

THE

# Sabbath OR Creation.

"The Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus."—REV. XIV., 12.

AN UNDENOMINATIONAL CHRISTIAN PAPER.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY LADY BLOUNT, at 11, GLOUCESTER  
ROAD, KINGSTON HILL, SURREY, ENGLAND.

---

---

No. 12.

MARCH, 1904.

ONE PENNY.

---

---

## THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS.

By Lt.-Col. T. W. RICHARDSON.

*(A sequel to the "Scenes at the Sepulchre," by BIBLIOPHIL.)*

In the "Scenes at the Sepulchre," it has been clearly demonstrated that the resurrection of Christ took place on the Saturday just before sunset—"In the end of the Sabbath." Matt. xxviii: 1. And after careful study of the various passages, the great mystery of confusion has become clearly and beautifully harmonious.

Some may, however, possibly fancy that confusion has been made more confounded, for if the crucifixion were on a Friday, as is generally supposed, how is it possible to make three days to the Saturday night? The Friday night to Sunday morning idea has perplexed many thoughtful Christians, but Friday night to Saturday night hardly makes matters better, for *neither* could possibly fulfil Christ's "three days and three nights."

This is of vast importance, for our Saviour asserted that He would be three days and three nights in the grave, see Matt. xii: 40, and the truthfulness of this statement is absolutely essential to the Christian's welfare, for Christ made it the test or proof of His Messiahship. Thus

to accept the Friday night to Sunday morning, or the Friday night to Saturday night, as the time He was in the grave, is to point blank deny His Messiahship.

Let the student rid himself of all preconceived ideas—this is no easy task—and carefully read the passages connected with the subject, having first ascertained how many different Sabbaths there were—the Sabbath of the Commandment or Seventh-day Sabbath, the Passover Sabbath, the Jubilee Sabbath, etc.,—and he will soon find that the three days and three nights were fulfilled, and that the resurrection was, as has been proven, on the Saturday. There is the clear evidence that Saturday was the termination of the three days and three nights, but seek evidence for a Friday crucifixion, and it is not to be found. Where then does the idea come from? From the fact simply that it was *the day before a Sabbath*. But the well-read student will at once recognize that that does not necessarily make it a Friday, as a Sabbath may be upon any day of the week, just as Christmas Day (which, by the way, was not our Saviour's birthday) falls on a different day of the week each year.

Now note that they "prepared spices," for they did not realize that Jesus would rise again at the end of three days. When did they prepare the spices? The time is differently described in the different Gospels. "When the Sabbath was past" they "had bought sweet spices." Mark xvi: 1. They "prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment." Luke xxiii: 56.

Thus the day on which they prepared the spices was after a Sabbath, and before the Sabbath of the Commandment, or a working day between two Sabbaths. The crucifixion took place the day before a Sabbath, and the body of our Lord was not allowed to hang on the stake (*stauros*) or tree on *that* Sabbath, for it was "an high day" (John xix: 31), following "the preparation" (Mark xv: 42). What "high day" Sabbath was there at that time? The Passover Sabbath, for Jesus had celebrated the Passover, and instituted the "Lord's Supper," on the evening of the day on which He was crucified (14th Nisan). In God's order the evening begins the day. Thus the Passover Day, the Lord's Supper Day, and the Crucifixion Day, are one and the same—14th Nisan, on Wednesday in that year, and commencing with what we call Tuesday evening. The first day in the grave was the Passover Sabbath, Thursday; the second day in the grave, a working

day, Friday; the third day in the grave, the "Sabbath according to the Commandment," Saturday. And the resurrection occurred "in the end" of that day, as the burial had occurred in the end of the Wednesday. Thus the sign of our Lord's Messiahship did prove true.



*I have received the following letter from a friend abroad, who upholds the true Sabbath:—*

I glean from your writings that you cannot endorse the "Trinity" belief. This subject was always an open one with me, indeed one to which I gave very little attention or study. But there is a step further—Who was Jesus? Whose son was He?

Entertaining a learned Jew one Sunday afternoon, these were his observations, in brief, of Jesus.

"The genealogy given by Matthew 1. (1-17) is given to prove Jesus the Son of David—hence the heir to his throne. The last heir was Joseph, who was of course well known, and a marked man, as the possible King of the Jews (Judah). It follows that if Joseph had no son, the line would be extinct. Now Jesus was not a son of Joseph, as you Christians claim. If that is so, will you show me the right of Jesus to David's throne?"

I was thus in great dilemma, but I replied—"If Mary was of the line of David, Jesus, being her Son, would be his heir."

"Not so" (he replied), "1st, because there is no proof that Mary was of the house of David, in fact *genealogies of women are never kept*. But even granting that Mary was of the line of David, the succession ran in the male line, and *never* in the female—and so, if Joseph had a son, either by Mary or by some other woman, *that* son would be the next heir, but as you believe that Jesus was not the natural son of Joseph, but a supernatural son by the Holy Ghost through Mary, it is certain that Jesus may lay claim to all that that Holy Ghost has or had, but it must be evident to you that He cannot lay claim to David's throne."

You will see from the above the way I was completely silenced. My Jew friend left in complete victory after remarking—"When you Christians can solve that problem, we Jews will then begin to look into the other claims of Jesus the Christ."

Somebody sent me several pamphlets, "The Nazarene Messen-

ger," [published by the "Josephites," *Ed.*] which boldly advocated that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and by many and incontestable arguments proved the matter beyond doubt to me.

The first chapter of Matthew, from 18 to end, is spurious, and so is Luke 11. (*Oh! Ed.*) Apart from these there is not a line in any of the Epistles of any immaculate conception idea.

*Regarding the above, I am led to think as follows:—*

The Holy Ghost, or Spirit, I believe to be the *Power of God*, and not a person. See Luke 1: 35.

As for the phrase *Trinity* it is not in the Bible, and those who first introduced the idea did not conceive it as it is now presented to the world. Very different was this doctrine when it was first floated; its founders believed *not* in three equal Gods contained in one personal being. This mythical doctrine, doubtless, was wafted to us from Egypt.

The false conception that any portion of a person or thing is equal to the whole is opposed to the true orders of known facts formulated and created by the Creator Himself. And such teaching is a fair specimen of earthly wisdom, and man-made collegiate theology. It is simply contrary to all reason, and is a fulsome violation of our senses. If the "Trinity" was presented to us in the Bible, I should, of course, accept it as a supernatural fact. *But it is not.*

But let no man deceive us so far as to cause us to give up our God-given reason—to which Jehovah Himself appeals.

How could Jesus, who came to do His Father's Will, and prayed to His Father, of whom He was "the express image," be the same as the One whose Holy Will He came to perform, and to whom He prayed and addressed as "My God"? Such an idea is an utter impossibility, because it would at once place Jesus in the position of being His own God, identically *the same* as that of which He was the express image.

A learned friend (Dr. E. Haughton) asserts that the text from Isaiah is half cut out in our translations, and the expression "father or founder of the everlasting age" is made to do duty for the absurd statement that the Son of God is also his own Father! Yes, this

human theology is too bewildering! Referring to the *Immaculate conception* we have the divine promise—recorded in Gen. 3: 15—in the words of the Creator Himself, and *recorded* by Moses.

Jehovah speaks and says, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. IT shall bruise thy head" (see Rom. 16: 20.)

Before passing on, I would draw my readers' attention to the fact that the translation of the R. C. Douay Version of the Bible has altered this passage very daringly—and it is rendered: "*she* shall bruise thy head," instead of IT—and thus it is made to appear that the Virgin Mary bruised the Serpent's head, and not *her seed*. And so the Virgin Mary is put in the place of the Saviour, and the Word of God spoken through His Son, and the prophets, and apostles, is set at nought! But the error of such teaching is exposed by the words of Moses which Peter quoted, and Luke narrated in Acts 3: 22:—

"Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." And in Gal. 3: 19, Paul says:—"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, TILL THE SEED SHOULD COME, to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

In Isa. 17: 14, we read the ancient prophecy, "Behold a Virgin shall conceive,"—and in Matthew 1: 20-21, and Luke, chapters 1 and 2, we have the annunciation and the fulfilment of the same. And I have never seen any good cause for believing that these chapters are "spurious," as asserted above.

Matthew gives the pedigree of Joseph because he was *legally* the father of Jesus. He wrote for Jews, and so he traced the descent through the male line. Joseph was descended from David, and so was Mary. Luke gives Mary's line from King David. He wrote for "Gentiles," so he traced Christ's natural descent back to Adam, as the "seed of the woman." See Gen. 3: 15.

Those who state that these passages in Holy Writ are "spurious," will find that they are mistaken in their conclusion, and they would find it an impossible thing to prove their unfounded statements. Some are led to this conclusion through getting into a wrong groove—

which causes mis-conception of the meaning of certain passages while others stand in their way. But why is it thought impossible by some men that God can work miracles? The whole of the life of Jesus was a miracle! Notice the difference between Matthew and Luke—Matthew says “Jacob *begat* Joseph the husband of Mary.” But Luke says simply he was “the son of” and the “son” is in italics showing that it is not in the original.

It is merely “of” so-and-so “as Joseph which was (*the son*) of Heli.” Now as Jacob *begat* Joseph, Joseph must have been the literal son of Jacob therefore he was “the son (in law) of Heli:” because Heli was the father of Mary. This reconciles every thing; so that it is clear that Jesus was descended from David both *legally* through Joseph and naturally through Heli and Mary. Luke 1: 27, is more emphatic in the Greek than in the authorized version in respect to Joseph being of the house of David. As Matthew 1 and Luke 2 are proofs that Jesus was the legal heir to David's throne, it has been asserted that these portions of scripture were spurious. But assertion is neither argument nor proof.

But this averment is in no way upheld by Bible scholars, nor by reliable translators. Of course we know that some Jewish writers, in their enmity to Christianity, have unwisely lent their influence in all sorts of statements, and inventing the most atrocious stories. But these we heed not. The succession only running in the male line was simply according to Israel. But that women are as much the actual seed of man is a fact according to the laws of Creation.

God is not bound by man-made laws and human ideas. He could have raised up children from the stones, for with Him “all things are possible.” But Jesus was born to Mary and Joseph after Mary was Joseph's wife by law or marriage. And Joseph, knowing the facts of the case through a divine source, accepted Jesus as his legitimate son in a legal and lawful sense—and he could not do otherwise unless he had proved that his wife had committed adultery. It has ever been a law that unless adultery is proved against a woman the man she is wedded to is bound to support her children, and own them as being legitimate.

Mary was the most honoured and “blessed amongst women,” but she was simply used, or ordained, to produce the Son of Man. Joseph was ordained too, to help, as far as needed, to carry out the will of God in this matter. While Joseph took Jesus as his legiti-

mate son, according to the law of Israel, no one could or would interfere. Joseph was a godly man, and his first desire, no doubt, was to do that which was God's will. The individual production of the human race in ordinary course is a miracle also—if we consider it. All things are miraculous, but God in His action is not bound by man-made conventionalities. For instance, David was not the *heir apparent* to the throne of Israel. Again, the younger of Joseph's sons took first place, contrary to human order. And many instances of the same deviation from merely human laws might be brought to mind. Therefore, in the eyes of those who did not accept Jesus as the son of the Highest, He was Joseph's legitimate son and consequently his royal heir son.

But to those who accepted Him as the Lord from heaven, He was the incarnate son of God, and the son of man. Joseph had espoused the body of Mary, and the fruit of her body belonged, in a human sense, to him. And doubtless it is that he rejoiced in the honour of his position as an instrument in the hand of the Deity. It is evident that Mary and Joseph were predestinated, or fore-ordained, as *human* beings to fulfil God's will. But no more than that. They afterwards lived an ordinary wedded life—and had children. I believe that the spirit of God came upon Jesus fully at the time He was baptized in the river Jordan, when He was "anointed," by the Spirit of God to be King of Israel.

[Reprinted in "The Faith" for December, 1902.]

## "THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH."\*

A SACRED SONG BY LADY BLOUNT.

*"But there is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."—Job xxxii. 8.*

SWEET memories of our Saviour's birth  
 Rise vivid in our "Christmas" lay.  
 He was "The Word made flesh" on earth,  
 "The Lord of Life," "The Truth, the Way"—  
 "The Lord of Life, the Truth, the Way."  
 In Eden the Creator said  
 Unto the serpent, as he wil'd,  
 The woman's seed "shall bruise thy head:"  
 In Christ God's mandate is fulfill'd!  
 Then let each heart rejoicing sing,  
 And faith Bells Jesu's praises ring.

The Word of God search out and trace,  
All else on earth is but a dream.  
Salvation for the human race  
Is now the only worthy theme—  
It is the only worthy theme.

God's Word is this, to all mankind,  
To all, to "whosoever will,"

Who thirsts for life "to-day" may drink,  
The pure Life Stream is flowing still!

Then let each heart rejoicing sing,  
And faith Bells Jesu's praises ring.

Benign Jehovah, Israel's God,

Can feed each human soul's desire,  
Give appetite for spirit-food,

And kindle yet the holy fire—  
And kindle yet the holy fire.

Our Father God in heaven can raise  
The soul that is as dead as stone.

Transform condition animal  
To pure angelic form and tone.

Then let each heart rejoicing sing,  
And faith Bells Jesu's praises ring.

God's Word of promise cannot fail,

The germ of lasting Life to give,  
And those who seek through Jesus Christ,

Through Him eternally shall live,—  
Through Him eternally shall live.

Oh, everyone that thirsteth come,  
Drink from the wondrous living spring.

All ye who hunger freely eat,  
Aye feast—and feasting gladly sing,

Then let each heart rejoice "to-day"  
And Faith Bells peal Salvation's Lay.

The wise in heart without alloy

Drink in the spirit of God's Word,  
They learn through Him sweet strains of joy

Which only through the Truth are heard,  
They fight—not in a carnal war—

They walk by faith, and not by sight,  
Obedient to God's perfect law,

They will be perfected in light.

\* \* \* \*

Life's Tree is their inherent right,  
Redeemed through Christ in robes of white.