus Christ says in Mark 5 that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled, and

the Greek of this is "Till all things be fulfilled." Don't you think that I have come to destroy the law, I am come to fulfill. Not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all things be fulfilled. Well, now then if the 7th day Sabbath is removed from the ten commandments how does it agree with the word of God. The jot was the smallest Hebrew letter and the tittle was a little crook, like the little crook in the letter "r" or the little dot of the "i." I will illustrate: Take the figure 7 and remove the little crook on the top part and you are removing the tittle. And it says whosoever shall break one of these least commandments (you can call the fourth commandment the least if you want to) and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. There is a translation of this which reads, of small esteem in the kingdom of heaven, Now I want to read to you from Matthew the 15th chapter, from the second to the seventh verses. Then does Christ abolish the law? I point to the third of Romans and the 31st verse. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid. Yea we establish the law. If we did not know the law we could not sin by breaking it as the Apostle Paul says to the Romans. Romans 3:20-21. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." In the 7th chapter of Romans, 7th verse, he says on this law question: "What shall we say then? 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 shalt not covet."

Without the law I had not known sin. Does he tell them to abolish the law? Read Romans 2:17-20. He says he is not a true Jew unless he has the circumcision of the heart. But further let us consult James 2:10 on the question of the law. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point he is guilty of all." And let me add that he who said, thou shalt not commit adultery, said also, remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

## **JULY 21, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.**

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am pleased to stand before you this evening to notice some points that were made last evening. There is some thing about this chart No. 1 that has a wonderful effect, a most wonderful effect. My opponent tried to explain it. but it remains just the name. He tried to fill the blank by alluding to the law of South Dakota and by saying that God made the Sabbath after resting on the seventh day, but it remains just the same with all his sophistry. And his not being able to fill that blank is proof positive that it was a Jewish institution. That little chart had the wonderful effect of driving him from the old testament to the new. But there are some points I want to notice before I leave the old testament. I am not through with the old testament yet. Last evening I referred to the fact that the Sabbath was given to the Israelites because they were bondmen in Egypt. Upon this question my opponent has not said a word. They were slaves in Egypt, therefore the Lord commanded them to keep the Sabbath holy for a memorial of their deliverance. We find in this what the object of keeping the Sabbath was. They had been slaves for 400 years in Egypt where they worshiped idols, and He brought them out with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and he commanded them to keep the Sabbath day. I can see a gem, a little boy asking his mother why we keep the Sabbath day. His mother takes him by the hand and she says: "My son, for 400 years our forefathers were slaves in Egypt. They were bondmen and their oppression and suffering was so great that parents would cast their children out to die rather than have them live in such bondage." Then she tells him about that great man, Moses; how he appeared before the king, Pharaoh, and finally of God's promises to Moses; how they marched down to the

Red sea, and through the Red sea between great waves and how Pharaoh came after them with six hundred chariots to destroy them, and how they marched on with the sea in front of them and Pharaoh's army in the rear, and how the Israelites crossed over dry shod and the Egyptians were over come by the sea. And as she tells that little boy how God rained down manna from heaven to feed them and brought them to the land that they now possess. I can see that little boy's chin quiver and the tears drop from his eyes, and he says: "Mother, that is a wonderful record." Then the mother takes the parchment and reads about the Sabbath day and how God wished them to keep it as a memorial of that event. Now I see why the Israelites were so tenacious to keep that day, but I cannot see why a Gentile should celebrate it when they were the ones who enslaved the Jews. And do you suppose that Almighty God would want us Gentiles to celebrate an event to our everlasting shame?

The Savior of mankind never made such a law for the Gentiles. We might just as well try to bind the Fourth of July on the English people as to bind the Sabbath on the Gentiles. On the first day of January, 1863, a proclamation went forth freeing four million slaves. They had been held as slaves for years, and because on that day the chains were stricken from their limbs, every year the first day of January is remembered with joy and thanksgiving by the negroes. But suppose this government should pass a law and that became a national holiday and everyone had to keep that day, then all the people of the South would have to commemorate that day to their shame and disgrace. This nation will never pass such a law. Supposing that it should come to pass that England and the United States should become one, can you not see that we could not then celebrate the Fourth of July? You could not ask an English citizen to celebrate the Fourth of July with as much propriety as you could a Gentile to keep the Sabbath. And so we can see why in the gospel of Jesus Christ not a word was said about keeping the Sabbath, and

neither did God say to the Jews. "You shall not keep that day." And why? Why, because they had been keeping the day for hundreds of years, and when a thing has been done for a good many years it becomes second nature. And so he did not say you shall not keep the Sabbath day, but gives them something better. I spoke to you last night about the penalty attached to the violation of the Sabbath not being abolished. And my opponent tells you that South Dakota has taken it up, and that the penalty is changed from stoning a man to death to fining him \$4.00. In Exodus 35:2-3 we read, Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day it shall be to you a holy day, as a Sabbath of rest to the Lord. "Whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death; ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation upon the Sabbath day." Here we see a positive law, he says, a civil law. If Dakota has a right to legislate on this question, I see no need of this discussion. The Sabbath was given to the Jews; and God said if you do any work on that day you shall die for it. He should be stoned to death for it. And I should like to see where the penalty has ever been repealed. We heard last night that a law was binding until repealed, and now before we go any further we want to know whether we are under obligations to stone a man to death if he builds a fire on the Sabbath. I do not like getting out of the old testament so soon. I want to investigate a little further and see if the Sabbath law was binding on the Gentiles.

I asked for a verse to fill this out, chart No. 1, and he gave me Mark 2:27. Where the Jews charge Jesus with being a Sabbath breaker. He cured a man on the Sabbath day and they called him a Sabbath breaker, and he answered them by saying that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, that man is above the Sabbath. Now does that prove that the Sabbath was kept for 2500 years before the Israelites were commanded at Sinai to keep it? The Sabbath was made for man and the scriptures are so plain on the subject that a child could understand it. Now we find that word "Sabbath" scores and scores of times in the old testament after the law was given to Moses. How is it that we do not find it once in the record of those 2500 years before that time. The law

was given to the Jews to commemorate their freedom from bondage in Egypt, and there was a death penalty attached to it. Another thing I would like my opponent to answer is, were the commandments, as written here (on this chart) ever written on tablets of stone? He would tell you that it is a copy of the ones written on stone on Mount Sinai. I would like the proof. If he has the proof we would like to have this matter cleared up. We would then be better prepared to go into the new testament Now in regard to the fulfilling of the law as given in the new testament. Jesus said: "I come not to destroy the law but to fulfill." Now I did not take the position that to fulfill the law meant to destroy it, at all. I took the position that when a law is fulfilled it is no longer in force, not destroyed. If I have a contract with you to do a certain amount of work for me for a certain sum and you do that work, and I pay you for that, that contract is fulfilled, but it is not destroyed. It remains on file and you can go to the record ten years afterwards and find the contract there. It is fulfilled, it is no longer in force, but it is not destroyed. You can never destroy it because you would have to destroy a part of the records of Lake county. When you pay off a mortgage you go to the county seat and pay it. Is it torn out and destroyed? No, they simply write canceled on the margin and it remains on record. Jesus said: "I come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it" and he fulfilled it. Luke 24:44.

God sent his son to fulfill the law—law which was to last until Jesus came. Gal. 3:21-25. And when he was hanging on the cross he said: "It is finished." It was fulfilled. Col. 2:14. It is fulfilled and therefore is not binding under the new dispensation. He fulfilled the old law that he might establish the new. That is what Jesus did, he fulfilled the old law. And he died upon the cross for us and left us his new will and testament. And all that is necessary for us to do to-day we will find in the last will and testament of Jesus Christ. He has sent out his ministers extraordinary plenipotentiary to spread his gospel, and to remit sin and retain sin. John 20:23. Now I will read to you Hebrews 10:9-10. "Then said he, lo, I come to do thy will, O God." He taketh away the first covenant that he may establish the second covenant. By the which will or covenant we

are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

## **JULY 21, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Now if brother Elliott has his letters here I can fill out his chart. I was somewhat diverted in listening to the first part of the speech this evening. I was sorry when I found that my brother had nothing to reply to last night, but I was not quite so sorry to-night when he spent almost all of the entire half hour in replying to my last night's speech. I will briefly review the points gone over. Speaking of the Jews and Gentiles: "They are one in Christ." Yes, but how did they become so? Did the Jews become Gentiles? No, but the Gentiles were engrafted into the Jewish stock. Remember the true Jew kept the law, had the circumcision of the heart by the spirit. Now I will read the statement in Romans 11:17-18: "And if some of the branches be broken off and thou being a wild olive tree (that is a Gentile) wert grafted in among them and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches," etc. Now we will turn to Mark 2:27: "And he said unto them, the Sabbath was made for man and man not for the Sabbath." The Greek rendering is, "The Sabbath was made for the man." If the Jews were the only people that are men, then they are the only people who were meant. I believe there are descendants of Adam here tonight. And the Sabbath was made for the man, definitely, the man Adam, the head or progenitor of the human family. I was called upon to prove that the ten commandments as given here were engraven on tables of stone. I have not the time to spend on this statement unless my brother defines his position then I will take a stand and not before, "The law was fulfilled." Then he goes on to show you that when it was fulfilled it ceased to be an obligation. Well, now, let us see. When Jesus was on earth he kept the commandments. Then he did not kill and that commandment ceased to be in force. He did not commit adultery and that commandment ceased to be in force. He did not steal and that commandment ceased to be in force, and then when Jesus kept the Sabbath you could write fulfilled and that ceased to be binding. Is this a fact? It is not. I will admit that there are some kinds of



contracts that cease to be an obligation when they are fulfilled. But let me tell you that there is some difference between this law and a written contract agreeing to pay a certain sum of money, say, \$100 for a certain piece of work to be performed by him. This law of ten commandments is just as much of an obligation today as when it was given. There are laws that are limited to a certain time. Take for instance the passover. The Apostle Paul says in I Corinthians 5:7: Purge out, therefore, the old leaven that ye may be a new lump as ye are unleavened, for even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." He says Christ is our passover. The old passover was but a shadow of what was to come and ceased to be an obligation when Christ died on the cross. But it is an eternal fact that Christ created in six days and blessed the seventh day and commanded us to remember it and keep it holy. And when it is kept you are under some obligation to remember to keep the next Sabbath and keep the whole in memory of Christ. But "they were abolished and are not binding." Of course this one, and this one (pointing to all the commandments but the fourth), and these have been reenacted, according to my brother. We will examine that later.

The covenant was referred to. Says the old covenant was taken away when the new dispensation took effect. Now the old testament refers scores of times (I do not know as I am correct in making that statement), but it refers to God making a covenant at different times, but not a word is said of abolishing any part of the ten commandments or old testament scriptures. Now that is not what God said through Paul. He said he would make a new covenant with his people and would write his commandments on the hearts of his people. Let's turn to the Hebrew letter and see what the Apostle Paul says. Hebrews 8:10, also the 8th and 9th. Does he say he will abolish the law? No, sir. "Behold the day cometh when I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and the house of Judea, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant and I regarded them not, saith the Lord, 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 minds and write them in their hearts and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people." And now did the early Christians keep the Sabbath? What does Luke say about the faithful women? and let me tell you the women were faithful through it all. Even when the strongest one of his apostles left him, Luke says in the 23d chapter 55th verse, "And the women also which came with him from Galilee followed after and beheld the sepulcher and how his body was laid, and they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath according to the commandments." This in after the body of Christ is taken down and laid in the sepulcher. The women brought spices and prepared them and then rested on the Sabbath according to the word of God. That is what the women did. And now what did the apostles keep? We turn to the Acts of the Apostles 13:43-45. Here we have Paul at Antioch preaching on the Sabbath, and when the Jews had left the synagogue the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. Here they had a religious meeting on the Sabbath and Paul preached to a mixed congregation, and after the Jews had gone out of the synagogue the Gentiles besought him to preach those words to them again on the next Sabbath. If they had been keeping the first day of the week they would have said come back tomorrow. Now we must infer that the Gentiles had some authority in the synagogue or they would not have asked the apostle to preach there. And it says Paul and Barnabas, speaking, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God. And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God, Now let's reason on this point: When I came to this town about two weeks ago, a man came to me and said, "Why didn't you come up and use the church?" I wondered who he was; I did not know him. I thought, Why does he ask that question? And so we talked on, and after awhile he said, "You can use the church just as well as not." And then I thought he must have some authority in the church. I found afterwards that he had. It was brother Elliott, here. Now. who asked the Apostle to preach in the synagogue? Was it the Jews? No, it was the Gentiles,

and they must have had authority or they would not have asked them there.

Now, we have another instance of the apostle keeping the Sabbath in the Acts 10:13: "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made, and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." And in the 17th chapter of Acts, 2d verse: "And Paul as his manner was went in unto them and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures." And in the 18th chapter and 4th verse: "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Now you can see that it was Paul's custom to speak on the Sabbath. But now then, another statement: I will admit that there is no command in the new testament for the apostles to go right on and keep the Sabbath, but on the other hand there is nothing said to show that they should not keep it, and it is agreed that a law is in force until it is repealed. But now another text. Acts, 22:12: "And one Ananias, a devout man, according to the law having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there." Now this Ananias was a disciple and he had a good reputation among the Jews. If he had not kept the Sabbath he would not have had a good reputation among the Jews. Now we know he was a Christian by reading the 9th chapter of Acts and the 10th verse. That individual was called a disciple, and in Matthew. 24:20, where he foretells the destruction of Jerusalem, our Lord says: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter or on the Sabbath day." Not in winter because it was the cold season of the year and they would have to go in haste, would have no time to go back to their homes for extra clothing to keep them warm and in health. In that inclement weather they would suffer from cold. They were to have a certain sign before this happened and they were to flee to the mountains, and they were to pray that their flight would not have to be made in the winter or on the Sabbath. The position may be taken that this latter was because the gates of the city would be closed on the Sabbath, and the Jews would not open them. No, sir, that was not the reason. That is not the way it reads. It says: "Then let them which be in Judea fly into the mountains." Judea was not

enclosed by gates. So that was not the reason, But God commanded us to keep the Sabbath and until he repeals that law it is binding. God does not conflict with himself.

## LAST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.

I am thankful that we are in the new testament. Now you will notice that not only is the seventh day the Sabbath, but it is binding on Christian people. It is the most essential thing of all. It is binding on every man, woman and child; hence the reason that it is the one all important question. But now for the proof of this. We have left the old testament and taken up the new. My opponent refers you to Luke where the women rested on the Sabbath day, and wants you to believe that that is proof positive that the Sabbath was binding under the dispensation of Jesus Christ. I would like to know if my opponent would have you believe that the dispensation of Jesus Christ commenced while he was in the grave; that the gospel of Jesus Christ was preached by the apostles while Jesus was in the grave; that it was preached before the resurrection of the Son of God; before the holy spirit descended upon the apostles at Pentecost; and before all authority was given to them. Luke 24:49. If this be true then there was no need of Jesus. Remember now I say that the new dispensation had not yet commenced and that those women were simply doing as they were used to do. And Jesus kept that Sabbath. He kept it in the grave.

Now he says that Paul preached at Antioch on the Sabbath. But that does not prove that he kept the Sabbath, for he was not preaching to a Christian assembly, but to a mixed assembly of Jews and Gentiles. We find him preaching first in one place and then in another; we find him at all times and under all circumstances preaching the word of God; preaching to all people, whether Christian or heathen, so that his preaching there on the Sabbath proves nothing. The Jews kept the Sabbath day and they are keeping it now just as they did then. It is not strange that Paul should preach to those Jewish people who met together on that day. He preached to them and baptized believers, whether by the river side, in the synagogue or in the market place. Acts 17:17. Wherever he found a collection of people he preached to them. He would preach any day. He must necessarily go where they assembled together. Now he tries to prove that the Gentiles had

authority in the synagogue from the fact that I had authority in the church here. That is no proof at all, for I have no authority whatever. I told him he might use the church simply because I heard the trustees say he might. I had no authority in the matter. If the Gentiles invited him (Paul) to preach in the synagogue they must have had the consent of the Jews. Did you ever hear of Gentiles having a synagogue? Now is it not very strange that during the whole of Christ's ministry he never commanded any one to keep the Sabbath day? He upbraided them for violating the law of Moses in many things, but he never said a word about the Sabbath. He was getting the people ready for a great change.

Some of the Jews said to Jesus, "Jesus, you are a Sabbath breaker." because he was healing the sick, etc., on the Sabbath day. They would like to say of Jesus. "You are not a good man." They said of his miracles, that he worked them through Beelzebub, and they charged him with being a Sabbath breaker, and they condemned him and put him to death. Jesus sent the apostles out to preach. Matt. 16:19; Matt. 28:18 -20); gave them all authority, and in no case, did the apostles ever command a man to keep the Sabbath day.

I have been asked to find the nine commandments in the new testament. I will bring the nine commandments upon a chart and you can judge for yourselves if they are binding upon us. But if the other one, the fourth commandment, were binding on Christians do you suppose that Jesus would come to preach and never tell the apostles one word in regard to the Sabbath? The apostles were given all power in heaven and earth. Matt. 16:19, John 20:21, and they were sent out by Christ to preach the gospel, and if my brother had been there he would have said, "Keep the Sabbath day holy for the whole thing hinges on that." And now as to the destruction of Jerusalem prophesied in Matthew 24. I suppose this is my opponent's strong point. But let us see. He says "that it could not be on account of closing the gates for all Judea was to fly into the mountains." But all those who have read history know that there had been a war for four years in Judea and that her cities had been

destroyed and many of the people had been killed and made prisoners and then the people by the thousands and tens of thousands got within the walls of Jerusalem. There were within the walls from a million to two millions of people.

When Jesus, looking down through the years, foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem, he saw how the Jews would be within the walls of the city: he saw great tribulation such as was not seen since the beginning of the world nor ever shall be again. Mark 13:19-20. And he said: "When you see the signs which I have given you fly into the mountains, but pray that your flight be not in the winter or on the Sabbath. Matt. 24:29. And my opponent tells us that the reason why they should pray that it should not be in winter was because they would perish from cold and exposure. But the reason why they should not fly on the Sabbath was because Jesus did not want them to violate the Sabbath. Now the suffering from starvation in the city was so great that women slew their infants and ate them. And the Roman army under (the use of history was prohibited by Mr. Kauble. Here the speaker refers to history and was stopped by Mr. Kauble's moderator. ) All right, I'll take that back, but as Gallileo said, "It's true just the same." Now would my opponent rather have them suffer all they suffered there than break the Sabbath? Do you believe that there are people to day who would suffer so rather than break the Sabbath? Do you believe for one moment that if the savages of the reservation were to come down on this little village tonight. (it is the Sabbath already for them) do you suppose if a messenger should rush through our town tonight crying as he went, "Fly for your lives, the Indians are coming! Fly! fly! fly for your lives!" Do you suppose our Adventist friends would stay sitting in their seats and be scalped rather than violate the Sabbath? I do not believe they would. I think they would run as fast as they could and I shouldn't wonder if my brother here would run as fast or perhaps faster than I could. Now I do not believe that the Saviour who died on the cross for us would expect such a thing of us. If I was driven to such straits to carry my point that I would have to distort the word of the

Son of God I would put my hand upon my mouth and put my face in the dust and cry, unclean, unclean.

As my opponent said the gates of Jerusalem were closed on that day and no one could get out or in. Neh., 13:17-22: "The gates were closed and the abomination of desolation (Mark. 13:14) was about the city." (I have to say abomination; if I said Roman army, it would be history). The reason that they were told to pray that their flight be not on the Sabbath day was because the gates of the city would be closed on that day, and they could not escape. Now I want to call your attention to Romans, 14:5. "He says one man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," Does he say, let every man keep the Sabbath? No, he says, let every man be persuaded in his own mind. And here is another one, Colossians, 2:26: "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days. You will notice that that word, days, is supplied, not being in the original. Now instead of preaching the Sabbath, he says: "Let no man judge you." And in the 17th verse, he says: "Which are a shadow of the things to come, but the body is Christ." That the Sabbath was a shadow or type pointing forward us well as back, is clearly set forth in Heb., 4: 1-11. The Sabbath was a type of the rest that the Jews were to enter (6th verse), and also a type of the rest that remains for the people of God (9th verse) that Christ has already entered.



## LAST HALF HOUR—KAUBLE.

I am very grateful this evening for another opportunity of standing before you in defense of what I regard as gospel truth. I suppose you were all more or less interested in the little boy that cried because his forefathers were brought out of Egyptian bondage and the parallel case of the Fourth of July. What would you think of a little boy that would cry when his father was telling him how his countrymen bled in defense of liberty? I heard a little boy say last night, "Hurrah for the Fourth of July!" And I thought that was what any boy would say when he was told of the struggle for liberty.

The question was left for me to answer, "Had the Christian dispensation begun when the record of the women keeping the Sabbath was made in Luke." If it had not begun then, when did it begin? Of course if it had it is fatal to the position taken by my brother. That the Seventh day Sabbath is not limiting under the Christian dispensation? The Christian dispensation began when the new covenant began. It had begun when those faithful women observed the Sabbath according to the commandments. When an individual makes a will it is expected that he will die, and the will will not be in force until he does die.

You may turn to Hebrews 9:16-17: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." The new covenant of Christ marked the new dispensation. All who are at least a little familiar with law know that a will comes into effect after the death of the testator. Then we must also conclude from that that Jesus made the new covenant before he died. And after Jesus died it could not have been made; he ratified that covenant; he sealed it when he died. But let us read something on this point in Galatians 3:15: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men. Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannuleth or addeth thereto." Now I want to ask when it was that this covenant

was so made, so sealed with the blood of Christ. In Matthew 26:28 we find, "For this is my blood of the new testament which if shed for many for the remission of sin. When Jesus the Savior offered the emblem of his blood and body and they accepted it, it was a contract that they would accept the sacrifice that he was about to make. This was before Luke 23:55-56. They had already accepted the promises he had given. The statement was made last night that Paul's preaching to Jews and Gentiles on the Sabbath at Antioch did not prove that he kept the Sabbath. It was just a "happen so." But now I want you to remember that that was not the only time he preached on the Sabbath. We have a record of his preaching 85 times on the Sabbath, and that could not be a "happen so," if you please. If it had been once we might say that it just happened so, that it was an accident.

Last night I referred you to Acts 13:43-44, where Jesus preached to the Jews, also to the Gentiles; and the Gentiles invited him to preach to them on the next Sabbath, and he did and nearly the whole city came together to hear the word of God. And I said the Gentiles must have had authority or they would never have asked Paul to preach there, and gave us an example my coming here to preach and brother Elliott offering me the church to preach in. And my opponent says that is no proof what ever, as he has no authority in the church. But I want you to understand that there is a little difference in the two cases. The Gentiles did not have the standing with the Jews that my brother has with his people. It's very probable that if he had offered me the church without having heard the committee say I might that they would have been satisfied. They would have said: "Well now, if brother Elliott said so it's all right; he knows, and it's all right." But that is no parallel at all. The Jews and Gentiles were not very friendly; the Gentiles did not like the Jews and the Jews hated the Gentiles. Another statement was made, that if I had been in Peter's place I would have said all things hinge on the Sabbath; on keeping the seventh day Sabbath. I would have done no such thing, but I would have said everything, even keeping Sabbath, hinges on faith in Jesus Christ. And I tell you the Sabbath was never kept without the sanctification that comes

through faith in Jesus Christ. No, sir, a man never kept it without. He may have kept Saturday, a man can rest on the seventh day and that is all that there will be to it. And I say, no man ever did or ever will keep the Sabbath without faith in Jesus Christ.

There was a statement made that was a perversion of what I said. I used Matthew 24:30 to show that Jesus did not want them to make their flight on the Sabbath, and he perverted it to mean before you that I had made the statement that Jesus would let his people starve or eat their children rather than break the Sabbath. Now I said no such thing, but I do believe that he would have them do neither. There is evidence that Jesus did not want them to go on the Sabbath from the fact that he told them to pray that their flight be not on that day. He told them to fly to the mountains when they saw the sign, and not to go back for extra clothing, and he spoke to the people of Judea, not to those in Jerusalem only. And if they prayed in faith they would not have to take their flight on the Sabbath, for if they would ask in faith they would receive. I take it from the word of God that it is so, that their flight was not on the Sabbath. He used Romans 14:5. Let us read that and see what it says against the Sabbath: "One man esteemeth one day above another, (and if my brother is sincere on the question he will discuss Monday night he will prove to you that he esteems one day above another, ) another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be persuaded in his own mind." Paul said, be persuaded in your own mind, and that is what I say. And I would not take any one into the church that was not persuaded in his own mind as to the Sabbath. Then Col. 2:16 was read, and I want to read it again. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in, respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." And the 17th verse says: "Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ," That was read against the seventh day Sabbath. But until he can show how the Sabbath was used as a shadow be fails to give any proof in Col. 2:16. And now I want this intelligent audience to read it correctly, as they will have to answer at the judgment day. And now as to the penalty attached to the Sabbath commandments. That was not the only commandment that had a

death penalty attached. They killed people for committing adultery by stoning. They killed people by stoning for violating the 5th commandment, as you can see by referring to Duet. 21. Last night I gave my brother the text that filled his chart and I'd like to see it here to-night.

And now I'd like to have my brother's chart show where the death penalty was taken from these commandments. Jesus came to magnify the law, and magnify means to show in a larger way. Law came that sin might appear more sinful. In Matthew 5:21-22 Jesus says: "Ye have heard," etc. There you see that you do not necessarily need to kill to violate the 6th commandment, but to have it in the heart. And in 1John 3:15 and in Matthew 5:28 we have something to prove the same for the 7th commandment. Thus we see that Jesus magnified the law; made it broader; made sin more apparent. And now I want to show you that these ten commandments are a copy of the ten commandments that are in heaven. I am going to prove that these are the commandments that God ordered to be put under the mercy-seat, that was a pattern of the heavenly, and that these commandments are under the mercy seat in the sanctuary of heaven where Jesus is to-day. Now I want you to read Hebrews 8:5 and I want you to read them well. "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle, for see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." And now let's read a little more on the subject; read the 3d and 4th verses in the 9th chapter. These things were made after the pattern. The Lord said: "You make everything according to the pattern." God gave the ten commandments to Moses and he told him to put them under the mercy-seat, Deut 10:5, and Moses lifted the mercy seat and put them under there. And that was after the pattern of the heavenly. And now before the mercy seat in the heavenly sanctuary Jesus, our Savior, to-day is pleading for humanity at the throne of God. And until my brother can say that the commandments were taken away from the mercy seat in heaven he never can sustain the position that they are abolished.

## **JULY 22, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am pleased for the opportunity standing before you again this evening in this discussion, and as there are a number here this evening who were not here last evening, I want to state the proposition:

Question 1, Do the scriptures teach that the Seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, is the Sabbath and is now binding upon Christians?

Binding upon all Christians, simply means that it is necessary to salvation. I am placed in the same position this evening that I was the first evening. My opponent took up all his time in rebutting my last speech. There is one point I would like to mention, however, and that is in referring to the Christian dispensation. My opponent says it began just as soon as Jesus was in the grave. This, I say, he is compelled to do, for when a man has a system, a hobby to ride, that hobby sometimes puts him in a peculiar position. In order to have the women resting on the Sabbath, he has the Christian dispensation begin while Jesus is still in the grave. He has it begin without any Holy Spirit (John, 7:30), without any apostle qualified to preach a word under heaven (John, 16:13-14), and he does that just to ride that Sabbath hobby, if that statement be true that the Christian dispensation began when Jesus was still in the grave, there was no use of Jesus' resurrection. He says also, that a man's will goes into effect as soon as that man is dead. If he were a lawyer he would not make that statement. A will does not go into effect until it has been in probate and proved.

And there have been men dead and in their graves for years before their wills were probated, and therefore could not go into effect Jesus ratified his will with his own blood, and after he arose from the dead and had appeared to his apostles, and had ascended into heaven when God crowned him Lord of Lords and King of Kings, his will was probated (Heb. 9:12-14) in heaven by the Father, and the Holy Spirit brought the intelligence on the day of Pentecost, as given in Acts 2:36. Then the Holy Spirit for the first

time in the history of the world descended upon the earth to stay. John 14:15-17. It does not seem much of a wonder to me that a man is mixed upon the question when he tries to make everything fit his hobby. I have contended all the while that the law of Moses went out of effect as soon as the new dispensation began. When I say the law of Moses I mean the whole of it. And then what did Jesus do? Through the inspired apostles he makes a new testament and in this new will he has incorporated everything he saw fit to put there. And that will is binding upon Christians to-day.

I told you the other evening that nine of the commandments were moral laws, that is, they are right or wrong in themselves, and one only is a positive commandment; that is, it is right only as long as God says it is right. If it is not incorporated into the new testament it is not binding upon us. I will produce the nine commandments as they were given in the new testament:

### ***Chart No. 2.***

I. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve—Matt., 4:10.

II. We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. —Acts, 17:29.

III. But I say unto you, swear not at all—Matt, 5:34.

IV..... Blank No. 2

V. Honour thy father and thy mother. Matt, 19:19.

VI. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

VII. Thou shalt not kill.

VIII. Thou shalt not steal.

IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness.

X. Thou shalt not covet. Rom., 13:9.

I have left a blank for my brother to put in the fourth commandment if he can find it in the new testament I could not

find it (Pointing to chart No. 2. ) The first we find where Jesus was being tempted by Satan. When Satan says I will give you all the kingdoms of the earth if you will bow down and worship me, and Jesus answers with his first commandment, "I \* \* Thou shall," etc. Which one is stronger, this one or the commandment as given in the old testament? Now in the next we find Paul down at Athens where he found the whole city given over to idolatry. He began to preach in the market place, and when he was preaching Christ crucified, he says to them. (2) "We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold," etc. He says we ought not to even think such a thing. The next one we find in Christ's sermon on the mount. (3. ) "But I say unto you, swear not at all." And then he goes on to say neither by heaven for it is God's throne, nor by the earth for it is his footstool, neither by Jerusalem for it is the city of the great king. Could you find language stronger? The fourth is a vacancy, a blank for my brother to fill out, and if he can find a place in the new testament where Jesus or the apostles said to keep the Sabbath day holy, then I am willing to pledge myself before this congregation that I will keep the next Sabbath. (5. ) "Honor thy father and thy mother."

(6. ) "Thou shalt not commit adultery. (I wish to say here that when Jesus or the apostles, referred to the commandments they never noticed the order. ) (7. ) "Thou shall not kill." (8. ) "Thou shalt not steal." (9) "Thou shall not bear false witness." (10. ) "Thou shall not covet."

And nowhere do we find a word about keeping the Sabbath. Oh, if that was only there! "Remember to keep the Sabbath day!" then I could say this much for the people of Ramona, they would keep the nest Sabbath.

Then after giving the commandments as I have them here, Paul says in Romans, 13:9: "And if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'" We are discussing this to find what the truth teaches, and I want you to read and see if the apostles have not incorporated the nine commandments into the new testament, and

if my opponent can find the verse to fill this blank I will keep the next Sabbath, for it will prove to me that it is the right day to keep; but if he cannot put it there I refuse to keep it because I have no authority to do so. Now I have this thing right to a point; right where I want it. My opponent need not speak another time if he can find one place where Jesus told the apostles to keep the Sabbath, or where the apostles told anyone to keep it or censured them for breaking it. And now if I was on the other side, and my opponent asked me to find a verse to prove this and I could not find it, I would stand up here and say, Ladies and gentlemen, I can not find it because it is not there. Now it seems to me that I am giving my opponent every chance. To use a common expression, we have it "cornered" now. The whole thing could be settled in a moment if he could find that verse. If he fails with all of his skill, with the help of all his brethren that have searched that book for years and years, we will have to conclude, that we common people cannot find it either. If it is in the new testament my brother will find it. He is just as well qualified to find it as any man I know. You will notice he says it is the question of the age. He is here to set us right. I want to be right. If he is right we ought to thank him. We will listen gladly to him, but we will not believe until he finds it given by Jesus Christ or the apostles. So we must say that this is a vital question. It is a vital question and it hinges upon that commandment as he has it here which was kept under the Mosaic law. But I want to call your attention to another fact: Look at the people who take the position that my friend does; look, if you please, at all of the Jews (for of course the Jews believe that the Sabbath is binding). You will find that they number thirty or forty thousand people besides the Jews. I am giving that number from memory; I have not the statistics. Look on the other hand on the people who think the Sabbath is not binding. You may count them by millions and by the tens of millions. Count the Catholics by the millions and the Protestants by the millions, all testifying to the same thing, that the Sabbath is not binding under the new testament. Both Protestants and Catholics say it is not binding to-day. Statesmen, scholars, Christian commentators all stand upon



the side of the question that I believe in to-day. Millions have gone to their graves believing it. And if it be true that my brother is right, millions of people are on the wrong track, providing that the Sabbath is the all essential thing. I say, "essential" because if it be a fact that it is binding to-day and God wills that of you and me, it behooves us to change our course. Now if it is true, my opponent will have the verse all ready to read to us the next time he speaks.

## LAST HALF HOUR—KAUBLE.

I want to say this much for my opponent, if he had any evidence on his side of the question he would be a power. But I want to notice a mistake he made, and I don't think he knew it. He said that life and immortality came through the resurrection to life, but the scriptures say life and immortality brought to light through the gospel.

Well, he said that I left him nothing to answer upon. I asked him to notice Col. 2:16 17, and he has not touched it with his fingers, I have asked him at least three times to answer before this intelligent audience the statement, "that Jesus was the author of the Sabbath." I have asked him to show where in the new testament the ten commandments were abolished and the nine re-enacted. I want to show you that these on his chart are not reenacted but simply repeated and recognized from old testament, (pointing to Mr. Elliott's chart). When I read from Matthew 5:17-19, that Jesus came not to destroy one jot or tittle of the law; he said that was true, but that Jesus was living under the old dispensation and not the new, hence the statement of no force or point, but he uses same scriptures to prove re-enactment of nine commandments. I asked him to show me the re-enactment of the nine commandments. And I want to tell you here to-night that if it can be found he is the man who can do it.

You will remember, my dear friends, that I read to you Matthew 5, to show that Jesus did not intend to abolish the old law. And nowhere does he say he did abolish it. No, sir, he does not say it. if he did, it would not be in force to day. Jesus was under the old dispensation. But he agrees with me that a law is binding until it is repealed, and I affirm that the fourth commandment is still binding, and I have invited him to read the text in rebuttal and he is as silent as the grave on the subject. Well, now I want to ask my brother to prove the statement he made referring to Pentecost. I know the audience would like the text, and I would like to have him give it for my benefit.

Now he says, that all nine are binding because reenacted. I want to try his logic on that point.

When were they abolished and when were they reenacted? Let's see. We will use this mark—I—to represent the time when they were abolished, and this mark—I— to represent the time when they were reenacted. Now from this time to this (pointing from one mark to the other) they had no law, there were no sinners, no transgressions for there was no law; no need of Christ. Or take it another way, this mark—I—will represent the time when the law was abolished, and this same mark will represent the time when it was reenacted; that is, there was not a moment of time when they ceased to exist, they just went right on. What did they want to abolish them for and then re-enact them again. Why, just to get rid of the fourth commandment. Why doesn't he take a manly position and say that the Sabbath was the only one that was abolished? A man goes to a physician with a wounded linger that needs amputation, and the physician takes off the ten and sticks the nine back on, all in order to get rid of the affected one. There is as much logic in that as in abolishing the ten commandments to get rid of the fourth.

I have no conscientious scruples about replying right along until he meets the question I presented before. Now then to continue the review: He gave Romans 13: let's see what there is in it. (reads). If you will read you will see that it is the civil government he is talking about. "Who resists the power of God resists the ordinance of God and therefore shall receive damnation." A Christian must obey the law of the state even when he knows it is an unfair law unless it conflicts with the law of God and even then he must not resist them. He need not obey them but he must not resist them and must submit to the punishment that may be attached. Now then the admission is made (and that admission is fatal to the position held by my brother) that all denominations agree upon the nine commandments but the difference comes in on the fourth. I want to read the third angel's message in Rev. 14:8 10, (reads) which shows that the test is to be brought on law of God and his

admission that the distinction between denominations is on 4th commandment is admitting position we have taken for 40 years as to the importance of the Sabbath. And he speaks of "majorities, majorities;" they prove nothing. We both believe in immersion, but the majority are against us. I'll admit that the majority is on the wrong side of this Sabbath question. Matt. 7:13 14, and always have been. He talks of the wisest men, of their being on his side, but don't you know, my friends, that the wisdom of the world is foolishness? I Cor. 1. Talking of majorities does not prove a thing on the subject. Does not Jesus say: "Fear not little flock." It is the little flock that has the promise in harmony with the word of God. And now I want to call my brother's attention to another text: Isaiah 42:21, he made the law honorable and did not abolish it. Now read in Isaiah 58:13. He says he will cause them to ride in high places that honor his holy day the Sabbath.

Position was taken that the old covenant was made with the Jewish people, and I want to call your attention to the fact that the new covenant was made with the same people that the old covenant was made with. Hebrews 8:6. What is established upon better promises? The covenant. The people promised they would keep the law of God. That was the promise upon which the old covenant was based. And what are the promises in the new? That I will abolish my law? No, sir. "I will put my law in their minds; I will write it on their hearts, I will be to them a God and they will be to me a people." You say we "believe that no individual can be saved if he does not keep the Sabbath." We believe that when an individual lives up to the light he has he is accepted of God. The same of Sabbath as of baptism, when we reject the light, then we are rejected. Another point: Romans 8:3 4. The mission of Christ was that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us. Fulfilled—a Greek word meaning "performed perfectly." Now I'll read; "That the righteousness of the law might be perfectly performed in us. "

## LAST HALF HOUR—ELLIOTT.

Well, now, I am lost again. I do not know whether my opponent is discussing baptism, law or congress. It's hard for me to keep up. It reminds me of a little story. One time in a certain town in Ohio there was a lawyer who was noted for winning cases that had little or no evidence, and the boys of the town thought they would play a little joke on him; so they took down a sign from over a turner's shop across the street and put it over his office door. When the lawyer came to his office the next morning he saw the sign over his door. It read: "All manner of twisting and turning done here." Now I think that my opponent ought to have a sign like that one over his tent. But then he does just as well as any live man could do under the circumstances. I could not do any better myself. He is the best man to talk against time that I ever saw. It's strange, though, that he did not fill out that chart. If my opponent will find the fourth commandment I will keep it. That is, if he will get it as good as I got the other nine. Is it not strange that during the three and one-half years that Jesus was with his disciples, as much as he talked with them, that he never once said a thing to them about the Sabbath? Singular indeed that during the three and one-half years that he preached to them he never told a man to keep the Sabbath, and that during all the years that the apostles preached they never said that a Christian should keep the Sabbath? Well I have something more; I have more commandments; I got them out of the new testament:

### *Chart No. 3.*

I. And Jesus answered him, the first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment.

II. And the second is, namely, this, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. —Mark, 12:29-31.

III. But above all things, my brethren, swear not at all. James, 5:12.

IV..... I... Blank No. 3.....

V. Do not commit adultery.

VI. Do not kill.

VII. Do not steal.

VIII. Do not bear false witness.

IX. Honour thy father and thy mother. Luke 18:20.

X. Take heed and beware of covetousness. Luke 12:45.

It reads over and over again about these nine commandments, in the new testament, but it is as silent as the grave about the Sabbath. The first of these commandments is (pointing to chart No. 3) found in Mark. 12:29-30. Where one of the scribes came to him and asked him, "Which in the first commandment." etc. The second is, namely, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Neither of these were given on tables of stone. (Quotes the other commandments on chart No. 3. ) And not one word about the Sabbath, and I want to assure you, my friends, that I would have put it there if it had been there. All of these nine we find in the new testament and where, oh, where is the fourth? And echo answers, where.

We might discuss this question for a year and it would be the same thing baptism or congress for he cannot find one word to prove this from the time when Jesus began to preach till he ascended into heaven. My friends, I know that this is just torture for my opponent. I would call it torture if I were in his place. Why, it is worse than the thumbscrew and the stocks. I would not be in his position for any thing.

I have another chart at home, or another set of commandments, and the Sabbath is not in that either. Do you think that it is an accident that from the beginning of Matthew to the close of Revelations that the new testament is silent on the Sabbath question? It is simply because Jesus and the apostles did not wish

you to perpetuate the freedom from bondage of the Israelites. He wants me to go to Romans, 14, and to Col., 2. The apostle says, "Don't you let a man judge you." and we are not going to either, unless they show us that they are right. And when he does that we will put our necks down to receive the yoke. Even if it is galling we will wear it if it is necessary; but we do not think it is, from what we find in Col. 2:16, and in Romans. 14:5. Now as to numbers: Majorities have been wrong on some subjects and majorities have been right on some subjects. Now in the great civil strife a few years ago majorities were right. Majorities can be right and they also can be wrong. The number cuts no figure at all. But the fact remains just the same that the fourth commandment is not in the new testament. If it was my brother would put it in the blank and complete the ten commandments. But it isn't there. Do you suppose it was an oversight on the part of Christ? Do you think Christ made a mistake, or forgot it? Do you think that the apostles, when they went preaching under the influence of the Holy Spirit forgot it? For some reason it is not there. I showed you the other evening from the chart that the fourth commandment was given to the Jews to perpetuate their deliverance from bondage. And Jesus Christ looking down through the years saw that it would be almost impossible to keep it out of the Christian church and so he said nothing against it. What does Paul say in Acts 15th when the Judaizers said to the Christians, "You have got to keep the law of Moses." The Christians wanted this thing settled. It was discussed and settled forever. The apostles said they need not keep the law of Moses. They said we never gave them any such commandment. (verse 24. ) The Judaizers are doing the same thing now. They are trying to say "You lack something: if you do not keep the fourth commandment you cannot be saved." I am thankful that the same arguments that meet us to-day met the Christians then. Everything that can come up against the gospel came up during the fifty years that the apostles preached. Every argument that could be made to draw men from the truth came up in that age. The same arguments that were brought up in 1843 when the world was coming to an end have been up many times. With them everything hinges on the

Sabbath. It's Sabbath in the morning, Sabbath at noon and Sabbath at night; Sabbath from one year's end to the other; nothing but Sabbath! Sabbath!! Sabbath!!!' I have attended every meeting held in this town except one, and my brother has been preaching nothing but Sabbath. Not because he couldn't preach anything else, but he leaves the rest to others. They come to us to preach something new, and if we meet them on the judgment day we must not reject the light. But keeping the Sabbath will not save him. They are saved by faith in Christ and if they hear nothing but Sabbath they will not know what to do to be saved. And what right have they to bind the yoke of Moses on the people? They have the right to keep it if they wish to, but they have not the right to bind it upon others. As I said before, we came and listened to them here, and we enjoyed it but it was Judaism just the same. I think it will be a good while before my opponent convinces us that the Sabbath is binding, unless he brings something from the new testament. It can not be bound upon Christian people.

And now I want my opponent to find a verse in the new testament to fill that blank in my chart, and if he cannot find it there, it is not there, and if it is not there, it is not in the new dispensation given by Christ and the apostles.



## **JULY 23, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is not necessary for me to say to you that I am glad of the privilege of standing before you this evening. This thing has not "tortured me" as badly as you may have thought it did. I have a few thoughts I would like to present this evening and they are God's truth. I shall read to you from Matt. 28:19-20. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And I believe that when Jesus said that, he was speaking the words of his Father, Jno. 14:24, speaking of his Father's law. I might dwell longer on this phase of the question, but here is a point that just hits the nail on the head. That is, if a man is a minister of Christ that he will teach that which Christ commanded him to teach, and if a man does not do that he is not fulfilling the law of Jesus. He never commanded us to break the Sabbath. He commanded us to believe that he did not come to destroy the law, and when he commanded this he taught a lesson that you and I might learn to-night.

He says in Matthew 5:17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." The position was taken the other night that the word "fulfilled" meant just the same here as it does in the fulfilling of a contract. Well, let us see. Take, for instance, the commandment which says, "You shall not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" is that the same as if you had agreed to pay a man for a certain piece of property? Then after a man had kept that commandment for a certain number of years it would be fulfilled and no longer in force? This is a different thing, if you please. "Fulfill" means here to "perform perfectly," and that is what Jesus came to do. To do all things that were written in the laws of the prophets. The prophets said that he would die on the cross, and he did. They said he would live in poverty and sorrow, and he did that and then he did something more. He said: "I have kept my father's

commandments." He did not make them as an old contract that could be settled. What would we think of an individual who would keep the commandments for twenty years and then would set them aside as last year's almanac, but Jesus says, "here, don't you think that I am going to destroy the law. I did not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, ' etc. The very strongest language he could use, "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law. till all be fulfilled. Now I want to know if that its the truth; if Jesus told the truth how can you take out the fourth commandment and be in harmony with Jesus? What would they have to think if they did not believe that he came to destroy the law? Why, they would have to think that he would let it alone.

Now there is a commandment that says that you are not to think that Christ came to destroy the law. And what were they commanded to tell other people to think? Matt. 28:19-20. It is to the disciples he is talking, to the followers of Jesus. See Matt. 5:14-16. "Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all that are in the house." Jesus tells them to preach all things that he has commanded, and he commanded them not to believe in the abolition of the law. Jesus did not teach dead faith, but living faith. And what kind of faith is living faith? A faith that will do that which is commanded. What kind of faith is a living in the commandment which says, "Thou shall not kill?" That is the kind of faith there is taught in the fourth commandment, a part of that law of which he says that not one jot or tittle shall pass away. I want my opponent to reply to this. I want him to tell this audience what Jesus has commanded us to teach, if he did not command us to teach people the perpetuity of the law of God.

The first position I took in discussing this question was that Christ is the creator of heaven and earth. John 1:3, and Col. 1:16 were the texts I used. Who was it who rested? He who created. And who was it that blessed and sanctified the Sabbath? He who created and rested. Who did the creating? I asked my brother to

answer this and he has not even hinted at it. In Hebrews 1 God calls Jesus, God, and in Psalms 3:4 we find: "He hath made his wonderful work to be remembered; the Lord is gracious and full of compassion." In Mark 2:27: "And he said unto them, the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. "

He made his work to be remembered, Christ did this, and he says he gave the Sabbath to man. In six days he made heaven and earth, and the seventh day he gave to man that he might remember that the Lord created the world. And in Ex. 20:10 he says: "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," etc. And in Eze. 20:12: "Moreover also I gave them," etc. When he gave the Sabbath there was no need of a Savior. He created and took delight in what he had created and so he gave the Sabbath to men that they might remember that he is their Lord, their God, and in addition to this, their sanctification also. In Hebrews 13:12 we find: "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify," etc. There is no question about that, we all believe that Jesus sanctified us with his blood. And further in Gal. 3:8. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would," etc. Now then the promise was made to Abraham on condition of his keeping God's law. And we find further confirmation of this in Gen. 26:4-5.. That is all I need to read on the subject to-night. Now then go a little farther in the investigation. Ex. 6:5-7 he says that he remembers his covenant and will save them on condition that they should obey (as Abraham) his voice. Hence remembered his law which was basis of Abrahamic covenant and makes it the condition of the covenant made at Sinai. See Ex. 19:5. Ex. 20. What did the Savior say in Matt. 5:17-19 and Paul in Romans 3:31? Paul speaks of the law. What law does he refer to? As you will see he refers to the ten commandments. The law he says is not a law. The fourth commandment is a part of that law and God commanded us to fear that law. The apostle says of that law, "Do we then make void the law through faith?" God forbid. Yea we establish the law. Jesus did not want us to think that he came to destroy the law.

## **JULY 23, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR —ELLIOTT.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I am thankful to see so many here tonight to listen to the closing remarks upon this question. Now for fear you do not know what the question is which is being discussed (from the former speech I could not have told if I had not known). I will tell you: It is, "Do the scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, is the Sabbath and is now binding upon Christians?" That is, a man must keep it to be saved.

I told you last night in my closing remarks that Jesus came here to preach, and during the three years that he preached he never said a word about keeping the 4th commandment. (See Jesus' comments when they called him a Sabbath breaker. Matt., 12:1-15. ) During those three years he never told an individual to keep the 7th day of the week. When I had the nine commandments on the chart and left a blank for my brother to put in the 4th and make it complete, he did not do it. I want to call your attention to the fact that God never told a Christian to keep the seventh day of the week. That law was given to the Jews, and the Jews had observed it for 1500 years. The gospel had to be preached to all these people, but the old law had become almost like second nature, and so Jesus was very careful to avoid this subject until he was ready to give them the gospel. He inaugurated a great scheme whereby the Gentiles could be grafted in and be saved. And after the apostles began preaching the gospel, there were some who said you must keep the law of Moses or you cannot be saved. Acts, 15:24. They made it a test of fellowship, those Judaizers. So Paul says to them in Romans, 14:5. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. "

Now what does that mean? You can keep it if you want to, Mr. Judaizers, but you must not bind it upon another man. Every man must be fully persuaded in his own mind. If that was the only text on the question you could see that no man shall bind the seventh

day upon you whether you want to keep it or not. We are willing to give to all the same privilege, and so the people who observe the first day of the week do not unchristianize them for keeping the seventh day of the week. It is the same about what one eats. If a man eats herbs he must not unchristianize a man who eats meat. He must not make it a test of fellowship. If a man wants to eat pork he can. Upon the other hand if a man eats pork he must not unchristianize a man for eating herbs. A man can eat what he sees fit. I Tim., 4:3-4. In the keeping of the Sabbath as well as in the eating of meat and vegetables, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. Every man has the right to judge for himself on these questions in the Christian dispensation. My opponent esteems one day above another, and no person would try to debar him from that right. We people who keep the first day of the week say it is a great day, the day on which our Savior arose from the dead, and therefore esteemeth it above all other days. But our Adventist friends call Sunday-keeping a "Mark of the Beast," and say we can't be saved unless we keep the Sabbath. I never would have entered into this discussion if it had not been for that. They say you cannot be saved unless you keep the Sabbath. That is the objection I have to this doctrine. They try to force the seventh day upon us. They make it a test of fellowship. That is why I took up this discussion. Let every man settle the question for himself. You can eat snakes if you want to; many people do in Africa; I know a man in Wisconsin who ate all the snakes he could find. It is not what goes into the mouth, but the words that come out of the mouth that defileth a man. Matt. 15:11.

The Jews complained of the disciples because they did not wash their hands before they ate. We do not propose to let anyone bind this upon us. A man must be fully persuaded in his own mind. A man can keep the Sabbath if he wants to but he should not make it a test of fellowship. I object to their unchristianizing people by the whole sale, by the hundreds and by the thousands and by the millions, simply because they make it a test of fellowship. Why, they will not take a man into their church unless he signs an agreement to keep the seventh day.

We believe a man can be saved if he does not keep the seventh day of the week if he is a Christian. But now is the Sabbath binding upon us? Is it taught in the gospel, as set forth by Christ and the apostles?

It has not been proved by my opponent for he has been jumping forward and backward, and though I have paid the strictest attention, to save my life I could not keep track of him. He went over a space of three or four thousand years at a single bound. Recollect I am on the negative of this question.

My opponent says you must keep the Sabbath; are you going from this place tonight and say, I am going to keep the seventh day of the week? In Col. 2:10 Paul says. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." But my opponent will make it mean anything on earth but what it says, and then he says it is a shadow and does not mean the Sabbath. And Paul says, it is the Sabbath. Or in respect of a holy day will cover all the feasts without regard to the seventh day of the week. Holy days came on certain days of the month, came on the Sabbath or the first day of the week or any other day. Paul says of the holy days or of the new moon or of the Sabbath. Now do you think that means the yearly Sabbath? That is what he will tell you.

Before I go any further I want to introduce a chart. I shall hang it up and let my opponent see it before he begins his last speech. I put it up now, so I can refer to it when I make my last speech.

#### ***Chart No. 4.***

I. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. —Matt. 4:10.

II. We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. —Acts, 17:29.

III. But I say unto you, swear not at all. —Mat., 5:34.

IV. A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. Jno., 13:34.

V. Honour thy father and thy mother. —Mat., 19:19.

VI. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

VII. Thou shalt not kill. VIII. Thou shalt not steal.

IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness.

X. Thou shalt not covet. Rom., 13:9.

I left a blank for the 4th commandment before, but he failed to till it, so I did it for him—I, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." John, 13:34, Those were the words of Jesus just before he died for the sins of the world. I have taken that commandment that has sustained men and women for 1800 years, and put that in place of the 4th commandment. Here I have the ten complete as given by Jesus and his apostles. I got them from the new testament. Which will you have? Would you rather have the new commandment that we should love one another, or the one that said keep the Sabbath? Jesus never said keep the Sabbath, but he did say love one another, I have the third chart with the nine. Which would you rather have? Which is the best? That you should love one another its Christ loved us or that you keep the Sabbath as did the Jews?

## LAST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.

That may sound pretty well, but who told him to put it there? That man would make a bible if he had a chance. I have known people to divide the commandments to make ten. but he without any authority has put that there, How does that compare with what Jesus said? "I come, not to destroy the law but to fulfill it, and not one jot or tittle shall pass away. "

I prefer to take what Jesus says. Jesus says don't you think any such thing. More talk about filling out charts. I filled out one for him and he has not brought it since, the other charts look lonesome without it. He talked about the Judaizers. I'll read you Gall. upon that, Paul said: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." Read Gall., 3:10-14 and see what it says. I think it would be nice to have a text on the face of an argument. It's very easy to assert a thing without the text. He laid great stress on the fact of my coming here and raising a commotion in this once peaceful town. etc. I think my brother would raise as much of a commotion on the subject of baptism if he were in a community that believed in sprinkling. What would he think if any one talked about his binding immersion upon the people? I refer to this only to show that there is no force in his argument. He would do the same thing for baptism. His texts on the chart would be very nice if he did not break sentences in two. It is not fair to put them before the people as proof and break sentences in two. Turn to Col. 2:16. Now he has here on chart, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." That is all right as far as he has gone, but let me read the rest of the sentence, in the 17th verse:" Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ." That is the sentence, and he cut it in two. He read enough to serve his purpose.

It is not right to divide the word of truth. Now in Romans 14:2, 3, 5: "For one believeth," etc. Now you can see that the fourth verse has reference to the second, for everybody eats that lives:



only dead men do not eat. So of course you can see that it refers to certain kinds of food, and not the ordinary food or eating. And now the 5th verse: "One man esteemeth one day above another, another man esteemeth every day alike." That is so right here in this town. My opponent esteems Sunday above other days, that is what he says. And I have no doubt that there are some men here in this town who do not esteem any day. Calls the ten commandments a yoke of bondage. He admits that nine of the commandments are binding, so he must still carry nine tenths of the yoke as he has thrown away only one-tenth.

Another question: If the ten commandments were ever abolished I want him to give the text for it. I ask him for the text that shows when they were reenacted. I want to ask again when the Christian dispensation began. Now he says that people who keep the seventh day can go right into another church which believes in 1st day. If this church will do that, it is the only such church I ever heard of in this world. I find that they unchristianize those who keep the seventh day as much as we do those who do not keep the Sabbath. They make that as much a test of fellowship as we do. We take the position that it is the truth of God, and like baptism or any other truths of God is binding on man. Talks of liberty. Show me anyone that believes or teaches more of the common God given rights than the Seventh day Adventists. We believe in the right of every man to choose for himself. I am opposed to the law that compels any man to keep a day if he did not want to do it. But now another thing: We do not "make pork a test of fellowship." And now let us try my brother's logic on that. Taking this some text that he has quoted, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink" etc. According to his position he would take any one in his church no matter what he ate, and no matter what he drank. He has given his cause away, he will have to take persons in who drink whisky and beer. And then in reference to the Sabbath days as given in the same text, it is not the Sabbath, the seventh day Sabbath, but "the Sabbath days that were a shadow of things to come. "

Now I would like my opponent to show in what respect the Sabbath is a shadow. He says we make the seventh day the test of fellowship. If he speaks from absolute knowledge he does not give facts and if he speaks from guess, he is not a good guesser. We do no such thing. The Sabbath is not the only test. We want a man that has faith in Christ, a man that is converted to God. When a man is converted, so far as we can judge, of course we cannot judge of the heart, we accept him knowing that a converted man will keep the law of God. He says I have skipped along from Gen. to Rev. I have read texts to prove my argument, and I wish he had. Now then that new commandment; I want to read something about that. Look in I John 2:8. (reads) What is that new commandment? Not a new one, but an old commandment, and that commandment is brought to view here. The same was from the beginning. It is new for an individual when he comes out from the darkness of sin into the liberty of Christ. It has been a new commandment as long as men have been converted, and as long as men have been converted they have loved each other. Now then if I had the privilege I would like to follow the subject a little farther. I want you to notice what Jesus said in Matt. 5, then what Paul says about that law in Romans 3:19-20, and as far as the 30th verse. He says the righteousness of God that comes by faith of Jesus Christ is witnessed by the law. In Romans 8, 7 he says: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Paul says in Gall. 2:20: "I am crucified through Christ," etc. Now Seventh day Adventists do not claim righteousness comes by the law, but that if a man has faith in Jesus Christ and knows the law he will keep it. We do not believe a man could be saved unless he did this. Do not let any statement turn you from the truth. I preach sanctification by faith in Jesus Christ. I heard it stated in this town that I preached nothing but sanctification by faith. Romans, 1:16 "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it in the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." No, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ and I have used texts to prove every one of my

arguments, and yet he tells you that I do not preach faith but only the Sabbath.

And now on the last question, you remember the commandment that was read, that is "Love one another." etc. And he said that it was love that was to rule the world, and I had to say amen to that It is love that will win the world, love to God first and then to our fellow men. And John says in I John 5:3: "For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments. And his commandments are not grievous, and he says, "Love God with all your soul," etc. On these two hang all the other commandments. An individual once asked me "Do you think that if I should keep these two commandments that I would be saved?" And I said: "Certainly, for if you love God with all your heart you will do anything God requires of you." It will only be a question of what God requires of you and when you see that the Sabbath is commanded you will keep it. I sincerely believe, that there are persons who have not received the light who are as acceptable to God as I am, but if they reject the light, they are rejected of God.

## LAST HALF HOUR — ELLIOT.

Now I have not much time to spend on the review, but I wish to call your attention to one thing, and that is a funny thing. But first I want to tell you that we are on the Sabbath question yet. I read to you from Romans, 14:3: "For one man believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not," etc.

And my opponent says that he must be a dead man if he don't eat. One man believes he can eat meat: another believes he must not eat meat, so he must be dead. This is a fair sample of his twisting the scriptures. My opponent seems to go by the hop, skip and jump system from the way he jumped from Genesis to Revelations. He finds fault with what I have on the chart. He says I did not give the whole verse. I appeal to this audience if I did not read the context. He says that what I quoted just means that if a man didn't eat anything, he was dead, or would be after awhile. My opponent can do just as well as any other live man under the circumstances. I have no doubt he is the ablest man they have in the northwest. But he can do no better, for he is in a straight jacket. The proposition is, that the Sabbath is binding upon Christians. Where is the proof? You remember I had a chart showing you that God rested on the seventh day of the week and 2500 years afterward the Israelites were commanded to keep it, and I left a blank for my opponent to fill and I told him to find a place in the scripture where man had been commanded to keep it, or where he had kept it, or where he had been condemned to death for breaking it in the first 2500 years. After a while he gave me a text to fill it with and what do you suppose it was?

He gave a hop, skip and jump of 1500 years and got away over in Mark. Used a text in Mark to show that the Sabbath was kept during the first 2500 years.

He says. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. You can fill your space with that." I say that it was not kept. There is not a word about it in the bible. It was given to the

Jews as a memorial of their deliverance from bondage; and they were to teach it to their children and their children's children. And the Jews teach it to their children now. And the Seventh Day Adventists try to bind it upon us. When the proper time had come Jesus came and he began to preach the gospel. He took twelve men and taught them in everything that they were afterwards to teach to all men. And I would like to know why he never said a word about the Sabbath if we were to keep it holy. But there is not a word said during the three, and one-half years that Jesus preached, or during the space of about fifty years that the apostles preached. Not a place where the apostles said to a Christian, you ought to keep the Sabbath, or you must keep the Sabbath, or you have broken the Sabbath, or you have polluted the Sabbath. There is not one solitary word about it. My opponent says, if the Sabbath is not binding neither are the nine commandments; that you can kill and steal if you want to. But us you see from the chart, I have the nine given by Jesus or the apostles, and I can produce five more charts with the nine, in principle, as they were given by Jesus and the apostles. I left a blank for him to fill with the fourth commandment if he could find it given by Jesus or the apostles where any man was commanded to keep the seventh day of the week, and it is just as blank as ever. Now do you believe that the Sabbath is binding upon Christians to-day?

But Judaizers got so thick down there that it became necessary to speak on the subject, so Paul said (Col., 2:16), "Let no man bind the Sabbath upon you." That word Sabbath is a sweet morsel to the Adventists and they roll it under their tongues. But once out of the sixty times it is mentioned, it does not mean the Sabbath at all (Col. 2:16); fifty-nine times it means the seventh day Sabbath, the Sabbath of the Lord, but where it says, Don't you let any man bind it upon you," it does not mean the Sabbath. Now doesn't that seem strange? And that is just simply the result of hobby riding. Fifty-nine times it can mean the Sabbath, but the sixtieth time it does not mean the Sabbath, but a shadow. Now we have the great question confronting us. I suppose there are hundreds of Christians here to-night, and some who are not, who would like to be settled on that

question. And we would like to know if the Sabbath is binding upon us. I have taken the affirmative of the question and my opponent has been following me. but why has he not put upon the chart the text where the apostles or Jesus ever said, "Keep, the Sabbath day holy." I want him to tell me where is the proof that it is binding upon Christians. I have produced the nine, yes, I have produced the ten, and he wants to know where I got the authority to put the fourth there, I never put it there through his authority. He does not like that because the Sabbath ought to be there. He has preached it scores of times and of course it does not fit there. I want to appeal to you, my friends. Is the Sabbath binding upon us? Is it possible that our salvation depends on keeping the Sabbath when Jesus and the apostles are silent on that great question? Jesus never said that man must keep the Sabbath, And the apostle says, "Let no man bind it upon you." With all the evidence before you, will you believe that it is binding? I think not. I am willing to submit it to the audience, and I think you will agree that the proposition has failed for want of proof. The question for you to settle is whether or not the Sabbath is binding on you and me. Which commandment will you take, the one Jesus gave or the one he is silent upon? You are to judge with all the evidence before you whether or not the proposition has been proved to you in this discussion.

In conclusion. I would say that we thank you for your attendance and kind attention. I am not going to keep the law of Moses for it is not binding upon us as it was upon the Jews. Rom. 6:14-15, Gal. 3:23-25, 4:26, 5:18. You have heard one of the questions and I would like you to hear the other. Sunday is the day that is observed by the greater part of the Christian world. After you have heard both sides of the question you will be better qualified to judge which is right.

**SECOND QUESTION.**  
**JULY 24, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR —**  
**ELLIOTT.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have met here to discuss the second proposition in the discussion, which reads as follows:

"Does the new testament teach that the that day of the week commonly called Sunday was observed by Christians under the direction of the apostles as a day of worship, and should be so observed in the same manner at the present time. "

This is a part of the discussion that I have been looking forward to with great pleasure because I believe the Christian people have a wonderful interest in this part of the discussion. Christian people for the last 1800 years have been assembling on the first day of the week in all countries for the purpose of worshiping God, and throughout all Christian countries it is universal. They come together for the purpose of worshiping God on the first day of the week. You think there must be some reason for it. If there is no scriptural reason for it the Christian world has been doing something without any authority for it whatever. It has been handed down during 1800 years. If we have nothing more than the tradition of roan, then you can truly say that we are wrong. It is a pleasure to open up this discussion. I propose to take it right through beginning with the things that led up to it and bringing it down through the history of Christianity as taught in the last will and testament of Jesus of Nazareth. You can change a man's politics easier than you can change his religion. Man will go to the stake; man will suffer himself to go to prison or be tortured before he will change his religion. It has always been so and is so to-day. It is a fact that there are no people on the face of the earth so hard to change as the Jews. They are the most stubborn that the world has ever seen. They are so much so that the great majority of the people (the Jews) are infidels, so far as Jesus of Nazareth is concerned.

Some man now and then might have read those prophesies and looked for the wonderful change that was coming through Christ. God in his plan to make a change in the religion gave us several types and shadows pointing to the great change that was to come. I wish to call your attention to this. After the Jewish people were brought out of Egypt God made laws for them which were types. They were to take the first fruits of the harvest to the priests as a wave offering, and the priest was to wave the sheaf before the Lord, as an offering to God. This was to be done on the day after the Sabbath. It was done on the first day of the week, Lev., 23:11). It was an offering of the first fruits of the harvest. It was made a day of rejoicing because the harvest was ripe, ready to cut. I speak of this simply because I shall have use for it further on. We find that God in his wisdom when the time came sent his Son for the purpose of completing that plan that he had had from all eternity or at least from the time that man fell. In the fullness of time meant something. When God sent his Son into the world, Gal., 4:4. there was peace throughout the world at that time. Luke 2:1. and now the time was up, the time was here, the only time when his Son might come into the world. The time that God prophesied, the time that had been in his mind for all ages. Jesus was born as other children are and when he was thirty years old he entered upon his ministry. But before he does that he goes down to the Jordan where John the Baptist is preaching and he asks to be baptized by John. John says: "I am not worthy," but Jesus answers: "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." as we ought to ratify every institution (living oracles). We are told by the historian that the heavens were opened as he came out of the water. This means something, my friends. We might think there was nothing remarkable in that, but when we remember that the heavens had been closed for about 400 years, not a revelation during that time. But when Jesus Christ ratified this institution of baptism the heavens were opened and God presented his well beloved Son to the world. He did not leave it to the prophets or angels, but he spoke with his own voice, and said: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." The Holy Spirit is sent to him and enters



into him. Given to him without measure. John. 3:34. This man was qualified to teach, qualified as no other man to be a great teacher. The Holy Spirit came and entered into him in the presence of all of the people who stood on the banks of the Jordan.

There never was a man so qualified as was Jesus of Nazareth. He was qualified because he was the son of the living God; because he was sent into the world to redeem the world. Jesus was brought up among common people and always lived among the common people and yet he spoke in the synagogue and in the temple. Is it any wonder that in a short time he had a great multitude following him? The people said "He speaks as one having authority; never man spoke like that man before." No man appeared before in the history of the world, no prophet spoke with the authority that Jesus did. He did not say, I will look up that question and the next time I will answer you, as great men ever since have had to do. They have to say, I cannot answer that question now, I will have to look it up. But Jesus answered every question without referring to authority. And so the people came to him to learn and in a short time he had well under way the work for which he was sent to the world.

In time the whole civilized world was talking of the wonderful works he had done. He was preparing for a grand change, such a change as the world had never seen before. He was teaching the people and getting them ready for a wonderful change. And he chose twelve men and taught them to preach the same thing. (The kingdom of God is at hand.) And he sent seventy men to preach "The kingdom of heaven approaches." Thus the twelve men and the seventy are preaching that a wonderful change is about to take place. It was necessary that the people should be instructed upon this and be ready for the change that was to come.

Then Jesus goes to Jerusalem to preach, and he works wonderful miracles there. There was never a change or reformation but what there was opposition to it. But you would naturally suppose that when the Son of God preached that there would be no opposition. But such was not the case. It is not clear evidence that a man is

right or wrong because he has opposition. Opposition met Jesus in the form of the highest authority of the Jewish people. The Scribes and Pharisees were the ones who opposed him. I wish to examine why they opposed him. They said if this man keeps on doing these wonderful works all the people will follow him. They said: "From the very nature of things, by the authority with which he speaks he will bring about a wonderful change." And so they sent secretly some of their sharpest lawyers to interview him because he was the greatest teacher they ever saw, and the temple services were dear to them and they did not want them changed.

When a people have been settled for a long time in a religion it is hard to change them. They had no wish for the change and so they said to themselves, if this man is left alone he will bring about a change in our religion. And they thought it would be disastrous to the Jewish people. And while they were trying to entrap him he was teaching the disciples the things that were to take place after he was crucified.

It is said that the disciples did not understand all that he would tell them, but would ask for the meaning of many things. And he would explain it to them. But we will see later that with all the instruction that he gave them they were not qualified to preach the new religion before they received the Holy Spirit. And when the Holy Spirit came to them he brought to their minds all that Jesus had taught them during the three years he was with them. John 14:26. The descent of the Holy Spirit was necessary to complete the great plan of salvation. Acts, 1:4. The new religion was to be a different religion because it was to be for the world. The Jewish religion was a religion for the Jews only and for a short time. Only until Christ came, Gal., 3:25, He was to make a religion broad enough to embrace the whole world. All conquests up to this time had been made by the sword, but here was one to be made by love. And so the apostles could not understand what he meant when he spoke of his kingdom. They thought he was speaking of a political kingdom, and they thought they were to be the chief men of his government.

## **JULY 24, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR—KAUBLE.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I take pleasure in coming before you on this subject. The question has been read before this audience once; I will read it again: "Does the new testament teach," etc. I shall insist in this debate that the affirmative confine himself to the question, and what the question says shall take as proof; that is, the new testament. And I shall insist that he read the text. This thing of talking for thirty minutes is a waste of time. It could all be settled in five minutes if he would read text; it would be settled so far as you are concerned and so far as I am concerned. The fact that the first day of the week was observed for 1900 years is no evidence that it ought to be observed now. If the age of a thing is any evidence that it ought to be practiced, the wickedest things have good foundation. You can trace sin to the Garden of Eden. I am willing to admit that Sunday has been kept; there is no question about that. The question that he affirms does not embrace that thought. The question is, was it observed by the apostles. I deny that it was observed by the apostles or by anyone under the direction of the apostles. I deny that it was observed by divine authority. I admit that it was kept, but I deny that it was kept under the direction of the apostles. I deny that the new testament teaches it, or that it is binding to-day, and I call for the text that would show such a thing. I am satisfied that this intelligent audience wants scripture text. You can judge if you have had it in the last speech.

The mission of Christ has been referred to, and the angel says to the mother of Christ that he is to be the savior of mankind. He came to save us. Another thought: After Jesus had commenced preaching, there were some who said. "He will destroy the law," and Jesus said in answer to this, "I do not come to destroy the law of the prophets." etc. He did not destroy the law; I admit that they accused him of it, but he did not destroy the law of God, but he fulfilled it. Now then another point. John, 14:24; "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not

mine, but the Father's which sent me." Jesus said I speak the words of my father.

Does the new testament teach that the first day of the week was observed by the early Christians under the direction of the apostles? Not a thing has been shown on the subject. I shall lead out on this subject; I shall examine the texts that say anything of the first day of the week. If the new testament teaches that the first day of the week is to be observed, it must speak of it as the first day of the week or how would the apostles know which day was meant. Now there are only eight texts in the new testament which mention the first day of the week. The first is in Matt., 28:1, where it says, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." That is all that Matthew says on the subject. In Mark. 10, there are two places where the first day of the week is mentioned. The first is in the second verse and the next in the ninth. But what do these texts teach? Why, they teach that the first day of the week follows the Sabbath. There are three of the eight, and the next is in Luke, 23 and 24. These chapters should not have been divided. Now the fact is, this Jesus was placed in the sepulcher on the preparation day and the Sabbath day drew on. and the women that came with him from Galilee brought spices and ointments and prepared them, and the next day they kept the Sabbath according to the commandment. And on the first day of the week they came to do the thing which they would not do on the Sabbath. Now that is all that Luke says about it. I'll turn to John, 20:1, and then in the 19th verse: Does that say that the first day of the week was given for worship? Well, that is about six of the texts, so there are two left that mention the first day of the week. Don't you think we will have to find it pretty soon? The next text is the one where I presume the strong point will be made for the affirmative. That is in Acts, 20:7. Is there any direction there for keeping the first day? The fact that they met together on that day and that Paul preached to them is no evidence. And do you know that my opponent will not take the stand for the very reason that he said the other night, that Paul's preaching on the Sabbath did not

prove that they observed it. It is a "happen so," if you please. It is no evidence whatever, for in Acts, 20, they meet every day of the week. In the 20th of Acts is the only place in the new testament that tells of their having met on the first day of the week. I know whereby I affirm, it is the only record, one single instance in the new testament scripture where a religious meeting was held on the first day of the week. The affirmative may tell you that there were other meetings, but the text is not in the new testament. Now, where was the apostle preaching? The fact is, the apostle was on a journey; he was going up to Jerusalem, and he stopped off here on the way, and he held meetings for about a week, as clearly shown in Acts, 20. The others went around a neck of land there, a distance of forty-two miles. Paul stays here to preach all night and then he cut across and met this boat that had gone around the night before. That is an assertion. Well: now I will read it, Acts, 20:13 14. It was Saturday night that Paul began to preach, according to our chronology. At that time the evening and the morning constituted the day. And when they came together on the first day of the week the day was not counted by them as we count it now. We begin to count at midnight; they began at sundown. He preached till midnight when Sunday begun according to our reckoning; then he healed Eutychus, and then broke bread, and after preaching to them till daybreak he walked nineteen miles across the country to where his companions were waiting for him at Assos. It was on Saturday night, according to our reckoning, and the beginning of Sunday according to theirs. I want to stop right here and ask what was that breaking of bread? Was it the Lord's Supper, or just an ordinary meal? The statement given in Acts 20 does not prove that it was the Lord's Supper. The expression was frequently used when speaking of an ordinary meal; it does not say there which it was. I want the text which shows that breaking bread was the Lord's Supper. I presume that if any one on earth can do it he can. Now the only remaining text that mentions the first day of the week is in 1 Cor., 16:2. If my opponent knows of another text he will read it inside of five minutes from the time he begins his next speech. Now what is the statement in Corinthians 16? Suppose you are my

congregation and I tell you, "Lay by you in store as God has prospered you, would you understand that to be a public collection? You would know that I meant to lay by at home. I have these words translated into eleven languages. I shall put them on a chart or on the board to show you that there is not one of them has the translation in English as we have. It means to lay by at home in store. Lay by him in store as God has prospered him. Does that sound as if it meant a public collection? Now I want to tell you that if there is another text that mentions the first day of the week in the scripture it will be read, and read in the next speech. If there is a text that mentions that then you will get it. I want you to wait until you get the text before you come to a conclusion. When he reads the text then I will give up this discussion at once. When he can read a text to prove that the apostles ever gave direction for keeping the first day of the week: when he reads that from the new testament I shall get right up in public and tell you that this discussion is ended. It will close five minutes after he reads that text.

## LAST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.

I am very thankful to my opponent for reading the texts for it will save me that much time. I wish to proceed at once to where I left off when my time expired. I was talking about the supposed political kingdom that Jesus was to establish. So much did the apostles think it was to be a political kingdom that they were disputing at one time, as they were, traveling, as to who would be the chief men. The excitement ran so high that Mrs. Zebedee went to Jesus and said: "Master, I have a request to make, it is that my two sons may sit one at the right and one at the left of you when you come into your kingdom." So you see they had only the idea of a political kingdom. And this idea they maintained even when they saw Jesus in the garden praying to his Father to "let the cup pass from him," they believed it was to be a political kingdom. After the last supper, after they had partaken of the cup they still believed it would be a political kingdom. After Jesus prayed in the garden, after the chief priests came with staves and swords, they still believed it to be a political kingdom, and Peter cut off a servant's ear, and Jesus said to him. "Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. "

Now Jesus was captured and taken before the high priest. The apostle John was a relative of the high priest and so gained admittance into the palace. And Peter went in also but the rest forsook him because he was in the hands of the Jews. They thought if Jesus was the Son of God he would show his power, he would proclaim himself king. They followed him into the palace of the high priest, where Peter denied him. From there Jesus was taken to Pilate and was finally condemned by Pilate and taken out to be crucified. Right here at the point I am at now hinges the whole question. The disciples expected this man to establish a political kingdom, and the Scribes and Pharisees believed it also, and upon this belief he was taken prisoner and was condemned as a rival of Caesar. The next morning he was taken out on the hill and there crucified between two thieves. And now their hope is gone, the

hope that he was the king that was to establish a throne. All hope had gone when he hung there on the cross. They had left everything and followed him for three and one half years, and these three and one-half years were for nothing. They expected he would proclaim himself emperor of the world, and now he hangs upon the cross between two malefactors. The women lingered there and saw where he was entombed. The disciples were all gone, the great seal was put on the door, a guard was placed in front of it for the Jews remembered that Jesus said, "After three days I will rise again." And they said his disciples may come and steal his body away, so the seal was placed on the tomb and the guard was placed before it. It was Friday evening according to our reckoning. The next day the women were keeping the Sabbath: the whole Jewish people were keeping the Sabbath and so was Jesus, but the time of the Christian dispensation had not yet come. The greatest and grandest and most awful event had not yet taken place.

And here they were observing the Sabbath day, there is no question about that part of it. The disciples gathered in, little groups and talked about their fallen hopes. It is said sometimes, that the darkest hour is just before dawn, and there never was a time so dark in the history of the world as this was. The day closes and the next day dawns upon the people. The awful scene could not pass out of their minds. Darkness for three hours, the earth shook, and the graves of the prophets were opened. It was something they could not forget. From the housetops they could see afar into the Garden. All at once they are startled by a light from heaven, something came down; the earth began to rock and shake again. The soldiers came into the city without their arms and in disorder and great confusion. Such a thing was never known before. The Roman soldiers would die before they would be taken prisoners or retreat. In a little while we see some women going up towards this hill conversing between themselves and weeping. In a little while we see the same women returning. We hear a different strain than we heard before, instead of weeping it is a cry of joy. They are saying something. And I want to say to you, my friends, that they are glorious words, words grander than the angels sang



when they appeared to the shepherds when Jesus was born, and sang "Peace on earth, good will to men." And while the women run they say, "He is risen from the dead." The chains of death were broken, and I say upon the statement that they made our salvation depends, and if it is not true no man can be saved. I Cor., 15:17-18. This was on the first day of the week. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John all testify that it was the first day of the week. Why was it not on the seventh day? I wish to ask why it was that our Lord did not rise on the seventh day,

From what my opponent says, the Sabbath was binding from the creation of man, is binding now, and will be in the world that is to come. Is it not strange that this most awful scene on which our salvation depends did not take place on the Sabbath? I could never harmonize that with having to keep the Sabbath. I can see why it was not so. A new religion was about to be instituted; a religion that was for the whole world. The old practices and customs were to be abolished and new ones were to take their place and so the resurrection was on the first day instead of the seventh. Some men have gone so far as to say that Jesus did not come forth on the first day of the week. I told you in my first speech that there was a wave offering as recorded in Leviticus and it was always on the day after the Sabbath. It was a day of rejoicing. We are told it was a type of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. I Cor., 15:20. And now I want to ask a question: Do you suppose anything ever caused such joy as when those women found that Jesus was risen from the dead? There was never such an event in the history of the world, and it was not done on the Sabbath but on the first day of the week. The women ran and told the disciples about it. The disciples felt that their hopes were gone and they would not believe it, but Peter and John ran to see, and they find the sepulcher empty; they examine it closely and find he had gone, but they do not know where. But the women affirm that he is risen from the dead. I want to read a story that my opponent failed to read. He read the first part of the 24th chapter of Luke. I want to read something that happened on the same day. Luke 24:13: "And behold two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from

Jerusalem about three score furlongs. And now they talked together of all things which had happened." The men were going to the village and talking about these things that had happened because their hopes were gone. "And it came to pass that while they communed together," etc. And when we come to the 30th verse we read: "And it came to pass as he sat at meat with them." etc. And then they went back to Jerusalem to the eleven and said to them. "The Lord has risen indeed and has appeared to Simon. "

Now I read this story for the purpose of calling your attention to this fact. Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene, he appeared to the two going to Emmaus and made himself known to them by breaking of bread, he appears to Simon Peter and to the eleven. Jesus appears no less than four times the first day of the week. This is the beginning of observance of the first day of the week. I say upon what is that gospel based? It was based upon the resurrection of Christ from the dead. And Jesus arose from the dead upon the first day and he appeared to people under different circumstances in the daytime and in the evening. What does that mean? Did it just happen so that he arose on the first day of the week by accident? Why did he come forth on the first day of the week? God had a purpose in view. I did not take the position that the Sabbath had ever been changed, but I do take the position that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week and that he appeared to the women and to the disciples. And still another point: One week from that time he appeared again. You will find it in the text that says after eight days he appeared to them. John 20:26. And now we will see that after eight days can be the eighth day, though my opponent says it would be somewhere in the middle of the week. In my next speech I will take this up.

## LAST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.

One point I wish to notice is the statement that the charge from the Mosaic to the Christian system was a great thing. The Mosaic system was not divided, so I take it for granted that by that statement he meant the whole system. If that was the idea I have a word to say about it. That it was the religion taught in the old testament. In Acts, 3:22, is a statement which I desire to read. "For Moses truly said." etc. That is a quotation from Deut. 18:18. I'll read the entire statement. "I will raise them up a prophet," etc. That is said of Jesus. Jesus was to be a prophet like unto Moses. God said he would raise up a prophet like unto Moses, and God says I will put my words into his mouth. And I have been reading to you the words that have been put in Christ's mouth to speak. In all the speeches you will hear on the affirmative of this question, you will never hear that Christ says keep the first day of the week as a day of worship. It is not in the new testament, and no one claims it for the old testament. God never taught through Jesus that the first day was to be kept. The apostles spoke the words of Christ and Christ spoke the words of God. The statement was made that I covered the question in one half hour. He is mistaken, and he will find out before the three nights expire. I will leave that for the audience to judge. Those women who kept the commandment were not scattered at all, and they rested on the Sabbath and they had faith in Jesus Christ. The question was asked, why was the resurrection on the first day of the week? I want my opponent to define himself; I want to know, and I want him to tell you whether there is any divine authority to keep it. Is it anything more than a commemoration of the resurrection of Christ? Was it in commemoration of the resurrection? Where in the new testament scripture does it say to keep it? If he does not come forward with some text, I shall write the question on the blackboard. I have no time to follow him around in his rambles after creation. The question is, "Does the new testament teach," etc. If the new testament teaches it there is no need of the three nights here. All I call for is a text. Says a new religion is about to be ushered in. A

new religion as much as it says that people are saved only through the blood of Jesus Christ. There is but one name under heaven through which we can be saved, and that name is Jesus Christ. That is a religion as old as the promise that the seed of woman should crush the serpent's head. I call for the text that calls the religion of Jesus Christ a new religion. It is much easier to make assertions than to produce the text that proves it. You cannot see in the bible that there was salvation at Sinai, because they were without faith in Jesus Christ. The religion is as old as Adam and came down to Abel, Enoch and all the patriarchs of old. There is no salvation in the covenant that was made at Sinai, and I say it is perversion to say it is so. Abraham has been saved, and saved through Jesus Christ.

Now I called your attention the other night to Rev. 5:9, and I want to again call your attention to it. "And they sung a new song," etc. Now the Redeemer says that in the song of redemption some from every kindred and tongue will join. Angels will join in the song of the redeemed. The religion of Jesus Christ was the religion that saved the fallen family. It was the fault of the Jews that they had a false religion and the life of Christ on this earth was only as the prophets said it would be. And when Christ came here and died for us he simply did what the prophets said he would do. God's word was just as true then as it is now. All are saved by the blood of Jesus Christ. And as they had their ceremonies that pointed forward, we have ceremonies that point backward, as the Lord's Supper and Baptism. How strange it is that the text in Luke 21 was not read in the last speech. Jesus arose on the first day of the week, and my opponent says that is very remarkable. What is the significance of that? The reason Jesus arose on that day was because it was the third day and not because it was the first day of the week. The prophets said he would rise on the 3d day and he did. Now another point: The burial and the resurrection of Christ are to be commemorated and I teach that it is so, but I deny most emphatically that we should keep the first day of the week. And if my opponent had evidence he would have produced it in the last speech.

Now I will read you Romans 6:3: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Now that is the way to commemorate the burial of Jesus Christ, and is a likeness of the resurrection. Being baptized to show faith in truth, that is the way to commemorate, and not by observing the first day of the week. I beg of him to show the purpose that Jesus had of rising on the first day of the week unless it was to fulfill what the prophet said. If there is any purpose it must be found by the affirmative of the question. He told you I would tell you something about that eight days question. After eight days he appeared to them again. That language must be literal or figurative. What day does he count from? If he counts from the first day of the week there would be Monday 1, Tuesday 2, Wednesday 3, Thursday 4, Friday 5, Saturday 6, Sunday 7, Monday 8. That would be eight days and after eight days would be no earlier than Tuesday. I want him to tell you how on earth he can get Sunday out of that. Men might have counted eight days to the week. If that is a literal expression then I have something to give you. I will give it to-morrow night from the text of scripture.

I want to briefly sum up during the time I have left. Now I hope the question will be placed on the board or on a chart where it can be read all the time the speech is being made. "Does the new testament teach that the," etc. That is the question under consideration. And I must insist that my brother read the text to prove this for my sake, as well as for yours, if he has the truth; and tell the relation of the text to the question under consideration. If there is no affirmative made; I am going to examine it all through. I am on the negative side, but I am going to take the Sunday question and carry it along. I ask my opponent to spare more time to show the application, and to use text. I deny that the first day of the week was kept by men under the direction of the apostles. And before I close my speech I want to say again that if there is not an affirmative stand taken I will have the right to take it myself.

## **JULY 25, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In my last speech last evening I was talking about the appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his rising from the dead. He appeared to the women, then to Peter, then to two as they walked in the country and was known to them by the breaking of bread, then he appeared to the ten in the evening, making four times that he appeared on that day, the day that he arose from the dead. There was one point upon which my opponent and I did not agree, and that was in reference to "eight days after." I called your attention to the fact that he met them eight days after he met the ten. My opponent thought it would not be on Sunday. He made some little marks on the board and left them there in proof of his theory. That in the strongest proof that has ever been brought up by infidels against the resurrection of Jesus. Does it not seem strange that he would take the same argument that the most bitter enemies of Jesus used to prove that he never came forth from the dead? Now I take the position that eight days after is the first day of the week. I am not alone on that opinion because the ablest commentators agree that that is what it means according to the language used at that time. My opponent showed you that if it was on the first day of the week, the first time he appeared to them, eight days would bring it to Tuesday. This looks plausible; but now let us turn to Mark, 8:31; "And he began to teach, that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." Jesus was to rise, after three days. Friday evening he was put in the sepulcher, one day would be Saturday, two days Sunday, three days Monday, So after three days would bring it to Tuesday that our savior came forth from the dead. When my opponent said that after eight days would bring it to Tuesday, some of his brethren were so pleased that they clapped their hands. Now at that time the expression "on the third day" meant the same thing exactly as "after three days," and it is just the same with "after eight days" and "on the eighth day," counting the two extremes. Now in Matthew, 16:21, it reads

"on the third day." and in Mark it is "after three days." And they mean the same thing. And "after eight days" means "on the eighth day." Commentaries agree that it was on the first day of the week. In Kings, 12:5-12, we find the same thing, "And he said unto them, depart yet for three days, then come again to me. And the people departed." And in the 12th. "So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam the third day as the king had appointed, saying, come to me the third day." And the same use of those words is given in Esther, 4:16 and 5:1. And after Jesus was laid in the tomb, Matt. 27:62: "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, (63) saying, sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, 'after three days I will rise again. ' (64) Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. (65) Pilate said unto them, ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can." And so you will see that it is the very same identical thing.

In Matt., 12:40, is another case. I said last evening there was to be a wonderful change. God for ages back had been preparing the people for it. It was a mighty change that was to send the gospel to the whole world. He was making preparation for a change of the whole religion. That was why he was with his disciples forty days. He said to them, "I am going away, but I will send the Holy Spirit to you to be your comforter." We find in Acts 1 that Jesus talked differently to his disciples than he had ever done before. And in Matt., 28:18, and Mark, 16:15, we find that he bids them preach the gospel of the new testament. We find that Jesus was preparing a religion for the whole world, Gentiles as well as Jews. The Gentiles were then without hope and without God. Eph. 2:12. The apostles were to go every where to preach repentance and remission of sin. Luke. 24:47. But my opponent says it was preached from Adam down. Jesus remained with his disciples forty days, and just before he ascended into heaven the apostles asked him, as recorded in Acts, 1:6: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore

again the kingdom to Israel?" And he told them it was not for them to know. And now I wish to call your attention to Acts, 1:8. He was preparing his apostles for a wonderful change. A religion based on better promises. Now my opponent told us last night that if there was another text on the subject of the first day of the week, that I would find it. He was right, for I have found it. But there

(X) is something like the marks he placed upon the board: just a little trick in it. But there is another time he might have mentioned, I refer to the text in Acts 2. We have a wonderful meeting here. A most wonderful meeting held on the first day of the week. Now I will read that record, "And when the day of Pentecost had fully come," etc. What was the reason my opponent did not read that to you? Simply because it did not say the first day of the week? If a man were writing a book and should use the words first day of January eight times and new year once, and I should read the book and say that the first day of January was mentioned only eight times, what would you think of me?

You would naturally think that New Year meant the first day of January. And when they wrote of Pentecost it was equivalent to saying the first day of the week. We have little boys and girls in the Sunday school who could have told him that Pentecost means 50th, and always came on the first day of the week. There were to be seven Sabbaths or seven weeks of Sabbaths and the next day was Pentecost Lev. 23:15-16. So here we find a wonderful meeting on the first day of the week. Jesus had told them to tarry in Jerusalem until he sent the Holy Spirit to them, until they were endued with power from on high. Luke. 24:49. So they were waiting there says the historian when the day of Pentecost, had fully come. Acts 2:1. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a mighty rushing of wind. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like fire and rested upon them. We find that Jesus when he instituted a new religion that the world had never heard of before qualified his disciples for the work they were to do by sending the Holy Spirit to them. And this great event took place on the first day of the week. The Holy Spirit of God descended upon them and qualified them



to preach the laws of the new religion. To preach repentance and remission of sins. The apostles are now qualified to make a change in religious matters. My opponent had marks on the board to show that either there was no change, or the world was without a law, for he did not know how long. But I want to tell you that when the old law was left off the new one began. Christ had authority more, than Moses ever had. And we find that on Pentecost a new religion began. A new religion, a better sacrifice, a better mediator, who is Jesus Christ. And now that the Holy Spirit had qualified the apostles preached salvation through Jesus Christ. Now there were there devout men of every nation under heaven. The people there could understand that the religion had been changed from the Mosaic to the law of Christ. They preached Jesus and him crucified. Did they say anything about the fourth commandment? No? They preached Jesus and that God has crowned him Lord and Christ.

## **JULY 25, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR— KAUBLE.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I suppose there are individuals in this tent who, when my opponent showed what an ignoramus I was, said: "There, he has caught him now." But last night was not the first time I had heard it. The term "after eight days" in the scripture is easy to explain but unfortunately for my opponent it does not mean eight days. Let the scriptures tell. Now I am going to turn to Matt., 17:1. If it were true that "after eight days" meant only eight days the scriptures would explain it, but there is nothing about it in the bible. He says: "Is it not remarkably strange that the holy spirit was poured out on the apostles on the eighth day?" It was poured out on Pentecost, he said it was on the first day of the week. But what does the scripture say. Pentecost means 50th and not the first day of the week. Turn to Matt., 17:1. I am so glad that the scriptures explain themselves when we let them. That gets us out of the difficulty. I suppose he thought that the congregation would think that he had completely foiled me on the point.

And now his statement that I took the same ground that the infidels do is not correct. I believe every word of the bible whether I understand it or not. I am going to show you that after eight days means literally after six days. Turn to Luke, 9:28. Now he says it is after six days, it necessarily would have to be on the seventh day. The evangelist says after six days or on the seventh day, not the eighth day. Now then let's try the other statement, after eight days will put you on the ninth day or almost the tenth day, Christ met with Mary Magdalene. Let us read from Mark, 16:9: "Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." While it is a fact that he met those women on the first day of the week, I put no stress on the fact. Now when Mary Magdalene and the other women came to anoint Jesus, the other women did not stay at the sepulcher when they saw that Jesus was not there, but it appears from the record that Mary Magdalene did, and that Jesus appeared to her first, and then he appeared to the women who were going to

tell the apostles, as recorded in Matt., 28:9. The next record of his appearing on that day is shown in Luke 24. He appeared to the two who were going to the village. They did not know him at first and told him all that had taken place and when they arrived at their place of destination they invited him to tarry with them, and he did, and it says in the 30th and 31st verses, "And it came to pass as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it, and break and gave to them, and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." And in the 33d verse: "And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them. "

And in Luke, 24:36. He appeared to the apostles as they were gathered together. The position will be taken that there is something in Christ's meeting on the first day of the week, but if he does he will make a serious mistake. Now as to commentaries: Many commentaries agree that sprinkling is baptism and now he may say that I am discussing baptism again—but I say that is unfair. I use that argument simply to show that what he says of my position is no argument at all. We should not take the commentator's word unless it agrees with the bible. The question is not what commentators say but what the bible says. He says that the new testament scriptures teach the remission of sin and that it was the first time it was taught. He says that I said it had been taught before. I read the text of Scripture that said so. I showed perfectly that God himself said so. I want to see if forgiveness of sin was taught in the old testament and I want you to see. Let us look at the 103d Psalm, the 12th verse: "As far an the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." I'd like to know what better is taught no far as the remission of sin. If you would believe in the face of this statement that forgiveness of sin was not taught before Pentecost, it seems to me, on my soul, that you would believe anything. If an individual believes it he will believe anything. Now in the 51st Psalm David says: "Have mercy on me, O God, "etc., and in the 13th verse: "Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee." Now I want to know how David knew this if it had never been

taught. Well, I'll read you a text in Ex. 34:7: "Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgressions and sin," etc. Says there is mention of the first day of the week that I did not mention. I said if he would read a text showing this I would give up this question at once. He did not do it, he tried to show that Pentecost and the first day of the week were the same thing. But you know that Pentecost did not come on the same day of the week every year. You know that it was governed as New Year is, and that New Year does not come on the same day of the week every year. I hope if he has not seen it before he will see it now. Now in reference to Lev. 23. That was read last night as if it was the first day of the week. It means the yearly feast. Now after locating the Passover on the 14th day of the first month and the feast of unleavened bread the next after that he says, from the Sabbath of the feast count seven Sabbaths and you have Pentecost. Pentecost was a movable feast. Now my birthday occurs on the 30th of April; I do not know what day of the week it was. Does it occur on the same day every year? Not much. That is the force of argument there is in saying that Pentecost means the same thing as the first day of the week. Now let's suppose I want you to have a general meeting to begin on the 14th of January, and it in to last a certain length of time. We want you to have it every year on the same day. This year it begins on Thursday, when will it begin next year? Will it be on Thursday? Certainly not! And that is the way Pentecost means the first day of the week. It does not mean it at all. His argument is not worth a pin. Every school boy here knows that the Fourth of July does not come on the same day of the week. He knows that some times he has been prevented from playing havoc on that day because it was Sunday. The next year it is on Monday. What relation does Pentecost sustain to the first day of the week? The same as the first day of January. Now you can see how much force there is in that.

The apostles were to continue in Jerusalem. What were they to wait there for? Jesus said wait until I send you the comforter. Now in the text it is distinctly stated that the day of Pentecost had fully come and says nothing of the first day of the week. Whenever he

reads another text that mentions the first day of the week this question closes at once.

Here I have a little chart I want my brother to notice. My brother has been so kind and has shown his benevolence in aiding me. Now I allow no one to be more kind than I. I did some work for him.

***(Reads chart. )***

I. All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

II. Every doctrine revealed. Every fault reproofed. Every error corrected. Perfect instruction given.

III. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. — I These. 5:21.

## LAST HALF HOUR—ELLIOTT.

Now I am more surprised than I ever was before. I have found a man that does not believe that Pentecost is on the first day of the week. I am surprised at his ingenuity. If I had not told the story about the twisting and turning I would tell it now. He says that because the feast began after the seven weeks of Sabbaths it could not be on the first day. That is the biggest piece of sophistry that I ever heard a man stand and make before an audience. He is the first man I ever heard or read of that denied that Pentecost was on the first day of the week. It is a fact that is just as well admitted in sacred history as in profane history. It is as well known that Pentecost is on the first day of the week as it is that New Year is on the first day of January. Count seven weeks of Sabbaths or seven Sabbaths and the next day was Pentecost, forty-nine days and the fiftieth was Pentecost. It always brought it on the first day of the week. I would dislike to take a position of that kind against what the ablest men have ever taught. The whole world acknowledges it to be the first day. I took the position that Pentecost was the first day of the week, and now my opponent has several reasons for trying to get around it; for if it be true, several grand events took place on that day. Christ arose from the dead on that day, and the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles on that day and the church began.

Now in regard to the remission of sin: My opponent says forgiveness of sin through the name of Jesus Christ was preached in the old dispensation; that there has been no change. It must be the same system since people were forgiven under the old dispensation. I say there was no forgiveness of sin under the former dispensation. I said there was a passing by of sin, but that they could not be forgiven. But he keeps calling that up, going back to the old scripture. If there was forgiveness of sin in the time of the old dispensation, there was no need of Christ's death on the cross. But there is no name under heaven through which forgiveness can be taught except the name of the resurrected redeemer. I want to read Hebrews. 10:1: "For the law having a

shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers there unto perfect." And in the third verse: "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." Sins were passed by but there was a remembrance of them every year. It was impossible that the blood of goats should take away sin. If it had not been for the offering of Jesus there would have been no sins forgiven. If there could have been there would have been no use for Jesus Christ. God sent his son to suffer for the forgiveness of sin. And the apostles began to teach this on the first day of the week, the day of Pentecost when Christ had promised he would establish his church. And on the day of Pentecost the apostles preached for the first time that Jesus was the Son of God and that they could have their sins blotted out through Jesus Christ. They were forbidden to preach it before. Matt., 16:20: "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ" I say that was the first time that this was ever taught. Those who deny this, dethrone Christ and have no use for him. They dethrone him and plant Moses in his place. There was no forgiveness of sin until Jesus had offered his blood for the remission of the sins of mankind. The day of Pentecost was the last day of something and the first day of something. Here in Acts, 2:15: Now Peter says what was spoken of by Joel. Do you not see that Joel says that in the last days "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions." Peter says this is the fulfillment of that prophesy. Acts, 2:16. It was the last day of the old dispensation and the first day of the gospel dispensation. Peter says it is the fulfilling of what the prophet said. When the Holy Spirit came and filled the apostles he says it is the fulfilling of it. But now I said I would prove that it was not only the last day of something but the first day of something. Let us read Acts, 11:15: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them (Gentiles) as on us (Jews) at the beginning." That is equivalent to saying the Holy Spirit fell on the Gentiles as it did on the Jews on the day of Pentecost, And he calls it the beginning, the first day. So

you see it was the first day of something, the beginning of something. And of what? The last day of the old dispensation and the first day of the new dispensation. Christ did come according to the prophets and he suffered and he died and arose from the dead and ascended into heaven and sent the Holy Spirit upon the apostles on the first day of the week. And the apostles preached the forgiveness of sin through Jesus Christ for the first time on the first day of the week. Now why did he have the church spring up on this day? I am talking about the Church of Christ. Read Matt., 10:18-19. "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against It. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou," etc. But my opponent thinks it was built in the Garden of Eden. But from this statement we see that he gave Peter authority to unlock the gates of heaven. The Mosaic law was full of types and shadows; all their worships and sacrifices were types and shadows of something grander and more beautiful. When the Mosaic law was given 3000 men lost their lives for the worship of a calf (Ex. 32:20-28) and this was a shadow or type of something to come. In the new dispensation we have 3000 men accepting the terms of salvation on the day of Pentecost. The new religion is as much above the old as Jesus was above Moses. We have an end of something and the beginning of something on the day of Pentecost. We find the Mosaic dispensation gone, and a new system in its place. The old is not in force after the new comes in.

Now I will undertake to show you that Christ taught by example the observance of the first day to the apostles. He appeared to them on the first day of the week, and he arose from the dead on the first day of the week, and he sent the Holy Spirit to them on the first day of the week. There never was a Christian before that day, I do not mean that there were no good men before that. There were followers of Christ before that time. They were known as disciples, but they were not called Christians until after that time. Now we find that the church began on this day. We find that men followed



this doctrine from that day on under the guidance of the apostles and not under the law; So we see that the first day of the week was observed by the early Christians under the direction of the apostles, and it has been observed by Christians ever since that time.

## LAST HALF HOUR—KAUBLE.

The affirmative said I could not find commentaries but what agreed that Pentecost was on the first day of the week. I just want to show you that he is ignorant on the subject or wants to mislead you. That was a bad statement to make. Commentaries of note he said. But I do not think he will dispute the authorities I have here. I will read from H. B. Hackett, comments on Acts, 3:2; Dr. A. Barnes; Jennings on Jewish Antiquity: Dean Aulford. (Quotes from each). And yet he would have you understand that all agree that it was on the Sabbath. (Was called upon to produce the commentaries).

Now I call that a great piece of nonsense., and I think it is unfair of Brother Elliott to expect me to carry around a car-load of books. He just simply wants to put me in a bad light before the audience. But I will get those books tomorrow if it is possible, if I have to go ten or twelve miles after them, and I will read to you from them tomorrow night.

The statement was made that "remission of sin was not taught before Pentecost." I refer you to Matt., 16:19. Now that was before Pentecost. I want to leave that question about the remission of sin to the bible. I never took the position that there was salvation in the covenant at Sinai. My position in that God saved people from the time of Adam; and Christ says Abraham shall sit in the kingdom, and Abraham was saved through the blood of Christ. He said I did not believe the Holy Spirit came to stay. Now you all know that is not what I said. I said that was not the first time. He says that a person was not forgiven before the day of Pentecost. I am going to leave him and David to fight it out. Now I want to read Cor. 10:1: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea." If you are ignorant. Christ does not wish you to be so. And in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th verses in traveling out to the land of Canaan the Israelites ate and drank as Christians do to day. There were no Christians before they got down to Antioch. The name, Christian,

was first used in derision. I do not care to discuss spiritual gifts now, but I am willing to discuss it when we are through with this, but not while we are discussing the Sunday question. Now Paul says in Romans, 3:31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid! Yea, we establish the law." That is the doctrine of the apostles. We do not make void the law through faith. God forbid. Now the apostles were not angels, God gave them great power but they were only men like ourselves. It did not make a thing right just because the apostles did it. Paul and Barnabas quarreled down at Antioch about Mark. Now we should not quarrel because the apostles did. They were children of God, but subject to sin like we men are. According to my opponent's position, we ought to quarrel because the apostles did. Now there is only one case recorded where they had a religious meeting on the first day of the week. But my opponent says it is an apostolic example and we ought to do it. Only one meeting held on the first day of the week, and if there in another he will find it. Now when my time expired the last time, I was calling your attention to my chart. I want you to read it now, and from it you will see that. "Every doctrine is revealed, every fault is reproved, every error is corrected, perfect instruction is given. "

Now then if Sunday keeping was taught by the apostles he can find it in the scriptures, and he can write it on this chart. It would look splendid, and I ask my brother if Sunday keeping is a new testament doctrine to write the text on that chart. If it is taught in the scriptures we are at fault, and as a Christian man it is his duty to set me right. The proposition of my opponent shows that the first day of the week ought to be kept by Christians, and if you are a Christian you will observe it as a day of worship, and you are no Christian unless you do that. And yet the position was taken that it does not unchristianize a man to keep the seventh day instead of the first, but the individual is unchristianized by the face of this position. How can a man say that the apostles taught that the first day should be observed, and then make light of it. The apostles did not deal in foolishness, but that which we should do for salvation. Now I want to read These., 5:2. The apostle says: "Prove all

things." How prove? What would you prove by that, that would furnish thoroughly? If it is a new testament doctrine, the first day should be kept, but how strange it is that there is not a text in the new testament that says we are to keep it. How plain it is about baptism confession of sin, support of the ministry and the Lord's Supper. How passing strange it is that not a word is said about keeping the first day of the week. Now if Sunday was kept as a day of worship under the direction of the apostles, I affirm it would surely be in the new testament. If it is not we are under no obligation to keep it. If I may draw a conclusion I believe the affirmative will take position that the first day of the week is held as a commemoration of the new dispensation. But where is the text? I have asked again and again when the new dispensation began, and he read Acts, 2. And now I want to say that if the Christian dispensation began on Pentecost there will be a statement in the scripture to that effect. And Jesus will confirm that covenant. Jesus did confirm the new testament, he began to confirm it three and one-half years before he died. The Christian dispensation began earlier than Pentecost and Jesus preached the pure gospel before qualification of the apostles took place at Pentecost and he told the apostles to go and teach what he had taught them, and if the apostles ever taught that the first day of the week was to be kept it was because Jesus taught it to them. And he says the words that I speak are right, not my own words, but the words my Father spoke. Speaks of the Garden of Eden. Paul says the gospel was preached to Abraham and it was preached on down when we come to the Israelites' flight from Egypt where they had lost all the highest idea of God. You can tell what a man's idea of God is by the way he worships him. Now what was the promise in the old testament? God said now I want you to obey my voice and you will be my people, and they said "all right, we will do it," and they agreed to keep the law of God. And their sacrifices simply pointed their minds to Christ, and there was no salvation without Jesus Christ.

Read Romans, 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." There it says through righteousness, not the law. Now it shows clearly here that instead of forgiveness of sin being taught for the first time at Pentecost—

## **JULY 20, 1893, FIRST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are pleased to see so many here this evening. Before I proceed on the affirmative I wish to review a few things my brother spoke of in his last speech. It has been requested that I tell when the Church of Christ was established. I told you that I believe it was established at Pentecost. My opponent says it was established prior to that time. He referred again last evening to baptism, says there was baptism in thy wilderness. That is true, but we in this day believe that baptism must be in the name of Christ. We both agree that there is a day of worship, but the question is which day is it, the last or the first day of the week? He says it is the last day, and you and I say it is the first day. "The first day has been kept for 1800 years. We have to look for it in the new testament. The new testament is a very small book, and I am forbidden to go into history.

I wish to call your attention to Acts, 20:7. which I have upon the chart: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Now it shows that it was their custom to meet upon that day. Paul preached to them ready to depart on the morrow. What does that mean? The disciples came together on the first day of the week for the purpose of breaking bread. You see that they are speaking of something familiar. It simply says, "And when the disciples had come together on the first day of the week, Paul was there and continued to preach until midnight." We would naturally suppose that they were familiar with it; that it was something that all Christians in the country understood. The disciples came together for the purpose of breaking bread. Every thing was done under the direction of the apostles. My opponent said he did not know whether it was the Lord's Supper or an ordinary meal. Why would they come together for the purpose of eating an ordinary meal? If it be true, that Paul continued preaching until midnight, and when a man fell out of the window and was killed and Paul went down and

restored him, that naturally interrupted the meeting, do you think that they would wait until midnight to get something to eat? If it was breaking bread as we do, we could see how it was done. In some congregations they partake of the Lord's Supper in the evening, and if the preaching should be prolonged unto midnight the Lord's Supper would not be partaken of until afterwards. So they came together on the first day of the week, and I cannot see how any sophistry in the world could make a man believe that they came together here to partake of an ordinary meal. Here we have a custom so established that the historian did not try to explain it. He talked as we would talk now. If a missionary should stop here a certain number of days, he in his report would say that he was in Ramona and preached to us until midnight. If we were in the habit of partaking of the Lord's Supper in the evening, as a good many churches do, we would not have taken it until after the preaching. If we are following the teaching of Jesus, the same language that would fit them then will fit us now. We can infer that it was an ordinary custom for them to come together on the first day of the week. I refer you to Cor., 16:12: "Now concerning the collection for," etc. Here Paul is writing to the Church at Corinth. My brother has told you that they were to lay by at home. Paul says to lay by on the first day of the week so that there would be no gathering when he came. If they laid by at home there would be the gathering just the same when the apostle got there. If our general secretary wished to make a collection and wrote to us to lay by in store as God had prospered us so that there would be no gathering when he came; if we laid by us at home the gathering would have to be done after he came, and he would have to go from house to house. What advantage would it be to write a special letter saying I want you to lay by something in store, if that was what it meant? What would be the advantage of that? None whatever. But I can see a reason why he would want them to lay by in store when they came together on the first day of the week. It simply was the custom for them to come together to worship on the first day of the week. Now I wish to refer you to another passage, Rev. 1:10: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as

of a trumpet." I refer to this simply to show you that the first day was being called the Lord's day. I can tell you what my opponent will say; that it is the Sabbath that is meant. During all the space of time that the Sabbath is used in the old testament, it is never called the Lord's day. But here we have a day in the new testament called the Lord's day. What did John mean when he said the Lord's day? He certainly meant the first day or the seventh; and if it is true that it is the first day of the week it will harmonize with all the other statements I made here as to its being a day set apart for worship, or else John would not have named a certain day. If it is the Sabbath that is meant, then it is the first time that it has been called that during all the hundreds of years it was kept and the hundreds of times it is mentioned.

Another thing I want to speak about is this: Is there a commandment for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week? If you ask for a commandment in the form of the decalogue, I say, no. You ask why it is not there. The Jewish religion was given to the Jews; they were together in one country. The new testament is for all nations, kingdoms and tongues until the coming of Christ. It is for the high and low, the rich and the poor, and for the heathen, too. The gospel is for every human creature, and it is so plain and simple that the people can understand it and live up to it. If there was a commandment given that we should meet together on the first day of the week, there are times when thousands upon thousands could not keep that commandment. It is not commanded, but it is an apostolic example, and we should follow that example when it is possible. Christians do not make the first day of the week a test of fellowship. And why is that? Simply because there is no positive command that it should be kept, but those who keep the first day of the week have an apostolic example. And besides we believe it is right to do it. It is right to set apart a day for worship, and the day on which Christ arose from the dead is as great a day as we could choose. And so I say, with the Christian people it is a principle and not a matter of "do it or die." We believe that if a man is a Christian and does these things set forth by the new testament he will regard that as a matter of



principle. I want to call your attention to the fact that the great majority of people are keeping Sunday. A million people to one who keep the seventh day. Why is that? Is it possible that millions of people can be mistaken and have been for over 1800 years?

I say is it possible that Christians both Protestant and Catholic have been wrong all this time? Millions that have kept the first day to one that has kept the seventh, or I might say thousands — I am not speaking from statistics—I might say a thousand to one. This is not a question of majority but still, where one intelligent man has been| on the side of the seventh day, one thousand just us intelligent have been on the other side of the question. Every time this question has been discussed, in every age, it has settled down on the first day of the week.

## **JULY 26, 1893. FIRST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.**

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel called upon to make a few remarks to-night before I make my reply to the affirmative. Last night when I read

those extracts from commentaries on the subject of the Pentecost, I was called upon to produce them. I went out to get commentaries, everything or anything I could get. The parties to whom I went, sent to Madison by parties who were going to get them for me, and Brother Elliott was to bring them to the tent. To-night when Brother Elliott came in I asked him if he had the books and he said they were up at the house and I could have them if I wanted them but that he did not want to read from them to night. So I will not read from them but if I had known that in time I would not have sent for them. But I will say here that I have two authorities you can read if you will go to Brother Elliott for the books, or you can come to me. You can examine them and see if my statement is in harmony with the commentary.

The first statement that was made to-night was a mistake. I think my brother failed to understand what I said, I spoke of baptism, but I said "was baptized in the wilderness," and I will read Cor. 10: 1-3: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, but that all our fathers," etc. I will necessarily have to speak very briefly on each point to-night and the first I want to notice is a text in connection with the first I gave last night; what I said about the church in the wilderness. The question is whether or not I was correct in saying it was the church. Acts 7:37-38: "This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount, Sinai, and with our fathers who received the lively oracles to give unto us." You see it says there was a church in the wilderness. Now the argument to night began on Acts, 20. Statement was made that I said the meeting was held on the seventh day. Now that is not what

I said, and I'll refer you to the stenographer. And just here I want to say that I've heard it said that when I am speaking there are certain individuals who say, "Oh, hear him lie," or "that's a lie." And when Brother Elliott gets up the same thing is said of him by others. Now I wish you would not say that. We do not intend to lie, and if we should hear you say so it would hurt our feelings. Try to remember the Golden Rule, and don't say that any more.

But now then the statement was made that I said the meeting was on the seventh day of the week. Now what I said was, "on Saturday night as we calculate." At that time the days were counted from sundown to sundown; the Sabbath or seventh day lasted from Friday evening at sundown till Saturday evening at sundown. It was changed about the 13th century. Then instead of beginning at sundown they began midnight and instead of leaving off at sundown it run over to midnight. Now Saturday night as we reckon was not the Sabbath. What night is this? Wednesday? Well. how long will it be Wednesday? Until midnight. Now at that time the first day of the week began on Saturday night at sundown (or on the seventh day for the names that we know them by were borrowed from the heathen). I did not say it was on the seventh day but Saturday. The Saturday began later than the Sabbath. But I hold yet that it was either on what we term Saturday night or it was on Sunday night. My brother did not know what time of the day it was when they met. Let us see: Upon the first day of the week Paul preached to the disciples and there were lights in the upper chamber. That does not say that they waited to get the lights; the lights were there when they assembled; it was the dark portion of the day. It was either on Saturday night or it was on Sunday night, and he did not begin to preach on the first day of the week. But if it were true that they commemorated the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week, supposing, I say. that it was their purpose it would not prove anything for the observation of the first day of the week. My brother spoke about their meeting on the first day of the week; he spoke of that as being a custom. What is a custom? When a thing is done once? No, my friends, but when a thing is done again and again until it becomes habitual. And yet there is but one

solitary statement in the new testament where a religious meeting was held on the first day of the week. But what of Cor. 16:2d verse? That comes a long way from being a religious meeting. Question is, why were they assembled? How does it come that they were together there if they did not meet for a particular purpose, that is, for religious worship? What did they come together for, to eat an ordinary meal? Speaking of the breaking of bread, I know of only one place where it is the Lord's Supper, and three places where the breaking of bread in the ordinary meal.

Now I want to call your attention to something else: The two disciples without knowing who he was, prevailed upon him to stay with them and when they were at meat Jesus broke the bread; he was made known to them in the breaking of bread.

Another point: Acts 2:46. "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." Now I want to give you the word for word rendering. Every day constant attendance with one man in the temple at home partaking of food with gladness and singleness of heart. Here they had all things in common. I'll read Acts 2:44-45 on that: "And all that believed." etc. They were just one great family. They lived together. Now you have an example. They were together to partake of bread. It was their custom: they lived together. Now the 10th chapter of I Corinthians. I have translations from several different languages here. The English as in the text is that you are to lay by him in store. French in his own house at home. German by himself at home. That comes a thousand miles from being a public meeting. Suppose that your pastor in this town tells you to lay by you in store as God has prospered you. Would you be so illogical as to conclude that he meant you to pass the hat? Why those words mean just the opposite of a collection. Don't you suppose that the apostle Paul could make himself understood? Did you ever hear a minister say, "now I want you to lay by you in store" when he wanted a public collection taken up? Talk about twisting and turning, if that is not a fair sample I do not know anything about it.

And where in the scriptures do you find that means only money? They were to lay by them in store as God had prospered them. And wouldn't it look funny to put lambs and calves in the contribution box? I do not know of a translation that gives it any other way. I know of two translations of the French, and two of the Latin and two of the Italian, and all give the same meaning. Let us turn to Rev. 1:10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." I was very much surprised when my brother said to prove that this was the first day of the week, that they had one day and they called this the Lord's day. That statement is fatal to the position he took that there was no day because people could not keep a day. It does prove that the Lord had a day; but what day does it prove it was. My opponent has not said one solitary thing to substantiate the fact that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. And he cannot find it in history that the first day was observed previous to the year 194 A. D. If he can find it I'll waive the rules of this discussion and let him read it. If he has anything reliable I'll let him read it. Why is a day called the Lord's day? He made the statement that the Sabbath was never called the Lord's day. He is mistaken. Let us read Isaiah. 58:13: "If thou 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; and shall honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor shaking thine own words." I want to know if the Lord's day is not holy? That is what he says in Isaiah. Turn to Mark, 2:28: "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." But my brother says the people could not keep the Sabbath if it was commanded. That is doubting the word of God. God has never commanded an unreasonable thing. The Lord of heaven never demanded an impossibility of any one. If it is commanded every man can do it. Yes, sir. that is certain. He says that some people could not assemble on the Sabbath for they are twenty miles from the house of worship. This would not be required to. We are not to do our own pleasure but remember the Sabbath to keep it holy, and I say that the commandment does not say he had to stay in the house.

Now then another astounding statement: "People who observe Sunday do not make it a test of fellowship." I would like to have him show me one denomination that does not, his denomination excepted. That is some of them, not all as I know because I was brought up among them. In the last Christian Standard I read that the people in twenty-five different states, who observe Sunday as a day of worship are in favor of making it a test of fellowship.

## LAST HALF HOUR — ELLIOTT.

(In regard to the commentaries, I told Bro. Kauble that I would go to the house and get them if he wished; that I had some six or eight but that I could not take the time to read from them the last night as it would take all of my time. He said he did not care to have the books brought. ) I wish to review for a short time some statements made in the last speech. First, in regard to the Lord's Supper: My opponent said that in the first years of the church the disciples had everything in common and that they broke bread every day; breaking bread from house to house. Some say it was a common meal and others say it was the Lord's Supper.

Commentators are divided on that question. But supposing that it was an ordinary meal; in the beginning of the church there at Jerusalem they had everything in common. That does not follow that by the time that this was written, twenty seven years after the beginning, in Acts 20:7, that these things were not regulated. We find in 1Cor. 11 that the Corinthian Church had made a mistake in regard to the Lord's Supper, They took with them a meal and they perverted it to that extent that they even got drunk. And the Apostle Paul wrote to them and said, "You are not doing right when you eat a meal when you come together to eat the Lord's Supper." Here the people had perverted the Lord's Supper and were making a meal of it and getting drunk. And Paul gives them instructions concerning this. He gives the idea that they should not come together for the purpose of partaking of an ordinary meal. And this record in Acts was written twenty-five, or twenty-eight years after Pentecost. This is enough so far as divine evidence is concerned, if rightly diverted.

Now in regard to 1Cor. 16: Paul was writing to the church and I think it was natural that he should say "lay by you in store." Of course if I wanted to raise a collection here to night, I would not say it; but if a man expected to be here by and by, he could write to this congregation and say upon each first day of the week "lay by you in store as God has prospered you." Paul is writing to this church to lay by in store so that there need be no gathering when

he comes. It would be all ready in the treasury (See Living Oracles, 1Cor., 16:2. ) My opponent says it was not all money, but anything they might have. I think it would look very funny to drop lambs into the treasury. Also to lay by calves and lambs in your house. Then think of Paul taking a lot of calves and lambs from Corinth to Jerusalem, a distance of about 960 miles. All churches have a treasury, and we know that in the time of Christ Judas was the treasurer and carried the money bag. Of course all churches have treasuries, sometimes there is not much money in them, but they have to have one. If our general secretary wished us to have \$50 ready for him when he came, he could write to us to lay by in store until he came. Now what would this congregation think he meant that they would lay by at home or in the treasury? Do you think he would want to drive miles out in the country to get that money? No; he would know that we meet together on the Lord's day and could leave the money in the treasury and when he came all he would have to do would be to go to the treasury and get it and give his receipt. And I want to ask if their meeting on the first day to worship does not harmonize with that.

Now in reference to not being able to keep Sunday: I said there were times when it would not be possible for some people to meet together to worship on Sunday. There have been times in this country when it would be impossible to meet together on Sunday to worship God. And so there was no positive command given because the gospel was for the whole world for all time. That is why God did not give it as a positive command, for if he had we could not have kept it as the Jews kept the Sabbath. That command was given in a specific country for a peculiar people and was to last a certain time. Christian people observe the first day of the week from principle. The civil law will never make a man worship on the first day, the law can never make man a Christian. It will never do any good to attempt to make a man religious by force. if he is a Christian man he will obey through principle. If a man does not obey then through love of God there is no law that will make him do so. It has been tried, and failed every time. We as a people do not believe in making a law to force any one to do so; there may



be some crank who would make it a test of fellowship. There are extremists on everything, but I am speaking of the people as a mass. We believe a man should be fully persuaded in his own mind. In regard to making it a test of fellowship, what I mean is this, that we do not unchristianize any one for keeping the seventh day. If there are any I do not know them. They have as good a right as I have to interpret the scripture; that is why I discussed the question; my brother makes it a test of fellowship.

Now I wish to rehearse very briefly the position I have taken. I take the position that when the gospel was established, the covenant given on Mount Sinai was abolished; that the new law was given to the apostles when they received the Holy Spirit. and everything that is not commanded is abrogated. That the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles on the first day of the week; that the disciples met together on the first day of the week for the purpose of religious worship; that they were in the habit of meeting on that day; that John had reference to the first day when he spoke of the Lord's day on the Isle of Patmos. You will notice that I took the position that the disciples met on the first day for the purpose of worshipping God. I never said it was commanded. We believe that apostolic example is as good as God's commandment. And if a man does not believe that, there is something wrong with him somewhere. He would want a positive command for everything he did. I might ask a man to go to Madison for a doctor for a sick child and he would say. I want a positive command for it in the bible or I will not go. But if he was a Christian man he would do as he would want to be done by. You could not find it in the bible nor can you find a positive command for keeping Sunday, but Christians have kept it ever since the religion of Christ was established. They are doing it because it is right to do as the early Christians did under the direction of the apostles; but there is no positive command for it in so many words for the reasons that I have already given. But on the other hand, the authority says let no man bind the Sabbath upon you. Col. 2:16. It never was bound on the Gentiles. The Gentiles were prejudiced against the Sabbath. My opponent would bind it upon Jews and Gentiles. The evidence

given proves as much as can be produced by scripture. Now take into consideration the thousands of men that have stood on the side of the first day, and the few who have stood on the other side. Are we wrong when we come together to commemorate the sufferings of Jesus? Christ has said it was right by example when he met with his apostles. If we are wrong we are growing wrong very rapidly. In heathen countries the people are being taught to observe the first day, and in this country I believe we make 200 converts to their one. The observance of the first day is being taught more than it was ever taught before in the history of the world.

**ROSE D. COLE, STENOGRAPHER.**

I do hereby certify that Rose D. Cole appeared before me and signed the foregoing document, and that it was done of her own free will and accord. Witness my hand and seal this the 24th day of August, A. D. 1893.

(SEAL) ALVAH C. WYMAN, NOTARY PUBLIC.

## LAST HALF HOUR — KAUBLE.

I believe it is already done. There are people lying in jail for that very thing. There are Seventh day Adventists lying in jail to-day in Maryland and in Tennessee for violating the Sunday law. They are under the condemnation of an unjust law. There is a national Sunday law that closes the World's Fair on Sunday. There have been individuals that have said that same thing for 40 years; said it would not be in the very face of the thing itself. And Seventh Day Adventists are punished in spite of what is said. There are Sunday laws to-day in every state in the union and Seventh Day Adventists would be in jail in other states as well as Maryland and Tennessee if the authorities were cranky enough to put them in force. The law of Tennessee is as lenient as the law of South Dakota. I have examined every statute of every state in the union, and they all have laws for Sunday keeping.

Now then the argument comes up again, "millions of Sunday keepers to one of them that are keeping the Sabbath." I do not know why that argument has been made so many times. "Enter ye in at the straight gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14. Is that so or is his statement so? I tell you Jesus' language is appropriate where he says, "Fear not little flock," etc. I would not have you draw the conclusion that we believe we are the only ones saved. We do not say that there are no Christians but Seventh Day Adventists. But we believe that take all the Seventh Day Adventists and all the Christians from other denominations that they will make "the little flock." I am willing to submit it to Matt. 7:13, 14. Look at the millions that are not Christians; that do not believe in Jesus Christ. Would it be so very strange that my opponent was badly mistaken about majorities? My opponent says that the majority have been in favor of Sunday in every age that this question has come up. Yes, and majority has always been on the side of wrong on that question. If a majority is any evidence of a thing being right the

religion of the devil must be right. There was a time not many years ago when there was little light in the world, but reformation after reformation has swept over the world, and the majority have been against the faithful people of God.

As has been said this is a great and an important question. From the humblest cottage to the halls of legislature, from the lowest to highest, are interested in this question, whether we are to keep the first day of the week or the seventh day. And it remains for us to follow the light of our own conscience. Just one point as I pass over this in regard to "laying by in store." If they were to put into the treasury on the first day of the week it does not necessarily follow that it was a religious meeting. We follow the same command now, on every first day of the week we strike up our accounts and lay by as God has prospered us. So you can see that if they had met together for that purpose it would have been a business meeting and not a religious meeting. He said you could not keep Sunday as the Sabbath was kept on account of our hard winters. Look here, don't you suppose that God of heaven and earth would know the climate? Didn't he say that he created this earth to be inhabited? There is no argument in that. I think as he does, that no man can be made a Christian by law. That is the truth; I had to say amen, to that.

But in spite of that there are thousands persecuting men who do not keep Sunday. Thousands of bigoted men who are ready to persecute men who do not keep Sunday. He says they do not unchristianize people for keeping the Sabbath. They might just as well, they won't let us work on Sunday. How can a man keep the first day of the week without a command for it? If a man were to say to Brother Elliott, Show me a positive command for confession of sin, or I will not believe it is binding, what do you suppose Brother Elliot would do? Why, he would get his bible just as quick as he could and show it to him, for it is in the bible: and so it is with everything but there is not a word about keeping the first day of the week. Not a soul of us can find it in the word of God. Do you remember that I left a blank in that chart for him and it has not

been filled out? Why doesn't he put the text there? If Sunday keeping is a good work we want to engage in it. If it is a good work it will be found in the new testament. It is not commanded in the old testament and so it must be in the new, as the Lord's Supper and baptism are.

Now then the disciples meet together on the first day of the week as recorded in Acts 20, that time when the Apostle Paul was on a journey and stopped to preach to them. He did not expect to see them again and they wanted him to stay as long as he could. His companions went around the neck of land by boat and he remained with them until daybreak and then walked forty-two miles across country to meet his companions. And this is the only meeting ever held on the first day of the week.

As to 1Cor. 16:2, that laying by in store was practiced everywhere: They did everything that God commanded them to do. They looked at it as a matter of business, as every man must do.

And now the position I have taken in rebuttal: We do not unchristianize people for not keeping the Sabbath. We say they are Christians as long as they follow the light, but when they reject the light they will be rejected. This question is being discussed in every part of the world. A man said to me the other day. This Sabbath question is being discussed from pole to pole; every inhabited part of the world has become interested in it." God gave a law to man and that law is just as binding now as then and will be as long as the world exists. I read in support of that Matt. 5:7, 9. Jesus would have the apostles understand that what the Jews said was not true. He said, "Don't you think that I have come to destroy the law of the prophets: not one jot or tittle shall pass away till all things pass away." And he goes on to say, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of my commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." We believe that Jesus meant what he said, and that the apostles taught what he said, and we take the position that no man can keep the law of God without faith in Jesus Christ There are no people in the world that believe and preach more of Jesus Christ than we do. A man cannot

do one thing to make himself righteous; righteousness is a gift of Christ and comes through faith in Christ. And our blessed master has redeemed us from every people and tongue, and when we sing the song of triumph, we will sing all honor and praise to Jesus who has redeemed us. And Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will sing that song that says that it is Jesus that saved us from sin. And in referring to our own case, as to whether or not we will be saved, we must examine the question whether Sunday or the Sabbath is the day to keep, from the standpoint of the word of God. Take it when you go home and let the spirit of God so animate you that you may see his truth and be willing to obey his law. And may God lead you by his own hand for Christ's sake.

## **ROSE P. COLE, STENOGRAPHER.**

I do hereby certify that Rose D. Cole appeared before me and signed the foregoing document, and that it was done of her own free will and accord. Witness my hand and seal this the 24th day of August, A. D. 1893.

(SEAL) ALVAH C. WYMAN, Notary Public.