

All Christians before and since the Reformers stood on Scripture alone and salvation only by faith in Jesus Christ. By the early 16th century, Protestants separated themselves from the Roman Catholic Church, at all costs to their lives and liberties, because they could no longer tolerate the self-exalting error and implacable wickedness of Rome.

However, there are two questions – controversies - that cut to the heart of the reformed tradition of Christianity. As a result of down-playing the importance of these issues, and information such as contained herein, we have now a watered-down ecumenical Christianity... which means one thing: the Reformation is not complete!

WHICH BIBLE SHOULD WE TRUST?

- 1. Which Bible Should We Trust?**
- 2. The Early Church**
- 3. The Discovery of the Alexandrian-Aryan Manuscripts**
- 4. The Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation**
- 5. The Growth of Roman Influence in 19th Century England**
- 6. Who were Westcott and Hort?**
 - 6.1. They were Catholic
 - 6.2. They were Evolutionists
 - 6.3. They were Spiritists and Members of Esoteric Societies
 - 6.4. On Bible Manuscripts
- 7. Highlight of Changes in the Versions**

WHY DO (SOME) PROTESTANTS WORSHIP ON SUNDAY?

- 1. Why Do (Some) Protestants Worship On Sunday?**
- 2. A Multi-Issue Question**
 - 2.1 Creation & the Law:
 - 2.2 Eschatology & political-economics:
- 3. Biblical Theology**
 - 3.1 Jesus, Paul, and the disciples
 - 3.2 Jesus's resurrection and first appearance
 - 3.3 Other cases & verses
- 4. Historical Theology**
 - 4.1 Definition of the day of the week
 - 4.2 The paganism of Sunday worship
 - 4.3 Ancient Sunday laws
 - 4.4 Protestant denominations concerning the day of worship
 - 4.5 Protestant error: the Reformation is not complete
 - 4.6 The impact of Catholic doctrine upon civilization
 - 4.7 The movement for modern Sunday laws
 - 4.8 The SDA Church and the Catholic Mirror

May 2010

www.takeittothestreets.info

www.scribd.com/takeittothestreets

takeittothestreets@live.com

1. Which Bible Should We Trust?

“No sooner was the work of Evangelists and Apostles recognized as the necessary counterpart and complement of God's ancient Scriptures and became the 'New Testament,' than a reception was found to be awaiting it in the world closely resembling that which He experienced Who is the subject of its pages. Calumny and misrepresentation, persecution and murderous hate, assailed Him continually. And the Written Word in like manner, in the earliest age of all, was shamefully handled by mankind. Not only was it confused through human infirmity and misapprehension, but it became also the object of restless malice and unsparing assaults.” - *Dean Burgon, Traditional Text, p.10.*

In the past wars have been fought over the Bible. It was persecuted by the early church, banned in the middle ages, and again came under attack during the Reformation. Today, essentially, the argument is not between the King James Version and other English versions, but between the traditional “Received Text” and the Alexandrian manuscripts (the Vatican B and the Sinaitic Aleph).

The original manuscripts that came from Syria and Jerusalem, where the Apostles preached, have been lost and all we have is copies of copies. The oldest manuscripts originate from the Alexandrian texts. However, there are thousands (1900) in almost every language from the traditional texts. Also, there are verses missing in the Alexandrian versions that are in the traditional texts. But there are letters written between church fathers that are older than the Alexandrian texts that include these missing verses.

David Otis Fuller, D.D., says fundamentally, there are only two streams of Bibles. The first stream which carried the Received Text in Hebrew and Greek, precious manuscripts were preserved by such as the church at Pella in Palestine where Christians fled, when in 70 A.D. the Romans destroyed Jerusalem; by the Syrian Church of Antioch which produced eminent scholarship; by the Italic Church in northern Italy; and also at the same time by the Gallic Church in southern France and by the Celtic Church in Great Britain; by the pre-Waldensian, the Waldensian and the churches of the Reformation. These manuscripts have in agreement with them, by far the vast majority of copies of the original text. So vast is this majority that even enemies of the Received Text (Textus Receptus) admit that nineteen-twentieths of all Greek manuscripts are of this class. - *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? Christian Centre Press, p.64.*

The second stream is a small one of a very few manuscripts. These last manuscripts are represented:

a) In Greek: The Vaticanus MS., or Codex B (prominent for counter-reformation), in the library at Rome; and the Sinaitic, or Codex Aleph (found in 1844, youngest find and oldest document).

b) In Latin: The Vulgate or Latin Bible of Jerome (383 AD).

c) In English: Many modern versions and the Jesuit Bible of 1582, which later with vast changes is seen in the Douay-Rheims.

“It must be emphasized that the argument is not between an ancient text and a recent one, but between two ancient forms of the text, one of which was rejected and the other adopted and preserved by the Church as a whole and remaining in common use for more than fifteen centuries.” - *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.46.*

“We need to understand, that many of the new translations are taken from old manuscripts. People think that these are more reliable. In actual fact they are saying, that a manuscript found in a waste paper basket in a cave in Mt. Sinai and questionable manuscripts from Alexandria in Egypt, are more reliable than the Received Text.” - *Les Garrett, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.15.*

“So the present controversy between the King James Bible in English and the modern versions is the same old contest fought out between the early church and rival sects; and later, between the Waldenses and the Papists from the fourth to the thirteenth centuries; and later still between the Reformers and the Jesuits in the sixteenth century.” - *“Which Bible” and “True and False”, edited by David Otis Fuller.*

2. The Early Church

From the birth of Christ to 400 AD Gnostic gospels and other writings were written. Paul makes mention of this in: 2 Cor. 2:17.

The received text is the old Byzantine text with hundreds of copies in agreement. It was written in koine Greek of which hundreds of words cannot be translated into classical Greek. The early Church used koine Greek manuscripts and rejected the Alexandrian versions which were based on corrupt version with Origen and other Gnostic revisions.

“Origen, being a textual critic, is supposed to have corrected numerous portions of the sacred manuscripts. Evidence to the contrary shows he changed them to agree with his own human philosophy of mystical and allegorical ideas. Thus, through deceptive scholarship of this kind, certain manuscripts became corrupt.” - *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.16.* Origen believed man is divine and is praised in Masonic writing.

“These revised [contemporary] versions are based on manuscripts from Egypt that were definitely corrupted. Both Augustine and Tertullian testified that the scribes in Africa corrupted and changed the manuscripts.” - *Christian Handbook of Manuscripts, Peter S. Ruckman.*

Kurt Aland, who is co-editor of both of the most widely used critical Greek texts and who is certainly the leading textual scholar on the European continent, proposes that the text of p75 and B (of the Alexandrian texts) represents a revision of a local text of Egypt which was enforced as the dominant text in that particular ecclesiastical province. - *Aland in "The Bible in Modern Scholarship", p.336. Cf. also 'Novum Testamentum, IX (April 1967), p.91.*

“How could Helvidius have accused Jerome of employing corrupt Greek manuscripts, if Helvidius had not had the pure Greek manuscripts?”- *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.61.*

In 331 AD Constantine ordered that an 'ecumenical Bible' be written. Eusebius, a follower of Origen, was assigned to direct this task. Eusebius rejected the deity of Christ and claimed that Christ was a created being. This error is the so-called Arian heresy (pantheism, etc). The early Christians rejected these manuscripts and were placed in a library only to be dug up as ancient manuscripts. There were about 50 copies made by Eusebius and were distributed and ended up in mainly in two areas - Rome and Alexandria. The Alexandrian library was world famous for its occult documents. The early Christians who were bible based burned the old library and this was a disaster to the occult world. UNESCO decided to rebuild it in 2002 exactly as the original.

Rome claims to be anti-arian and has said to have fought wars against the arians. There is no evidence that the nations that were destroyed because they were arian *were actually arian* because we have none of their writings. Only Roman Catholicism claims that they were arian. The gospel to the goyim (Catholicism) is not arian but the insider esoteric gospel is arian. We know this because the Pope has declared Jerome's Latin Vulgate an infallible bible but this version is arian.

3. The Discovery of the Alexandrian-Arian Manuscripts

In 1481 AD the Vatican Codex B manuscript was discovered in the Vatican library. This manuscript repeatedly casts aside the deity of Christ. It reflects the Arianism of Origen and is thought by some to be one of the surviving manuscripts by Eusebius at the command of Constantine. The date of its writing coincides with the 'ecumenical Bible' of Constantine. Interesting, this text, which led to the Jesuit-Douay Bible, was found just in time to counter the reformation which used the Received Text. If this text is true, then the truth had been kept from virtually all generations since Christ up until 1481. In 1844 AD The Sinaitic Codex Aleph manuscript was discovered at Mt. Sinai in the monastery of Saint Catherine. It agrees closely with the Vatican manuscript as it is Arian in nature and is probably another of the fifty that were written for Constantine.

“Who but those with Roman Catholic sympathies could ever be pleased with the notion that God preserved the true New Testament text in secret for almost one thousand years and then finally handed it over to the Roman pontiff for safekeeping?” - *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.91.*

“Going back to the time of the early church we find the Coptic Versions, the Latin Versions, and the Syrian Versions. These Bibles were in circulation before the Vaticanus was written. It is hard to see how God would allow the true text to be hidden in the Vatican library and in a waste paper basket in a cave for one thousand five years and to be brought to the light of day by two Cambridge professors [Westcott & Hort] who did not even believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures.” - *“Which Bible” and “True and False”, edited by David Otis Fuller.*

“We oppose facts to their speculation. They exalt B and Aleph and D8 because in their own opinions those copies are the best. They weave ingenious webs and invent subtle theories, because their paradox of a few against the many requires ingenuity and subtlety for its support. Dr. Hort revealed in finespun theories and technical terms, such as 'Intrinsic Probability,' 'Transcriptional Probability,' 'Internal evidence of Readings,' 'Internal evidence of Documents,' which of course connote a certain amount of evidence, but are weak pillars of a heavy structure....Even conjectural emendation and inconsistent decrees are not rejected. They are infected with the theorizing which spoils some of the best German work, and with the idealism which is the bane of many academic minds especially at Oxford and Cambridge....In contrast with this sojourn in cloudland, we are essentially of the earth though not earthly. We are nothing if we are not grounded in facts: Our appeal is to facts, our test lies in facts, so far as we can we build testimonies upon testimonies and pile facts on facts. We imitate the procedure of the courts of justice in decisions resulting from the converging product of all evidence, when it has been cross-examined and sifted....In the balances of these seven Tests of Truth the speculations of the Westcott and Hort school, which have bewitched millions are 'Tekel,' weighed in the balances and found wanting... I am utterly disinclined to believe, so grossly improbable does it seem - that at the end of 1800 years 995 copies out of every thousand, suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four, or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired... What, in the meantime, is to be thought of those blind guides - those deluded ones - who would now, if they could, persuade us to go back to those same codices of which the Church hath already purged herself?”- *Dean Burgon, The Revision Revised, p.334-335.*

4. The Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation

“Then the Bible, that serpent which with head erect and eyes flashing threatens us with its venom while it trails along the ground, shall be changed into a rod as soon as we are able to seize it... for three centuries past this cruel asp has left us no response. You well know with what folds it entwines us and with what fangs it gnaws us.” - *The Jesuits in History, Hector Macpherson, 1997 originally published 1900, ap.1.*

Jesuit Catechism: Q. What if the Holy Scriptures command one thing, and the Pope another contrary to it? A. The Holy Scriptures must be thrown aside. Q. What is the Pope? A. He is the Vicar of Christ, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and there is but one Judgment-Seat belonging to God and the Pope. - *Roy Livesey, 1998, Understanding the New Age: World Government and World Religion, p.104.*

Tyndale used the Received Text in his Bible and said to the Pope, "If God spare my life, before many years I will cause a boy that driveth a plough to know more of the Scriptures than thou doest." - *God Wrote Only One Bible, Jasper James Ray.*

"Whenever the so-called Counter-Reformation, started by the Jesuits, gained hold of the people, the vernacular was suppressed and the Bible kept from the laity. So eager were the Jesuits to destroy the authority of the Bible - the paper pope of the Protestants, as they contemptuously called - that they even did not refrain from criticizing its genuineness and historical value." - *Von Dobshutz, The Influence of the Bible, p.136.*

"The early church at Antioch used the Syrian Bible translated from Hebrew and Greek and is older than the Masoretic text. The Waldenses had access to these writings and in 1453 when the Turks captured Constantinople Greek scholars brought their manuscripts to the West."

"We must undermine the Bible of the Protestants and destroy their teachings" say the Jesuits... The Queen of England realizing the damage the Jesuit Bible would do, sent to Europe for Beza, who was with John Calvin, to help... Thomas Cartwright... With one hand he took hold of all the Greek manuscripts and with the other hand he took hold of all the Latin manuscripts from the Received Text, and he hit the Jesuit Bible blow after blow... Finally the Spanish Armada came against England with 136 armed ships, some with 50 cannons... England could only gather thirty ships and these were led by Sir Francis Drake. Freak storms came down the English Channel and the Spanish ships were found wrecked right up to the Scottish coast and England became a great sea power." - *Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.60.*

5. The Growth of Roman Influence in 19th Century England

Before the English people could go the way of the Continent and be brought to question their great English Bible, the course of their thinking must be changed. Much had to be done to discredit, in their eyes, the Reformation - its history, doctrines, and documents - which they looked upon as a great work of God. This task was accomplished by those who, while working under cover, passed as friends. In what numbers the Jesuits were at hand to bring this about, the following words, from one qualified to know, will reveal:

"Despite all the persecution they (the Jesuits) have met with, they have not abandoned England, where there are a greater number of Jesuits than in Italy; there are Jesuits in all classes of society; in Parliament; among the English clergy; among the Protestant laity, even in the higher stations. I could not comprehend how a Jesuit could be a Protestant priest, or how a Protestant priest could be a Jesuit; but my Confessor silenced my scruples by telling my, omnia munda mundis, and that St. Paul became a Jew that he might save the Jews; it was no wonder, therefore, if a Jesuit should feign himself a Protestant, for the conversion of Protestants. But pay attention, I entreat you, to discover concerning the nature of the religious movement in England termed Puseyism. The English clergy were formed too much attached to their Articles of Faith to be shaken from them. You might have employed in vain all the machines set in motion by Bossuet and the Jansenists of France to reunite them to the Romish Church; and so the Jesuits of England tried another plan. This was to demonstrate from history and ecclesiastical antiquity the legitimacy of the usages of the English Church, whence, through the exertions of the Jesuits concealed among its clergy, might arise a studious attention to Christian antiquity. This was designed to occupy the clergy in long, laborious, and abstruse investigation, and to alienate them from their Bibles." - *Desanctis, Popery and Jesuitism in Rome, pp.128, quoted in Walsh, Secret History of Oxford Movement, p.33.* Descartes was Priest at Rome, Professor of Theology, official Theological Censor of the Inquisition.

"Romanism is known to have recently entered the Church of England in the disguise of Oxford Tractarianism (1833-1841); to have drawn off no inconsiderable number of her clergy and members; and to have gained a footing on British soil, from which the government and public together are unable to reject her."

Newman (Leader of the Oxford movement who later went over to the Church of Rome) wrote in 1841 to a Roman Catholic: "Only through the English Church can you act upon the English nation. I wish, of course, our Church should be consolidated, with and through and in your communion, for its sake, and your sake, and for the sake of unity." - *Newman, Apologia, p.225.* He and his associates believed that Protestantism was Antichrist.

Faber one of the associates of Newman in the Oxford Movement, himself a brilliant writer, said: "Protestantism is perishing: what is good in it is by God's mercy being gathered into the garner of Rome... My whole life, God willing, shall be one crusade against the detestable and diabolical heresy of Protestantism." - *J.E. Bowden, Life of F.W. Faber, 1869, p.192.*

Pusey (well known member of the Oxford movement and author of "Minor Prophets" and "Daniel the Prophet" said: "I believe Antichrist will be infidel, and arise out of what calls itself Protestantism, and then Rome and England will be united in one to oppose it," - *Walter Walsh, Secret History of the Oxford Movement, p.202.*

6. Who were Westcott and Hort?

Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort became friends during their student days at Cambridge University. They worked for over thirty years together on the subject of the Greek text of the New Testament. Both were members of the Broad Church (or High Church) Party of the Church of England. Westcott went on to become the Bishop of Durham (England) and served for a while as chaplain to Queen Victoria. Hort is best remembered as a Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University.

Before 1900 any Bible in any language in the world was based on the Received Text except the Jesuit and Vulgate versions. With modern Greek scholarship many of the verses in the modern versions have better translation than in the older versions. But, if the grammar is improved it does not necessarily mean that the context has to be improved.

In 1881 AD The Westcott and Hort Greek Text was introduced upon which all modern versions are based. This text departed from the Textus Receptus and follows the Vatican and the Sinaitic corruptions. Tischendorf (1815-74), Tregelles (1813-75), Westcott (1825-1901), Hort (1828-92), and other contemporary scholars insisted that as a result of their labours the true New Testament text had at last been discovered after having been lost for well-nigh fifteen centuries.

"When Eberhard Nestle, in 1898, presented the first edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece*, he had achieved a work of which the consequences were not only unknown to him at the time, but also to the Wurtemberg Bible Society that made the edition possible. If the Textus receptus at that time still had a number of defenders, the science of the 19th century had however, finally proved it to be the worst text of the New Testament. There the editions of Tischendorf (since 1841, the finalized edition of *editio octava critica maior* of 1869/72), Tregelles (1857/72) and Westcott/Hort (1881) controlled the field. But in practiced terms at the level of university, church and school, the edition of the Textus receptus was still largely used internationally as for example by the British Bible Society till 1904. Only with the release of the Nestle text did the rule of the Textus receptus come to an end here also.

"Naturally Hort regarded those manuscripts as most trustworthy which give the readings recognized by Origen; and these no doubt were the readings which in the third century were most preferred at Alexandria. Thus Hort's method inevitably led to the exclusive adoption of the Alexandrian text."- *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, Benjamin G. Wilkinson, 1996.

Westcott and Hort had various non-Christian views, as their own writings testify. And given their stated hostility towards the Received Texts, it is obvious that such translators would not have produced a faithful, orthodox bible manuscript. Most of the following quotes are from books written by the sons of Westcott and Hort (published in 1896): *The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott* and *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*.

6.1. They were Catholic

6.1.1 They generally agreed with Catholicism over Protestantism

1.1.1-- Hort to Mr. John Ellerton, July 6, 1848: "The pure Romish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the Evangelical... We should bear in mind that that hard and unspiritual medieval crust which enveloped the doctrine of the sacraments in stormy times, though in measure it may have made it unprofitable to many men at that time, yet in God's providence preserved it inviolate and unscattered for future generations... We dare not forsake the sacraments or God will forsake us."

1.1.2-- Hort to Westcott, September 23, 1864: "I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so long ago by expressing a belief that 'Protestantism' is only parenthetical and temporary... Perfect Catholicity has been nowhere since the Reformation."

1.1.3-- Hort to Rev. Rowland Williams, October 21, 1858: "Further I agree with them (authors of *Essays and Reviews*) in condemning many specific doctrines of the popular theology... Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible." - *Which Bible?* by Dr. David Otis Fuller

6.1.2 The atonement

1.2.1-- Hort: "I think I mentioned to you before Campbell's book on the Atonement, which is invaluable as far as it goes; but unluckily he knows nothing except Protestant theology." - *Life*, vol. 1, p.322.

1.2.3-- Hort to Westcott, Oct. 15, 1860: "I entirely agree - correcting one word - with what you there say on the Atonement, having for many years believed that "the absolute union of the Christian (or rather, of man) with Christ Himself" is the spiritual truth of which the popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit... Certainly nothing can be more unscriptural than the modern limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to His death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy." - *Life*, vol. 1, p.430.

6.1.3 Mary-worship

1.3.1-- Westcott from France to his fiancée, 1847: "After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very

small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (i.e. a Virgin and dead Christ)... Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours." - *'Which Bible' by Dr. David Otis Fuller*

1.3.2-- Westcott, Sept.27, 1865: "I have been trying to recall my impressions of La Salette (a marian shrine). I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness; and how we can practically set forth the teaching of the miracles".

1.3.3-- Westcott to Rev. Benson, Nov.17: "As far as I could judge, the 'idea' of La Salette was that of God revealing Himself now, and not in one form but in many." - *Life, Vol.1, p.251.*

1.3.4-- Hort to Westcott, Oct.17: "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results. Perhaps the whole question may be said to be involved in the true idea of mediation, which is almost universally corrupted in one or both of two opposite directions. On the one hand we speak and think as if there were no real bringing near, such as the NT tells of, but only an interposition between two permanently distant objects. On the other we condemn all secondary human mediators as injurious to the one, and shut our eyes to the indestructible fact of existing human mediation which is to be found everywhere. But this last error can hardly be expelled till Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of Priesthood." - *Life, vol.2, p.49.*

6.1.4 Purgatory

1.4.1-- Hort to a young student: "The idea of purgation, of cleansing as by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the Divine chastisements; and, though little is directly said respecting the future state, it seems to me incredible that the Divine chastisements should in this respect change their character when this visible life is ended. "I do not hold it contradictory to the Article to think that the condemned doctrine has not been wholly injurious, inasmuch as it has kept alive some sort of belief in a great and important truth." - *Life., vol.2, p.336.*

1.4.2-- Hort to Rev. John Ellerton, 1854: "I agree with you in thinking it a pity that Maurice verbally repudiates purgatory, but I fully and unwaveringly agree with him in the three cardinal points of the controversy: 1)that eternity is independent of duration; 2) that the power of repentance is not limited to this life; 3) that it is not revealed whether or not all will ultimately repent. The modern denial of the second has, I suppose had more to do with the despiritualizing of theology than almost anything that could be named." - *Life, p.275.*

6.2 They were Evolutionists

2.1-- Hort to Westcott: "Have you read Darwin? How should I like to talk with you about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book." - *Life, vol.1, p.416.*

2.2-- Hort to John Ellerton, Apr. 3, 1860: "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. I must work out and examine the argument in more detail, but at present my feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period." - *Life, vol.1, p.416.*

2.3--"In this connection we see the full meaning of the words used of creation in Hebrews 11:3 By faith we understand that the worlds (the ages, i.e. the universe under the aspect of time) have been formed by the Word of God... The whole sequence of life in time, which we call 'the world' had been 'fitted together' by God. His one creative word included the harmonious unfolding on one plan of the last issues of all that was made. That which is in relation to Him 'one act at once' is in relation to us an evolution apprehended in orderly succession." - *Westcott, Some Lessons, p.187.*

2.4--Hort: "The beginning of an individual is precisely as inconceivable as the beginning of a species...It certainly startles me to find you saying that you have seen no facts which support such a view as Darwin's...But it seems to me the most probable manner of development, and the reflections suggested by his book drove me to the conclusion that some kind of development must be supposed." - *Life, p.430.*

2.5-- Hort to John Ellerton: "I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants." - *'Which Bible' by Dr. David Otis Fuller*

2.6-- Hort to MacMillan, Nov.9, 1860: "Another last word on Darwin...I shall not let the subject drop in a hurry, or, to speak more correctly, it will not let me drop. It has completely thrown me back into natural science, not that I had ever abandoned it either in intention, or altogether in practice. But now there is no getting rid of it any more than of a part of oneself." - *Life p.433.*

2.7-- Westcott to the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 4, 1890: "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did." - *'Which Bible' by Dr. David Otis Fuller*

6.3. They were Spiritists and Members of Esoteric Societies

3.1-- Hort to Westcott, Aug. 14, 1860: "It is of course true that we can only know God through human forms, but then I think the whole Bible echoes the language of Genesis 1:27 and so assures us that human forms are divine forms."

3.2-- "Yet he found time to attend meetings of the various societies, and in June joined the mysterious company of the 'Apostles.' He remained always a grateful and loyal member of the Secret Club, which has now [ca. 1896] become famous for the number of distinguished men who have belonged to it. In his time the Club was in a manner

reinvigorated, and he was mainly responsible for the wording of the oath which binds the members to a conspiracy of silence.” - *The Life and Letters of F.J.A. Hort, vol.1, p.170.*

3.3-- Hort: “Westcott, Gorham, C.B.Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Laurd, etc. and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances, and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective delusions; we shall be happy to obtain any good accounts well authenticated with names. Westcott is drawing up a schedule of questions. Cope calls us the 'Cock and Bull Club;' our own temporary name is the “Ghostly Guild.” - *Life, vol.1, p.211.*

3.4-- In 1882 the Society for Psychical Research was founded. In effect it was a combination of those groups already working independently in the investigation of spiritualism and other psychic phenomena (telepathy, clairvoyance, etc). Of these the most important was that centered round Henry Sidgwick, Frederic Myers and Edmund Gurnery, all Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, and deriving its inspiration from the Cambridge University Ghost Society, founded by no less a person than Edward White Benson, the future Archbishop of Canterbury.

3.5-- “Among the numerous persons and groups who in the middle of the nineteenth century were making enquiries into psychical occurrences may be mentioned a society from which our own can claim direct descent. In the Life of Edward White Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, by his son A.C. Benson, will be found, under the year 1851-2, the following paragraph: “Among my father's diversions at Cambridge was the foundation of a 'Ghost Society,' the forerunner of the Psychical Society [meaning the S.P.R.] for the investigation of the supernatural. Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort were among the members. He was then, as always, more interested in psychical phenomena than he cared to admit.” - *W.H.Salter, The Society For Psychical Research: An Outline of its History, 1948, p.5.*

3.6-- Darwin also attended SPR meetings. Arthur Balfour, who was a member of Hort's Apostles, Westcott's Eranus (Hort called this group a senior Apostles club), as well as President of the S.P.R., soon became the Prime Minister of England and instrumental in the first League of Nations. Balfour not only headed the S.P.R., holding seances at his home, but initiated a group called 'The Synthetic Society' whose goal was to create a 'one world religion'. He invited Frederic Myers of the S.P.R. to join and together they created “The preamble of all religions.” It included the dogma, “departed spirits can communicate.” - *www.historist.com.* The S.P.R. is now heavily involved with the new age movement.

3.7-- “The evolution from traditional mediumship to contemporary channeling has been gradual. The original spiritualism had its start in 1848...Organizations like the Society for Psychical Research in Britain were formed...When Russian-born Helena Petrovna Blavatsky found Theosophy in 1875, the slow transition toward modern channeling began... her two chief works, Isis Unveiled, and The Secret Doctrine laid the foundation for the modern New Age belief system.” - *Elliot Miller, 1989, Crash Course on the New Age.*

3.8-- “Lightfoot and Westcott both became bishops, and Hort Professor of Divinity. The S.P.R. has hardly lived up to the standard of ecclesiastical eminence set by the parent society.” - *W.H.Salter, The Society For Psychical Research: An Outline of its History, 1948, p.5.*

6.4. On Bible Manuscripts

6.4.1 They Considered the TR to be ‘vile’ and ‘corrupt’

4.1.1-- Hort to John Ellerton, Dec 20, 1851: “I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus. Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on later MSS; it is a blessing there are such early ones” - *Life, vol.1, p.211.*

4.1.2-- Hort to Rev. John Ellerton, Apr.19: “One result of our talk I may as well tell you. He (Westcott) and I are going to edit a Greek text of the New Testament some two or three years hence, if possible. Lachman and Tischendorf will supply rich materials, but not nearly enough; and we hope to do a good deal with Oriental versions. Our object is to supply clergymen generally, schools, etc., with a portable Greek text which shall not be disfigured with Byzantine corruptions.” - *Life, vol.1, p.250.*

6.4.2 They Considered gradual changes to be the best approach to a new text

4.2.1-- Westcott to Lightfoot, June 4: “Ought we not to have a conference before the first meeting for Revision? There are many points on which it is important that we should agree. The rules though liberal are vague, and the interpretation of them will depend upon decided action at first.” - *Life, vol.1, p.391.*

4.2.2-- Hort to Rev. Rowland and Williams, Oct. 21, 1858: “There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible...If this primary objection were removed, and I could feel our differences to be only of degree, I should still hesitate to take part in the proposed scheme... The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted upon by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time if it is allowed to go on quietly; but I fear that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism.” - *Life, vol.1, p.400.*

4.2.3-- Hort to Rev. J.L.I. Davies, May 14, 1870: “No rational being doubts the need of a revised Bible; and the popular practical objections are worthless. Yet I have an increasing feeling in favour of delay. Of course, no revision can be final, and it would be absurd to wait for perfection. But the criticism of both Testaments in text and

interpretation alike, appears to me to be just now in that chaotic state (in Germany hardly if at all less than in England), that the results of immediate revision would be peculiarly unsatisfactory. I John 5:7 might be got rid of in a month; and if that were done, I should prefer to wait a few years." - *Life*, vol.2, p.128. I John 5:7- For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

4.2.4-- Hort, July 7, 1870: "It is quite impossible to judge the value of what appear to be trifling alterations merely by reading them one after another. Taken together, they have often important bearings which few would think of at first...The difference between a picture say of Raffaele and a feeble copy of it is made up of a number of trivial differences...We have successfully resisted being warned off dangerous ground, where the needs of revision required that it should not be shirked... It is, one can hardly doubt, the beginning of a new period in Church history. So far the angry objectors have reason for their astonishment." - *Life*, p.138.

4.2.5-- Westcott to Hort, Sept 29: "As to our proposed recension of the New Testament text, our object would be, I suppose, to prepare a text for common and general use...With such an end in view, would it not be best to introduce only certain emendations into the received text, and to note in the margin such as seem likely or noticeable - after Griesbach's manner?"

4.2.6-- Westcott to Hort, May 29: "though I think that Convocation is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that as 'we three' are together it would be wrong not to 'make the best of it' as Lightfoot says. Indeed, there is a very fair prospect of good work, though neither with this body nor with any body likely to be formed now could a complete textual revision be possible. There is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin." - *Life*, vol.1, p.390.

4.2.7-- "I feel most keenly the disgrace of circulating what I feel to be falsified copies of Holy Scripture (a reference to the AV?) and am most anxious to provide something to replace them. This cannot be any text resting solely on our own judgment, even if we were not too inexperienced to make one; but it must be supported by a clear and obvious preponderance of evidence. The margin will give ample scope for our own ingenuity or principles...my wish would be to leave the popular received text except where it is clearly wrong." - *Life*, vol.1, p.228. Sometimes 'alternative' translations (traditional TR) are found in the margins. Then, in following versions those marginal notes are axed away.

7. Highlight of Changes in the Versions

It is possible to start with some of the lesser quality Bibles until we grow in our Christian walk and learn more about the differences. If there are differences that cannot be resolved, then we become unable to establish doctrine and are basically left with an relativistic-ecumenical document.

"The Revisers had a wonderful opportunity. They might have made a few changes and removed a few archaic expressions, and made the Authorized Version the most acceptable and beautiful and wonderful book of all time to come. But they wished ruthlessly to meddle. Some of them wanted to change doctrine. Some of them did not know good English literature when they saw it... There were enough modernists among the Revisers to change the words of Scripture itself so as to throw doubt on the Scripture." - Heal and Presbyter (Presbyterian), July 16, 1924, p.10.

"By the sole authority of textual criticism these men have dared to vote away some forty verses of the inspired Word. The Eunuch's Baptismal Profession of Faith is gone; and the Angel of the Pool of Bethesda has vanished; but the Angel of the Agony remains - till the next Revision. The Heavenly Witnesses have departed, and no marginal note mourns their loss. The last twelve verses of St. Mark are detached from the rest of the Gospel, as if ready for removal as soon as Dean Burgon dies. The account of the woman taken in adultery is placed in brackets, awaiting excision. Many other passages have a mark set against them in the margin to show that, like forest trees, they are shortly destined for the critic's axe. Who can tell when the destruction will cease?" - Dublin Review, July 1881.

of Verses Effected (Which Bible Can We Trust? - Les Garrett, 1982)

New American Standard - 909	Good News - 614
Revised Version - 788	Amplified - 484
New World Translation - 767	Douay - 421
NIV - 695	Old Jehovah's Witnesses - 120
NKJV ignored the textus recepticus 1200 times	

New World Translation (NWT)

The Jehovah's Witness Bible entitled the "New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures" was translated from the text of Westcott and Hort. Before Westcott and Hort's text was available, the JW's had the KJV and modified it. JW's was the first to change, early in the 1900's when Westcott and Hort produced their document. The JW's didn't have their own version because there had been no other version except the Jesuit Douay version which had been rejected totally by the reformation. More modern versions have emulated the JW's by casting doubt in the margins of the authenticity of the verses that the JW's removed. There was a huge cry after the revisions of the JW bible became known but today there are even greater changes with less complaint.

Missing Verses

Matt. 16:3

Revisions

John 1:1

Additions/Omissions

Mark 9:46
Mark 16:9-20, John 8:1-11
Acts 8:37, 1 John 5:7

New International Version (NIV)

From the middle of the book of Acts in an NIV bible and the number of words till the end of revelation, that will roughly equal the number of words gone - 60,000. There is confusion because of the use of the term "morning star" in some Bibles (i.e. the NIV) which is given both to Lucifer (in Isa. 14:12) and Christ (in Rev. 22:16).

"This passage [Acts 15:23] is used as a foundation on which to base an argument for a clergy separated by God in their function from the lay brethren. It makes a vast difference, in sending out this authoritative letter, from the first council of the Christian Church, whether it issued from the apostles and elders only, or issued from the apostles, elders, and the brethren. Here again to effect this change the Revisers omitted two Greek words." - Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, Benjamin G. Wilkinson, 1996.

One writer thus registers his indignation upon the change made in 1 Cor. 5:7: "Mad? Yes; and haven't I reason to be mad when I find that grand old passage, 'For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us' - a passage which sounds the keynote of the whole doctrine of redemption - unnecessarily changed into, 'For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ'? And we have such changes everywhere. They are, I believe, called improvements in style by their authors - and certainly by no one else." - Rev. E.B. Birks in Dr. Warfield's Collection of Opinions, vol.2, p.30.

Missing Verses

Luke 9:55,56
Matt.27:35

Revisions

2 Samuel 23:5
Hosea 11:12
Rev. 22:14
Acts 13:42, 15:23
1 Pet. 1:22, 4:6
2 Tim. 4:1
Matt. 18:2,3
Heb. 11:3, 1:2
Heb. 9:27, 10:21
Col 1:14
2 Thess. 2:2
John 9:4
James 5:16
Job 26:5
2 Pet. 2:9
1 Cor.15:3,4
Prov. 8:22

Additions/Omissions

2 Samuel 21:19
Matt. 25:13, 24:36, 13:51
Mark 2:17, 10:21, 10:24, 7:19
Luke 4:4, 4:8, 1:72, 2:33
Rev. 14:5,5:14
Acts 16:7, 24:15, 9:29,22:16
1 Cor. 5:7, 11:29, 11:24
Heb. 7:21
Eph. 3:9
John 5:39, 2:11, 16:16
Mark 15:3
1 John 4:3
Matt. 6:13
Luke 11:2-4
Rom. 1:3
1 Tim 3:16 (Paul's battle cry)
1 John 5:7

Revised Standard Version (RSV)

"The word 'miracle' is found, singular and plural, thirty-two times in the Authorized Version of the New Testament. Alas! What desolation has been wrought by the Revised! In twenty-three of these instances, the word 'miracle' has entirely disappeared. In the case of the other nine, although the term is used in the text, its force is robbed by a weakening substitute in the margin." - Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, Benjamin G. Wilkinson, 1996.

Dr. Alexander Roberts, a member of the English New Testament Committee writes on Acts 3:19,20: "Acts 3:19,20. An impossible translation here occurs in the Authorized Version, in which we read:... For eschatological reasons, it is most important that the true rendering of this passage should be presented. It is thus given in the Revised Version:..." - Roberts, Companion, p.80.

A Catholic magazine claims that the Revised Version is the death knell of Protestantism: "On the 17th of May the English speaking world awoke to find that its Revised Bible had banished the Heavenly Witnesses and put the devil in the Lord's Prayer. Protests loud and deep went forth against the insertion: against the omission none. It is well, then, that the Heavenly Witnesses should depart whence their testimony is no longer received. The Jews have a legend that shortly before the destruction of their Temple, the Shechinah departed from the Holy of Holies, and the Sacred Voices were heard saying, "Let us go hence." So perhaps it is to be with the English Bible, the Temple of Protestantism. The going forth of the Heavenly Witnesses is the sign of the beginning of the end. Lord Panmure's prediction may yet prove true - the New Version will be the death knell of Protestantism - Dublin Review (Catholic), July 1881.

"From the Very Rev. Thomas S. Preston, of St. Ann's (R.C.) Church of New York: 'The brief examination which I have been able to make of the Revised Version of the New Testament has convinced me that the Committee have labored with great sincerity and diligence, and that they have produced a translation much more correct than that generally received among Protestants. It is to us a gratification to find that in very many instances they have adopted the reading of the Catholic Version, and have thus by their scholarship confirmed the correctness of our Bible.'" - Dr. Warfield's Collection of Opinions, vol.2, p.21.

Cardinal Wiseman exults that the Revision Movement vindicates the Catholic Bible: "When we consider the scorn cast by the Reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the Vulgate, and obtained for it its critical preeminence, are Protestants."

Canon Farrar claims the change [in Heb.9:27] was deliberate: "Canon Farrar ought to know, because he was a member of that brilliant organization the 'Apostles Club'...Farrar said on this change: "There is a positive certainty that it does not mean 'the judgment' in the sense in which that word is popularly understood. By abandoning the article which King James translators here incorrectly inserted, the Revisers help, as they have done in so many other places, silently to remove deep-seated errors. At the death of each of us there follows 'a judgment,' as the sacred writer says: the judgment, the final judgment, may not be for centuries to come. In the omission of that unauthorized little article from the Authorized Version by the Revisers, lies no less a doctrine than that of the existence of an Intermediate State." - Canon F.W. Farrar, Contemporary Review, March 1882.

Rabbi Balfour Brickner of Temple Sinai, Washington: "I am delighted to know that at least this great error of translation has been finally corrected, and that at least some elements of the Christian world no longer officially maintain that Isaiah 7:14 is prediction that Jesus was to be born of the Virgin Mary." - "Which Bible Can We Trust", Les Garrett, p.49

<u>Missing Verses</u>	<u>Revisions</u>	<u>Additions/Omissions</u>
Matt. 18:11,27:35	Rev. 22:14	Matt.5:44, 20:16, 25:13, 24:3
Matt. 20:22,23	Acts 13:42, 15:23	Mark 2:17, 6:11, 10:21, 10:24, Matt 2:15 (Hosea 11:1 is now not a fulfillment of prophecy)
Mark 15:28	1 Pet. 1:22, 4:6	Mark 13:14, 7:19, 15:3
Luke 9:55,56	2 Tim. 4:1	Luke 2:14, 4:4, 4:8, 23:44, 1:72
Luke 22:43,44	John 2:11	John 10:14, 5:39, 3:13, 6:33
Acts 28:29	Matt. 18:2, 16:22	1 Cor. 10:28, 5:7, 7:5, 11:29
Mark 16:9-20	John 1:3,4,9:4,7:8	Rev. 14:5
Luke 24:40	Heb. 11:3, 1:2	Acts 16:7, 24:15, 2:30, 8:36,22:16
	Heb 10:21, 9:27	Phil. 3:20,21
	Col 1:15,16, 1:14	Heb. 7:21
	2 Thess. 2:2	Matt. 1:25, 1:16, 13:51, 19:16-17
	Titus 2:13	Luke 2:33, 11:2
	Rev. 1:7, 13:8	1 John 4:3
	James 5:16	Matt. 6:13
	Job 26:5	John 6:47, 16:16, 16:23
	1 Cor.15:3,4	Rom.1:3,9:5,14:10
	Is. 7:14	1 Cor.15:47
	Ps. 45:6 & Heb. 1:8 1 Tim 3:16 (Paul's battle cry)	1 Pet. 4:14
	Prov. 8:22	Rev.1:11,5:14
	Dan. 3:25	
	Micah 5:2	

American Standard Version (ASV)

<u>Missing Verses</u>	<u>Revisions</u>	<u>Additions/Omissions</u>
	2 Tim. 3:16	Mark 10:21, 15:3
	Rev. 22:14, 1:7	Phil. 3:20,21
	1 Cor.15:3,4	
	Titus 2:13	
	Dan. 3:25	
	Matt.2:15	

New American Standard Version (NASV)

"You will always be my friend but I can no longer ignore the criticisms. I cannot refute them, and dear brother I have not a thing against you, but the only thing I can do under God, is to renounce every attachment to the New American Standard Bible."

- Dr. Frank Logsdon to F. Lockman, - Les Garrett, 1982, Which Bible Can We Trust? p.236.

<u>Missing Verses</u>	<u>Revisions</u>	<u>Additions/Omissions</u>
	Job 19:26	Luke 24:51,52

Douay

Council of Trent, fourth session, 1546 "Whoever shall not receive as sacred and canonical all these books and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the catholic church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed."

"The Douay is like the Revised. On this change R. George Milligan says: "Acts 16:7,... the striking reading, 'the Spirit of Jesus' (not simply as in the Authorized Version 'the Spirit') implies that the Holy Spirit had so taken possession of the Person of the Exalted Jesus that He could be spoken of as 'the Spirit of Jesus.'" - Milligan, Expository Value, p.99.

Missing Verses

Revisions

Additions/Omissions

Acts 13:42
2 Tim. 4:1
Col 1:14

Luke 4:8, 2:33, 11:2-4
Acts 16:7
1 Cor. 5:7
Heb. 7:21
Matt 6:13

Moffat

Revision: Luke 23:44 "...till three o'clock, owing to an eclipse of the sun."

The Apocrapha

Bewitching art: Tobias 6:4-8.
Rebuke: Mark 16:17, Acts 16:18.

Works: Tobias 12:9
Rebuke: 1 Pet. 1:18-19.

Prayer for dead: 2 Maccabees 12:43-46
Rebuke: John 1:7.

The Vulgate

Council of Trent (1545-1563) proposed the Vulgate Latin Bible as the only authentic translation. Pope Sixtus V declared the Vulgate infallible but Clement III in 1592 ordered a better edition and 2000 changes were made.

2 Tim. 3:16 - All Scripture is God-breathed.

Douay- All scripture inspired of God is profitable.

Heb.11:21 - Jacob worshipped as he leaned on top of his staff.

Vulgate- Jacob adored the top of his rod.

Rev. 22:14 - Blessed are they that wash their robes (Codex Vaticanus)

KJV - Blessed are they that do his commandments.

1. Why Do (Some) Protestants Worship On Sunday?

“Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day *is* the sabbath of the LORD thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates: For *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.” (Ex 20:8-11 KJV)

“It *is* a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.” (Ex 31:17 KJV)

Some churches have services on multiple days but the prime day of worship for the majority of the congregation should be the solemn day. The sabbath, translated as Saturday, was in Old Testament (pre-Christ) times the day of worship given by the fourth commandment. If the OT is definite on this issue then we have to know if and where the New Testament denies the solemnity of the sabbath or shifts it to another day (Sunday) for very explicit and understandable reasons. That the case for Sunday must be nearly obvious is necessary not only because the large majority of Christians hold to the solemnity of Sunday but also because the Bible (the OT & NT) is one continuous document of revelation, and the Word of God surely does not contradict Himself.

2. A Multi-Issue Question

Given that the Bible is inerrant in content, complete in truth, and authoritative in teaching, the issues related to the keeping of the sabbath can be summarised as such:

2.1 Creation & Law:

The sabbath is memorial to Creation and kept by the command of the Creator (Ex. 20:8,11). The Law would have less or no authority if the law-giver is not also the creator, if God took longer than one week to complete creation, or if the seventh day of rest is still continuing (as some interpret John 5:17, etc.). Since sin is transgression of the law (Rom. 4:15, 1 John 3:4) then did Christ or the NT change or even negate the law? What is the authority of the ten commandments to the NT church? Should a person be put to death for not keeping the sabbath? (Ex. 31:14, 15)

2.2 Eschatology & Political-Economics:

The sabbath is a sign between God and his people (Ex 31:17). Since the word “sign” is closely translated as “mark” then this immediately conjures up thoughts of the mark of the beast (Rev. 16:2, 19:20, 20:4). Could the issue of keeping the sabbath, and God’s commandments in general, play a significant part in the end of times? However, the mark, in some cases, may actually be physical (Eze. 9:4,6).

The sabbath was given to man as weekly day of peace, refreshment, and rest from work (Ex. 20:9,10, Mark 2:27). By legislating one day as a non-work day the state would likely align itself with some branches of Christianity and church denominations. A neutral position could be two days of rest per week and operations allowed on Sunday.

3. Biblical Theology

Why would the disciples, early church fathers, or the Church itself desire to commemorate some important event by making solemn the day it occurred? Where would they get the authority to do this? Why would the entire body of Christ since then follow their teaching? How can this be possible if God and His law doesn't change (Heb. 13:8, Matt. 5:17-19)? Instead, we should honour Christ by obeying Him (John 14:15 15:10, 1 John 5:3) and worship Him in Spirit and in truth (John 4:24). Surely we should not transgress God's commandments with tradition (Dan.7:25, Ezek. 22:26,28; Matt. 15:3, Mark 7:9).

3.1 Jesus, Paul, and the disciples

Jesus kept the sabbath (Luke 4:16), healed (Luke 14:3-5) and worked for food on the sabbath (Matt. 12:1). Jesus and His disciples did this because "the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day" (Matt. 12:8) and because "the sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath" (Mark 2:27). Jesus expected His followers to be keeping the sabbath after he ascended (Matt 24:20). Paul preached to and reasoned with Jews, Gentiles, and entire cities on the sabbath (Acts 13:14,42,44, 16:3, 17:2, 18:4).

3.2 Jesus's resurrection and first appearance

Mary Magdalene and the other Mary attended to Jesus' body and then kept the sabbath (Matt. 28:1, Luke 23:54-56, 24:1). Mary returned on the first day of the week to find the tomb empty and Jesus resurrected (Mark 16:1,2,9, Luke 24:2, John 20:1). Jesus then saw his disciples the same day (John 20:19). Was the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1) on the sabbath (Acts 1:12)?

3.3 Other cases & verses

- The sabbath days in Col. 2:16 refer to those sabbaths commanded as part of the ceremonial law (Lev. 16:29-34, 23:4-8, 15-16, 23, 34-36, 25:1-7, 8-9, 26:2, 34-35; 2 Ch. 36:21). This law was completed by Christ and nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14, Gal 3:10, 13, Rom 3:28, Gal 2:16).
- What does it mean the "Lord's day" (Rev 1:10)? If it is a day of the week then surely it is the sabbath (Matt. 12:8). Especially given the context of the Book of Revelation, the Lord's day could refer to when the Lord will exact his vengeance (Isa. 34:8, Zep. 1:8, 14, 2:2). John did witness "the things which shall be hereafter" (Rev 1:19).
- Whether a person esteems one day above the other or esteems every day alike, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. 14:5). This is acceptable since we are to live by faith (Rom. 14:23), not put stumblingblocks in front of our brother (Rom. 14:13-14), and whether we live or die we are the Lord's (Rom. 14:8). Whatever Rom.14:5 implies it does not involve switching the day of worship from the last to the first day.
- The meeting of Acts 20:7 was held on Saturday night after the sabbath. Paul preached into the night because he was leaving the next morning. The disciples broke bread daily (Acts 2:46).
- The putting aside money was done on the first day of the week (1 Cor. 16:1,2), thereby keeping the sanctity of the sabbath.

4. Historical Theology

4.1 Definition of the day of the week

The sabbath is the seventh day of the week from Friday at dusk to Saturday at dusk (Mark 16:1-2; Ex. 20:10, Acts 20:7). New dictionaries say that Sunday is the day after Saturday and before Monday.

"Monday was the moon's day, and with the assimilation of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian pagan gods, Tyr, one of the oldest gods of Norse mythology, became identified with Mars and thus we have Tys dagr or Tuesday; Wednesday is derived from Woden, also known as Odin; and Thor, the thunder god of the early Germanic peoples became synonymous with Thursday equated as he was with the Roman god Jupiter; while Friday is named after Frigg, the wife of Odin and the mother of another pagan god, Balder. The day of Saturn or Saturday was followed by Sunday, the day of rest and recreation, as it is observed today." – *The Sun in Myth and Art UNESCO, p.90*.

"Sabbath... A Hebrew word signifying rest... Sunday was a name given by the heathens to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshipped the sun." - *John Eadie, D.D., LL.D. A Bible Cyclopedia, p.561*.

"Sunday ... so called because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun, or its worship." - *Webster's International Dictionary, 19th ed.*

"Sunday (Dies Solis of the Roman calendar, 'day of the Sun,' being dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week." - *Schaff-Herza Encyclopedia, Sunday*.

4.2 The paganism of Sunday worship

"Almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries (the Lord's supper) on the Sabbath of every week... yet the Christians of Alexandria and Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this." - *Ecclesiastical History, bk.5, ch.22, NPNF 2nd series, v2, p.132*.

"Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet (the sun)... The Christians thought fit to keep the same day and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles." - *Six Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p.23*.

"The sun was a foremost god with heathendom... The sun has worshippers at this hour in Persia and other lands... There is, in truth, something royal, kingly about the sun, making it a fit emblem of Jesus, the Sun of Justice. Hence the Church in these countries would seem to have said, 'Keep that old pagan name. It shall remain consecrated, sanctified.' And thus the pagan Sunday, dedicated to Balder, became the Christian Sunday, sacred to Jesus." - *The Catholic World, March 1894, p.809*.

"This tendency... to meet paganism halfway was very early developed... Upright men strove to stem the tide, but... the apostasy went on, 'til the Church, with the exception of a small remnant, was submerged under pagan superstition." - *The Two Babylons, p.93*.

4.3 Ancient Sunday laws

We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (AD 336), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday. "The Church, ... after changing the day of rest from the Jewish Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, to the first, made the third commandment refer to Sunday as the day to be kept holy as the Lord's Day." - *Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 4, p. 153*

"On the venerable Day of the Sun let the Magistrates and people residing in the cities rest, and let all workshops be closed." - *Edict of Constantine, A.D. 321*

"Christians shall not Judaize (keep Sabbath) and be idle on Saturday (Sabbath original) but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour." - *Council of Laodicea, canon 29*.

“From the apostles time until the council of Laodicea, which was about 364, the holy observation of the Jew's Sabbath continued, as may be proved out of many authors; yea notwithstanding the decree of the council against it. - *“Sunday as Sabbath,” John Lea, p.163.*

“That the Sabbath was kept, 'notwithstanding the decree of the council against it' is also seen from the fact that Pope Gregory I (AD 590-604) wrote against Roman citizens (who) forbid any work done on the Sabbath day.” - *Nicene' and post-Nicene Fathers, second series, vol.XIII, p.13.*

Synod of Tholouse AD 1163: “The bishops and priests take care and to forbid under pain of excommunication, every person from presuming to give reception or at least assistance to the followers of this heresy, which first began in the country of Tholouse, whenever they shall be discovered, neither were they to have any dealings with them in buying or selling; that being so deprived of the common assistance of life, they might be compelled to repent of the evil of their way. Whosoever shall dare to contravene this order, let them be excommunicated, as a partner with them in guilt. As many of them as can be found let them be imprisoned by the catholic princes and punished with the forfeiture of all their substance.” - *King Ildenfonfus of Arragon banished all Waldensers in 1194 as a consequence.*

4.4 Protestant denominations concerning the day of worship

Anglican: “Many people think that Sunday is the Sabbath, but neither in the New Testament nor in the early church, is there anything to suggest that we have any right to transfer the observance of the seventh day of the week to the first. The Sabbath was and is Saturday and not Sunday” - *Rev. Lionel Beere, Church and People, Sept. 1st 1947.*

Anglican: “Reverend Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, sent local clergymen into a huddle today by saying outright that there was nothing to support Sunday being kept holy. Carrington definitely told a church meeting in this city of straightlaced protestantism that tradition, not the Bible, had made Sunday the day of worship.” - *Toronto Daily Star, Oct. 26, 1949.*

Baptist: “There was and is a commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday... There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh day to the first day of the week.” - *Dr. Edward T. Hiscox (author of the Baptist Manual) New York Ministers Conference, Nov. 13, 1893.*

Congregationalist: “It is quite clear that however rigidly or devoutly we spend Sunday, we are not keeping the Sabbath... There is not a single sentence in the New Testament to suggest that we incur any penalty violating the supposed sanctity of Sunday.” - *Dr. R.W. Dale, The Ten Commandments, p.100.*

Episcopal: “Is there any command in the New Testament to change the day of weekly rest from Saturday to Sunday? None.” - *Manual of Christian Doctrine, p.127.*

Lutheran: “The observance of the Lord's day (Sunday) is founded not on any command of God, but on the authority of the church.” - *The Augsburg Confession, Catholic Sabbath Manual, part 2, section 10.*

Methodist: “Take the matter of Sunday... there is no passage telling Christians to keep that day, or to transfer the Jewish Sabbath to that day.” - *H.F. Rall, Christian Advocate, July 2, 1942.*

Presbyterian: “A change of the day to be observed from the last day of the week to the first. There is no record, no express command, authorizing this change.” - *N.L. Rice, The Christian Sabbath, p.60.*

4.5 Protestant error: the Reformation is not complete

“The Bible says remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. The Catholic church says No! By my divine power I abolish the Sabbath day and command you to keep holy the first day of the week. And lo the entire civilized world bows down in reverent obedience to the command of the holy Catholic church.” - *Father Enright, American Sentinal June 1893.*

“...the observance of Sunday by Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the Catholic Church.” - *Monsignor Louis Segar, Plain Talk about the Protestantism of Today, p.213.*

“But the Protestant says: How can I receive the teachings of an apostate Church? How, we ask, have you managed to receive her teachings all your life, in direct opposition to your recognized teacher, the Bible, on the Sabbath question.” - *The Christian Sabbath (2nd. ed.; Baltimore; The Catholic Mirror, 1893, p.29.*

“The New Testament makes no explicit mention that the apostles changed the day of worship, but we know it from tradition.” - *The New Revised Baltimore Catechism (1949), p.139.*

“You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday.” - *James Cardinal Gibbons, The Faith of our Fathers, p.89.*

“Sunday is a Catholic institution, and its claims to observance can be defended only on Catholic principles... From the beginning to the end of Scripture there is not a single passage which warrants the transfer of weekly public worship from the last day of the week to the first.” - *Catholic Press (Sydney) August 25, 1900.*

“The Protestants would follow the Bible, they should worship God on the Sabbath Day. In keeping the Sunday they are following a law of the Catholic Church.” - *Albert Smith, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, replying for the Cardinal in a letter dated February 10, 1920.*

“Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Roman [Catholic] Church, has no good reasons for its Sunday theory, and ought logically to keep Saturday as the Sabbath.” - *John Gilmary Shea, in the “American Catholic Quaterly Review”, January 1883.*

“Reason and common sense demand the acceptance of One or the other of these alternatives: either Protestantism and the keeping holy of Saturday, or Catholicity and the keeping holy of Sunday. Compromise is impossible.” - *The Catholic Mirror, December 23, 1893.*”

“It was upon this very point that the Reformation was condemned by the Council of Trent. The Reformers had constantly charged, as here stated, that the Catholic Church had “apostatized” from the truth as contained in the written Word. “The written Word,” “The Bible and the Bible only,” “Thus saith the Lord,” these were their constant watchwords; and “the Scripture, as in the written Word, the sole standard of appeal,” this was the proclaimed platform of the Reformation and of Protestantism. “The Scripture and tradition,” The Bible as interpreted by the Church and according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers,” this was the position and claim of the Catholic Church. This was the main issue in the Council of Trent, which was called especially to consider the questions that had been raised and forced upon the attention of Europe by the Reformers.

Finally, after a long and intensive mental strain, the Archbishop of Reggio came into the council with substantially the following argument to the party who held for Scripture alone: “The Protestants claim to stand upon the written Word only. They profess to hold the Scripture alone as the standard of faith. They justify their revolt by the plea that the Church has apostatized from the written Word and follows tradition. Now the Protestants claim, that they stand upon the written Word only, is not true. Their profession of holding the Scripture alone as the standard of faith, is false. PROOF: The written Word explicitly enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. They do not observe the seventh day, but reject it. If they do truly hold the Scripture alone as their standard, they would be observing the seventh day as is enjoined in the Scripture throughout. Yet they not only reject the observance of the Sabbath enjoined in the written Word, but they have adopted and do practice the observance of Sunday, for which they have only the tradition of the Church. Consequently the claim of 'Scripture alone as the standard,' fails; and the doctrine of 'Scripture and tradition' as essential, is fully established, the Protestants themselves being judges.” - *J.H. Holtzman, Canon and Tradition, 1859, p.263.* Archbishop Reggio made his speech at the last opening session of Trent, on the 18th of January 1562.

4.6 The impact of Catholic doctrine upon civilization

“We have made a change from the seventh day to the first day, from Saturday to Sunday, on the authority of the one holy Catholic and apostolic church of Christ.” - *Why we keep Sunday. p.28.*

“Sunday is our mark of authority... The Church is above the Bible, and this transference of Sabbath observance is proof of that fact.” - *Catholic Record, September 1, 1923.*

“Of course the Catholic church claims that the change was her act, and the act is a mark of her ecclesiastical power.” - *Faith of our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons. Letter, Oct. 28, 1895, from C.F. Thomas, Chancellor of Cardinal Gibbons.*

“Q. Which is the Sabbath day? A. Saturday is the Sabbath day. Q. Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday? A. We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.” - *The Convert's Chatechism of Catholic doctrine, 1957, p.50.*

“Sunday is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church, as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.” - *Editorial, The Catholic Mirror, Baltimore, September 23, 1893.*

Not the Creator of the Universe, in Genesis 2:1-3, but the Catholic Church “can claim the honor of having granted man a pause to his work every seven days.” - *S.C. Mosna, 'Storia della Domenica', 1969, p.366.*

“Sunday is founded not on Scripture, but on tradition, and is a distinctly Catholic institution.” - *Catholic Record, Sept. 17, 1893.*

“The authority of the church could therefore not be bound to the authority of the Scriptures, because the Church had changed... the Sabbath into Sunday, not by command of Christ, but by its own authority.” - *Canon and Tradition, p.263.*

“The Sunday... is purely a creation of the Catholic Church.” - *American Catholic Quaterly Review, January 1883.*

“Sunday... It is a law of the Catholic Church alone...” - *American Sentinel (Catholic) June 1893.*

“The (Catholic) Church changed the observance of the Sabbath to Sunday by right of the divine, infallible authority given to her by her Founder, Jesus Christ. The Protestant claiming the Bible to be the only guide of faith, has no warrant for observing Sunday. In this matter the Seventh-day Adventist is the only consistent Protestant.” - *The Question Box, The Catholic Univers Bulletin, August 14, 1942, p.4*

“Most Christians assume that Sunday is the biblically approved day of worship. The Roman Catholic Church protests that it transferred Christian worship from the biblical Sabbath (Saturday) to Sunday, and that to try to argue that the change was made in the Bible is both dishonest and a denial of Catholic authority. If Protestantism wants to base its teachings only on the Bible, it should worship on Saturday.” - *www.immaculateheart.com/maryonline, December 2003*

4.7 The movement for modern Sunday laws

“All businesses, including gasoline stations and restaurants, should close every Sunday by force of legislative fiat through the duly elected officials of the people.” - *Christianity Today*, May 7, 1976, Harold Lindsell, editor.

"The next obligation that a citizen of God's world order owes is to himself. 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy' is a command for the personal benefit of each citizen... Higher civilizations rise when people can rest and draw inspiration from God. Laws in America that mandated a day of rest (Sunday laws) have been nullified as a violation of the separation of church and state... As an outright insult to God and his plan, only those policies that can be shown to have a clearly secular purpose are recognized." - *Pat Robertson, The New World Order*, p.236.

“When, through the centuries, she has made laws concerning Sunday rest, (109) the Church has had in mind above all the work of servants and workers, certainly not because this work was any less worthy when compared to the spiritual requirements of Sunday observance, but rather because it needed greater regulation to lighten its burden and thus enable everyone to keep the Lord's Day holy. In this matter, my predecessor Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* spoke of Sunday rest as a worker's right which the State must guarantee... Therefore, also in the particular circumstances of our own time, Christians will naturally strive to ensure that civil legislation respects their duty to keep Sunday holy.” - *DIES DOMINI*

4.8 The SDA Church and the Catholic Mirror

On February 24, 1893, the General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists adopted certain resolutions appealing to the government and people of the United States from the decision of the Supreme Court declaring this to be a Christian nation, and from the action of Congress in legislating upon the subject of religion. In March 1893, the International Religious Liberty Association printed these resolutions in a tract entitled *Appeal and Remonstrance*. On receipt of one of these, the editor of the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore, Maryland, which was the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons and the Vatican in the United States, published a series of four editorials, which appeared in that paper September 2, 9, 16, and 23, 1893.

This article is an expose of the Sabbath as good as any Seventh-Day Adventist could write. The Catholic Church wrote it, out of extreme arrogance, to prove that the both the Old and New Testaments require the honouring of Saturday as the Sabbath so that it could be recognized that it was out of her authority, and not God's, that churches now worship on Sunday. The Catholic Church will blatantly admit that they changed the day of worship because it is a symbol and proof of her authority.

“The Adventists are the only body of Christians with the Bible as their teacher, who can find no warrant in its pages for the change of the day from the seventh to the first. Hence their appellation, “Seventh-day Adventists.” Their cardinal principle consists in setting apart Saturday for the exclusive worship of God, in conformity with the positive command of God himself, repeatedly reiterated in the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments, literally obeyed by the children of Israel for thousands of years to this day, and endorsed by the teaching and practice of the Son of God whilst on earth.

No Protestant living today has ever yet obeyed that command, preferring to follow the “apostate church” referred to than his teacher the Bible, which, from Genesis to Revelation, teaches no other doctrine, should the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists be correct. Both sides appeal to the Bible as their “infallible” teacher. Let the Bible decide whether Saturday or Sunday be the day enjoined by God. One of the two bodies must be wrong, and, whereas a false position on this all-important question involves terrible penalties, threatened by God Himself, against the transgressor of this “perpetual covenant,” we shall enter on the discussion of the merits of the arguments wielded by both sides.”

There was no getting around this, for the Protestants' own statement of faith -- the Augsburg Confession, 1530 -- had clearly admitted that “the observance of the Lord's day” had been appointed by “the Church” only.

The challenge issued by Rome over 100 years ago remains: Either the Catholic Church is right, or the Seventh Day Adventists are right. There can be no other choice. And if one choose neither, then the whole doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* collapses, and with it, the pillar upon which all of Protestantism stands. What one has left is an invented religion, an invented God, and an invented set of beliefs that suits man's purpose, and not the Creator's. Like Satan and Luther before them, Protestants have spoken the creed, in action and in thought, if not in word, “I Will Not Serve.” - www.immaculateheart.com/marionline, December 2003

God Loves You

For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life (John 3:16).

All Are Sinners

For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23).

As it is written, "There is none righteous, not even one" (Romans 3:10).

Jesus Christ: God's Remedy for Sin

For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord (Romans 6:23).

But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, even to those who believe in His name (John 1:12).

For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures (1 Corinthians 15:34).

Our Response

If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness (1 John 1:9).

Whoever will call on the name of the Lord will be saved (Romans 10:13).

Assurance As a Believer

That if you confess with your mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved (Romans 10:9).

Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death and into life (John 5:24).

But these have been written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in His name (John 20:31).

Next Steps

But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18).

Straightening up, Jesus said to her, "Woman, where are they? Did no one condemn you?" She said, "No one, Lord." And Jesus said, I do not condemn you either. Go, and sin no more (John 8:10-11).