

THE SABBATH of CREATION

"THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, AND THE FAITH OF JESUS."—Rev. xiv. 12.

AN UNDENOMINATIONAL CHRISTIAN PAPER.

Printed & published by Lady Blount, at 11, Gloucester Road, Kingston Hill, Surrey.

No. 10.

JANUARY, 1904.

ONE PENNY.

CREATION'S CHRONOLOGY.

No. VI.

The creation of the world proves that both Time and Space are limited in duration and extent. Men may make guesses, but they know nothing of unlimited Time, or infinite Space. Both alike are unthinkable and unscriptural. Time began with Creation; and if Time be the sequence of celestial motion it must have begun with the revolution of the heavenly lights and light-bearing orbs. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The first verse of Genesis I. is a sort of heading to the whole chapter. That it does not refer to any creation previous to the Adamic creation was shewn in a previous article. Our Lord, referring to the creation of Adam and Eve, says it took place in "The Beginning"; that is, during creation week, on the sixth day. The week, therefore, is the measure of the creation period, including its memorial, the Seventh Day Sabbath, or Rest. And it is remarkable that, while planetary motion marks off all other subdivisions of Time, the Week is unique; that is, it is not so marked off, but it is the measure of some special period, namely, the Creation of the World. So that, looked upon in this light, the universal week is an ever-recurring testimony to the marvellous work of the Creator. The sun rules the day, the moon decides the natural month, the stars the sidereal, and the sun the solar year, and the eclipses and the planets the longer cycles; but the week, with the divinely appointed Sabbath as its blessed conclusion, can only be traced back to creation and the ordinance of God!

In the previous chapter, from data given in the Bible, I traced down the Line of Time to the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt in the year of the world 2513. Moses was eighty years of age at that time, so that he was born in 2433 A.M. The Exodus was one of the most important events in the history of the world, for it gave liberty, and as it were birth, to a nation which is destined to dominate all nations. The man Moses, chosen by God to lead forth the Israelites, was no less remarkable. Educated at the court of a powerful earthly king, and disciplined by the special providence of

a heavenly One, Moses became one of the most learned and notable men of ancient time. He was learned in all the learning of Egypt, besides that learning which he subsequently acquired from God. The Egyptians were evidently acquainted with the Prime Date of Creation, as witnessed by the Sothic Cycle of, and from, 1460 years, of which more may be written later on, if time and space permit. Moses, therefore, knew this, as also the exact period of the great sojourn of his people. He evidently knew to a day the beginning and the end of the four hundred and thirty years, for he says it was "the self-same day." He tells us what day of the month it was, *Ex. xii., 17, 18.* Whether we can learn what day of the week this day was remains to be seen. Mr. Dimbleby thinks we can tell from a table of his which he calls "The Ancient Chaldean and Hebrew Solar Cycle," and which I have copied from his book entitled *All Past Time.* The Table referred to is on the following page.

Mr. Dimbleby makes much of the above Table, which he denominates "The Ancient Chaldean and Hebrew Solar Cycle." He does not give any evidence that this table was ever in use by the Chaldeans or the ancient Hebrews. And the same may be said of his former table which he heads: "The Antediluvian Solar Cycle." No evidence is offered that the Ante-diluvians ever used that table. Yet the way he speaks of both tables would lead one to think they were anciently in use by the people to whom he refers them. But as I give reasons for thinking otherwise, I must briefly explain the construction of Table V.

This table has been compiled by Mr. Dimbleby himself, and has been made to consist of fifteen lunar years, commencing with the year 1722 A.M. Why should it begin with this particular year if it be a solar cycle? Is there any celestial phenomenon behind it? Would it work backwards to the Prime date as it ought to if it be an astronomical solar cycle? And if used for ante-diluvian times would it give the same days of the week for the flood dates as the so-called "Ante-diluvian Solar Cycle"? If not, why not? If they give different days, can both be correct? Are there, in fact, two solar cycles? one of seven and the other of fifteen years? What celestial phenomena takes place at or during these periods? In short, are they astronomical tables at all? The compiler of these

tables offers no evidence, either for their historical existence, or in support of their astronomical accuracy. The question then arises Are they of any use in determining the particular day of the week on which any past event of history took place? Mr. Dimbleby undoubtedly thinks so, and makes a great point of it. We should be glad to think so too, but we must not sacrifice truth for the purpose of fitting up an acceptable theory. Let us, therefore, examine further into this question.

INTERCALARY DAYS.

As I pointed out under Table II., the lunar year is about $11\frac{1}{2}$ days shorter than the Solar year: the lunar year, therefore, gets behind the Solar year by this amount annually. If this were allowed to go on without adjusting the calendar the beginning of the Solar year would gradually fall more and more behind the lunar year. In two years about 23 days, in three years about 34 days, and in seven years about 79 days behind. Thus the seasons, ruled by the Sun's motion, would soon get across and run through the various months of the lunar year. To prevent this confusion extra days were added at the end of the lunar year to bring its next commencement into line with the beginning of the solar year. These extra days are called Intercalary days. They are frequently referred to in the Bible, especially in the marginal readings, under such phrases as:—"At the end of days," "In process of time," "At the end of two full years," "After two years fully expired," and "After three years of days," &c., &c. See Genesis, iv., 3, and xli., 1: 1 Kings, xvii., 7; Jer., xxviii., 3; and Amos, iv., 4, &c., &c. These extra, or Intercalary, days were added on to the Calendar at the end of the lunar or civil year, about the time of our month of September. The natural or solar year commenced when the Sun was at the autumnal equinox, on or about September 23rd. This is the true commencement of the year, for Adam was created when the fruits were in season. Our years are artificial and unnatural, being made by Acts of Parliament!

Now, judging by Scripture references, it would appear that the Intercalary period was sometimes "two years," and at other times "three years"; but in the above Table V Mr. Dimbleby makes it uniformly three years. And in Table II he actually makes the intercalary period seven years! The figures of these Tables, there.

fore, can hardly be true either to historical facts, or to astronomical phenomena. It is very unlikely that the antediluvians would allow the lunar year to get before the solar year nearly three months, as it would in seven years. Besides, we are informed by Mr. Dimpleby that the ancients commenced the months with the new moon, which was the natural commencement of the month. Now if 79 extra days were added on to the Calendar at the end of seven lunar years, these days would give for the seventh year two extra months of $29\frac{1}{2}$ days each, and a short one of the 20 days left over! How then could the moon be new at the beginning of the following month and cycle?

And a similar objection stands against the use of his so-called "Ancient Chaldean and Hebrew Solar Cycle." In this Table Mr. Dimpleby adds 34 days for Ve Adar, the intercalary month, every three years. At the end of the third year (Column "C") he gives the dates of the Sabbath days as 2, 9, 16, 23, 30. According to this, in the fourth year of the cycle (Column "D") New Year's Day would fall on a Thursday, and the first Sabbath of the first month would fall on the third day of the month. But the new moon could not possibly fall, as it ought to, on or near the first of the month; nor the full moon on the fifteenth. And the differences would accumulate. So that the compiler of the table is either wrong in saying that the ancient and natural months were marked off by the moon, or the dates in his table which he gives for the Sabbath days succeeding his intercalary periods are wrong. But both the Bible and history show that the months were anciently ruled, as they ought now to be, by the moon; therefore the only conclusion I can arrive at is, that these dates are unhistorical and unreliable.

I wrote to Mr. Dimpleby about this important matter on Feb. 5th, 1903. I wished to use and to support his chronological tables wherever they are trustworthy. I asked four questions; but two of them he ignored. I wrote again, Feb. 12th, respecting the two unanswered questions, and of course I enclosed postage. On March 17th following he wrote, and amongst other things said:—"I am sorry if I have not caught the meaning of your questions, and also sorry if you have not understood my replies."

Now I had perfectly understood Mr. Dimpleby's replies, but, as I told him, they were not *answers* to my questions. How he failed to

catch the meaning of my questions I am at a loss to understand. However, I give the original questions, and his subsequent "replies," as follows:—

Question (3)—"If in the 'Ancient Hebrew Solar Cycle' of 15 years (as given in your book *All Past Time*) 34 intercalary days were added *every three years*, how could the New Moon occur on the first of the lunar month immediately after their addition?"

Answer—"I suppose the ancients found it necessary to use 34 days, but buy an Hebrew Almanac and see how these 34 days, used to bring up the lunar to the solar, work."

Question (4)—"If 34 intercalary days were *not* added every three years, is your Table of the 'Ancient Hebrew Solar Cycle' of any use in deciding on what day of the week any particular date fell? If so, how?"

Answer—"I see no reason in supposing an error of this kind when there are so many records of the form of the ancient lunar year always having 34 days for the intercalary period. Such a form was practically found to be necessary. See Jewish Almanacs."

In accordance with the above advice I "bought" an Hebrew Almanac, more than one. Yet I failed to see, and I still fail to see, "*how* these 34 days work." In fact I find they do not "work," for the simple reason that they are not used.

Modern Jews, though wrong in the number of their years, have a better plan for adding on intercalary days, so as to keep the new moon close to the first of the month, and at the same time bring the lunar and solar year frequently into line. But to go into this branch of the subject would make my papers too long; let it suffice for the present to say that Jewish Chronologers sometimes only add on 29 intercalary days for Ve Adar, or Adar Sheni, as they call the extra month. They certainly do not add 34 days every three years.

A DATE REPEATING CYCLE.

But Mr. Dimbleby maintains that his A. H. S. Cycle is a date repeating cycle, and therefore correct. It may be a date repeating cycle, and yet not repeat *the* dates, as to the actual day of the week, of any particular historical event. The fifteen year "solar" cycle does not appear to mark off any astronomical solar event, certainly not in connection with the motions of the moon. It is not an eclipse cycle. It seems to be entirely empirical, discovered by experiment as a date

repeating cycle; and, as Mr. D. confesses, "evidently amputated" from a cycle of 21 years. This may be noticed from the fact that he has in his book on *The Date of Creation* given the cycle a different form in the ninth year (Column "i"), from that given at the end of the same column in a previous work entitled *All Past Time*. In the former work he gives as the dates of the Sabbath for Ve Adar 7, 14, 21, 28: and in the latter as in the above table, 1, 8, 15, 22, 29. Both cannot be historically correct. Yet he says: "We can now assign a date to every day that has occurred since creation, and give it the proper position in the week." This is a very desirable accomplishment, but I fail to see how it can be done accurately and historically from the solar cycles he has given. I know how the inventor of these cycles professes to do it, and I will give the reader an interesting example, so that he may judge for himself.

Referring to that important chronological passage in Ex. xii., 41, which the reader should take the trouble again to read, Mr. Dimbleby says:—

"Here we have the most splendid date since Creation. Historians confer a great boon on posterity when they use long periods of time from one event to another. What Moses here states is that the Israelites left Egypt on the same date of the month with which the sojourn began; that is to say, 430 years when reckoned from the 15th of the 7th civil month in 2083 (table *l*), or to the end of 430 years when counted from the 15th of the same month in 2082, table *a*. In the latter case the Israelites left Egypt on the same day of the week (Tuesday) and same date of the month (15th) in which Abraham left the City of Ur. On looking at the Solar Cycle it will be seen by the dates of the Sabbaths in the 7th civil month being the same in table *a* (2082) as in table *l* (2513), the 15th of the 7th month would be Tuesday in both cases. This is the advantage of taking all our time from the clock like work of the Solar Cycle. We can all agree, and are preserved from error." *Historical Bible*, page 33.

This "advantage," as I have admitted, would be considerable, and very desirable, if the clock is true to history and to time. But we are not all agreed on this point; and if we were agreed we might not be "preserved from error." Moses, no doubt, knew the above date was repeated at the Exodus; but the day of the week might not be Tuesday, unless Mr. D. can show that his Solar Cycle is in harmony with history and astronomy. This he has not done; he has not even attempted to prove that the ancients used a calendar, or a cycle, like his. Of course the year of the Exodus was 2513 A.M., and this would come to what Mr. D. calls table *l*, and which I call *column l*, in his

A. H. S. Cycle. This was the 12th year of that cycle, as may be seen by subtracting 1722, with which year he starts the cycle, from 2513, the year of the Exodus, and dividing the remainder by 15. Thus the year 2502 A.M. would be the first in the cycle, the Sabbath dates for which are given in column "a"; and the Exodus year would come the 12th in the cycle, the Sabbath dates for which are the same, and given in column "l." For the seventh civil or first sacred month these dates are 5, 12, 19 and 26, which agree with the dates found by a similar process for the year 2083 A.M., column "a." Now if the second Sabbath of this seventh month *did* fall on the 12th the following Tuesday of course would be the 15th, in both cases. But that the Sabbaths really occurred on those dates depends upon whether the intercalary days are correctly added, or not. As I have already shewn, the probability is that they are not. If not, then the 15th day of the month Nisan, or Abib, would not necessarily fall on a Tuesday. Mr. Dimbleby, speaking of ancient calendars, says:—"The moon was new on the first day of every month and year." Doubtless this was the case; but if so the fact destroys the reliability of his so-called "Solar Cycle" for repeating the actual dates of ancient history. The moon could not possibly be new on the first of his months, in harmony with the dates he has given in that cycle. Therefore those dates are unhistorical and unreliable.

ALBERT SMITH.

"AN INVALID'S PRAYER."

Abide with me! dear Lord! this is my prayer,
 My heart would lay on Thee its ev'ry care;
 Through Thy dear Son, who unto all is kind,
 And they who seek through Him shall surely "find."

Abide with me! Lord Jesus! day by day,
 When worn from pain, be THOU my strength and stay.

W. J. YOUNG (BEDRIDDEN).