

Gerhard Ebersöhn

Part 6/3

Seventh Day Adventism
Refuted

E.G. White

Save your life to save the Sabbath, and you shall lose both; lose your life to save the Sabbath, and you if God will, might save the Sabbath.

The Seventh Day Adventist Church in order to save the Sabbath, should sever all ties with its past, and unconditionally and totally reject and renounce not the person of Mrs E.G. White, but the doctrine and dogma as well as attitude and approach it, has adopted and based and erected on 'Inspiration' and 'the Testimonies'.

Gerhard Ebersöhn
Suite 324
Private Bag X43
Sunninghill 2157
Johannesburg
biblestudents@imagnet.co.za
<http://www.biblestudents.co.za>

2008

ISBN 978-0-620-41731-0; 978-0-620-41747-1

Save the Sabbath!

[A word before.

I would not know if this is the last time; it may be yet another new beginning. In Thee I trust! It today is Thursday, 3rd of April, 2008. I have begun a few days ago with this task, very, reluctantly. But as I got going, I saw more and more its opportunities and challenges.

Many and much of the things I have written through many years, I have many times, changed; but not beyond recognition – as far as I am aware of. I only tried to say things better and clearer as also my own insights improved, I hope. I do not pretend to have said things the best way every last time. I still am convinced, my standpoints cannot be confused for anything they are not. Looking back over forty years of writing, the greater outline of my beliefs and principles is bold and firm, and one of the principles enclosed, was change, change which I shall always believe has been in the right direction, towards a clearer, more correct, and TRUER knowledge and understanding of the Mystery of Godliness, the One and Only Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Free Grace of our loving Father. So help me God!

Read this booklet in view of same things, said differently in many other places.]

I dedicate this booklet to my school-time only and best of my life friend, Carolus Reinecke, yea, in fact the whole book, 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace', which was written from start to finish (Immer nicht Schluss!) with an event of my youth always in the back of my mind looming. Will he recall, when I stayed opposite his home in the high street of Potgietersrus in the wonderful old Transvaal, how a pugnacious Seventh Day Adventist adult, picked a theological squabble with an innocent and tender young lad of fourteen, maybe thirteen ... an incident at my house?

**A Reconsideration, or a Comparison of,
or a Contradiction, or a Controversy between,
the faith I, as a child held for truth, and the Truth
that as a grownup, kept me, In The Faith –
which same Faith was, and is, and ever,
I pray the Lord, will be, the Faith of Jesus Christ!**

Quotations taken from '*The Desire of Ages*', or, '*The Passion of Love*', by EG White, Remnant Publications, Inc. Coldwater, MI, 2004. All rights reserved, ISBN 1-883012-18-X.

My objective is to show by contrast, what I believe the Scriptures in truth teach for Truth regarding the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of our Lord Jesus – but, regrettably, also in contrast to show the falsities of the author, her authoring, and her Church.

The reader of the book I shall discuss, is invited by the publishers, "*Are you searching for the truth? Do you need reliable answers to urgent questions?*", like this one, "*Is the development of character important?*"— on the third page after one has opened the book! I despite will go ahead with using and quoting from the above book, without written consent. And if 'they' want to prosecute (–it's my conceitedness of course that they might–), well, so be it! It has become time for the truth to be told, and legal matters won't deter me!

Just to make sure the reader won't miss which are the words of Mrs E.G. White, and which mine, I have italicised her words, and put them in "*quotation marks*". Where I use her words out of their original context, I shall indicate them with '*single quotation marks*', Each remark of hers I might choose to respond to, shall be quoted as it stands in the 'edition' above indicated.

Emphasis by underlining and / or **bold** print, are mine.

Christ's Divinity

"Chapter 1, 'Gethsemane', This chapter is based on Matthew 26: 36-56; Mark 14: 32-50; Luke 22: 39-53; John 18: 1-12."

(p 12) ". . . As man He must suffer the consequences of man's sin. As man He must endure the wrath of God against transgression." Page 70 §2, "God veiled the **human** agony of His Son" as could not God undergo agony. Nevertheless, in the very same lines E.G. White speaks of Jesus' "*face, reveal(ing) ... the image of God*". When it is "*innocence, serenity, benevolence revealed*", **God** is able Subject; when it is agony and suffering, **Man** – the 'human', 'as man' – is subject. Was Christ two persons? Or was Jesus' 'humanity', a unique, and therefore, a divine, humanity? **God, veiled, and, revealed, Himself through Jesus' divine agony and suffering!**

Reference: "*Zechariah 13: 7*": ". . . *the Man that is My Fellow, saith the LORD of hosts.*" Like Christ was the Fellow of man, so was He the Fellow of Yahweh. He was of the nature of man and of God in Himself, indistinguishable and inseparable, one, "*the Mystery of Godliness*", indeed. Christ's sufferings were His; not of a part of Him merely. As suffered the Son of **Man**, so suffered the Son of **God**. 'As man', so, 'as God' – No! As **The Man**, so, as **GOD!** "*As man*" as though not also 'as God', is a falsity: "*As man He must suffer the consequences of man's sin. As man He must endure the wrath of God against transgression*".

Yet another falsity is, such a claim "*is based on Matthew 26: 36-56; Mark 14: 32-50; Luke 22: 39-53; John 18: 1-12.*"

'It is written', not, "*as a man*"; it is written, "*Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things?*"— the whole, the only, the one, "*the Christ*". We cannot dissect Him as were He an object of our curiosity. "*Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; ... this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.*" Paul never spoke of Jesus Christ 'as man'. In fact, said he, "*We no longer know Christ after the flesh*". 'As man' would mean we knew Christ 'after the flesh'.

The New Testament does not mention that Jesus took on 'nature' or different 'natures'. Jesus' 'nature' was Jesus' love for His Father and for His Own; "*For He took on, verily the seed, of Abraham*",

Hb2: 16— 'in the flesh!' Now we know Him as Lord and God even in His suffering of dying and death in 'the flesh' of his Humanity, which, like His 'nature', was no ordinary, but **was, Divinity** – Divinity Himself. Not just 'divine' to describe something other than Deity Himself. We know Him as Lord and God exactly in His suffering of dying and death or we do not know Him or Divinity. For in His suffering of dying and death, both Jesus and God are **glorified**— not as different Gods, but as Father and Son, unto Whom **praise**, not 'as Man', but as **God** one in 'nature', belong! The Christ of God in his suffering, is Jesus the Son of Man in his resurrection, "Christ, the same, yesterday, today and tomorrow." Paul preached not a Christ 'as man'; He preached Jesus, as Christ, as **Christ** who "must needs have suffered". Always, while 'in the flesh', Jesus had been **Man fully**; always, while 'in the flesh', Jesus had been **God fully**. As through **resurrection** from the dead Jesus was God **and** Man fully, so through entering into and going through **death**, was He Man, **and**, God, **fully**. "*I have Power to lay down of Myself, my Life; I have Power to take up of Myself, my Life.*" Jn10: 18. Jesus was Man, **and**, God, **fully**. Do not say, '**both**, Man, and, God'!

Mrs White maintained that Christ not 'as God' suffered and died the death which is sin's reward. She teaches a strange gospel. But then again, **contradicting herself**, she expresses the most sublime of Truth, "*God ... sacrificed Himself, in Christ, for man's redemption. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." 2 Cor. 5: 19.*" p 77 §2. Is that, 'Inspiration'? No! It is just a fallible human being; and it is cruelty to call it or her, 'Inspiration'! The Seventh Day Adventist Church is a heartless opportunist-assembly of men.

Judas

"As the trial drew to a close, Judas could endure the torture of his guilty conscience no longer. Suddenly a hoarse voice rang through the hall, sending a thrill of terror to all hearts: He is innocent; spare Him, O Caiaphas! The tall form of Judas was now seen pressing through the startled throng. His face was pale and haggard, and great drops of sweat stood on his forehead. Rushing to the throne of judgment, he threw down before the high priest the pieces of silver that had been the price of his Lord's betrayal. Eagerly grasping the robe of Caiaphas, he implored him to release Jesus, declaring that He had done nothing worthy of death. Caiaphas angrily shook him off, but was confused, and knew not what to say. The perfidy of the priests was revealed. It was evident that they had bribed the disciple to betray his Master.

"I have sinned," again cried Judas, "in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." But the high priest, regaining his self-possession, answered with scorn, "What is that to us? See thou to that." Matt. 27: 4. The priests had been willing to make Judas their tool; but they despised his baseness. When he turned to them with confession, they spurned him.

Judas now casts himself at the feet of Jesus, acknowledging Him to be the Son of God, and entreating Him to deliver Himself. The Saviour did not reproach His betrayer. He knew that Judas did not repent; his confession was forced from his guilty soul by an awful sense of condemnation and a looking for of judgment, but he felt no deep, heartbreaking grief that he had betrayed the spotless Son of God, and denied the Holy One of Israel. Yet Jesus spoke no word of condemnation. He looked pityingly upon Judas, and said, For this hour came I into the world.

A murmur of surprise ran through the assembly. With amazement they beheld the forbearance of Christ toward His betrayer. Again there swept over them the conviction that this man was more than mortal. But if He was the Son of God, they questioned, why did He not free Himself from His bonds and triumph over His accusers? Judas saw that his entreaties were in vain, and he rushed from the hall exclaiming, It is too late! It is too late! He felt that he could not live to see Jesus crucified, and in despair went out and hanged himself.

Later that same day, on the road from Pilate's hall to Calvary, there came an interruption to the shouts and jeers of the wicked throng who were leading Jesus to the place of crucifixion. As they passed a retired spot, they saw at the foot of a lifeless tree, the body of Judas. It was a most revolting sight. His weight had broken the cord by which he had hanged himself to the tree. In falling, his body had been horribly mangled, and dogs were now devouring it. His remains were immediately buried out of sight; but there was less mockery among the throng, and many a pale face revealed the thoughts within. Retribution seemed already visiting those who were guilty of the blood of Jesus." p 40-41.

Judas, embarrassed by his 'Master' being taken "*like a thief with swords and staves*", did not with the mob go to the house of Caiaphas. After he betrayed Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane, Judas, too afraid to stay, and too ashamed of himself to look anyone in the eye, like "*all the disciples, forsook Him, and fled.*" But Mrs White draws another picture. She has Judas in the house of the high priest **Caiaphas**, in "*the hall*" where "*the throne of*

judgment" was, with Caiaphas sitting upon it. But actually "the hall" with its "throne of judgment" was in the palace of Pilate, see Jn19:9. "They led Jesus, **from Caiaphas, unto the hall of judgment.**" Jn18:28. Caiaphas would not even enter Pilate's palace, "lest he should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." **Judas**, was nowhere near.

"(Jesus) looked pityingly upon Judas ('his betrayer') and said, For this hour came I into the world." But Jesus never mentioned '**this hour**', to Judas. It is unfounded Jesus **spoke** to Judas in the house of Caiaphas at all. The only references to the '**hour**', are Jesus speaking to Andrew and Philip, "For this cause, came I unto this hour", Jn12:27; in Gethsemane to the priests, elders and chiefs, "This is your hour and the power of darkness", Lk23:53; and Mt26:55, "to the multitudes".

It is unfounded Judas **in the house** of Caiaphas, while during the 'trial', "threw down before the high priest the pieces of silver that had been the price of his Lord's betrayal". No **Judas-'scene'** played off in 'the hall' of Caiaphas' home. Matthew records, "All the chief priests and elders of the people took council against Jesus", in the 'palace' of Caiaphas, 26:57-75, "to put Him to death". 27:1. "And when they had bound Him", after His 'trial' there, "they led Him away, and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate the governor" (27:2). All of them! The whole caboodle after the 'trial' in the house of Caiaphas, set off for Pilate's place, with nobody having stayed behind. "The chief priests and elders" were the chief accusers, so they had to go there as well. Judas could not have argued with them still back at the house of Caiaphas.

"Then Judas brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders", verse 3— clearly a **parenthesis** that tells of an event of another time, in the **temple**— verse 5! No indication of when Judas did this, is given. The priests much later, where and when they could have argued, "It is not lawful for to put in the treasury", must have "(taken) the silver pieces" back. Judas therefore never came **near** inside the house of Caiaphas or, "the throne of judgment" assumed inside it, or even outside the house! Neither entered Judas the house of **Pilate!** "But all this was done, that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples **forsook Him, and fled.**" Mt26:56.

Judas in the **absence** of the 'throng' "brought again the thirty pieces to the chief priests and elders". He was received coldly by the priests, What have you come here for, "again"? "Again"— that means, **where**, they first closed connivance, Mk14:10-11, Mt26:14!^(*) What is it you want, 'this time'? O, you (in the meantime) repented your betrayal of innocent blood? "What is that to us? See thou to that!" turned they the back on Judas.

After the priests at first refused the money, Judas "cast down the pieces of silver **in the temple**, and departed, and hanged himself." Verse 5. Yet again, the Gospels give no indication of Mrs White's, that "Later that same day, on the road from Pilate's hall to Calvary (before the Crucifixion) ... they saw ... the body of Judas." p 41 §4. It is sheer conjecture. There's nothing of Mrs White's **melodrama** around the 'throne of judgment' or 'at Jesus' feet', Judas pleading for Jesus' sake. Where the Father did not leave, but comforted the Son, there Mrs White has the Father absent; where the people left Jesus, she has them at his side, pleading for his sake.

After all, it was not Judas' wish, but God's determinate will, that decided all the disciples should forsake Him. So they forsook Him – everyone of them. White's Judas-story is gruesome hypochondria. The passion of the plagiarist is blinding, for, somewhere, White had to have got her nonsense from – from anywhere, but from the Gospels; from anywhere, but from 'Inspiration'! ** It is such utter disrespect from '*the pen of Inspiration*' for fact, truth, 'detail', that Seventh Day Adventists refuse to open their eyes to – or rather, which they will protect and defend at the price of their own souls.

(^(*)) Do not confuse the occasion, place or time of Mk14:10-11/Mt26:14 for the occasion, place and time in Mk14:1/Mt26:3, in "the palace of the high priest"! They were different and separate, yet of the same day, cf. Lk22:2/4. Mk14:1 and Mt26:3 played off in the house of Caiaphas, but Judas was **not** present; in Mk14:10-11, Mt26:14, he was; but it is not told **where** the meeting took place. Judas "two days before Passover (**Fest Day Nisan 15**)", which is Nisan 13, consulted with the priests and scribes. "Then came / followed the Day-of-Unleaven-when-must-be-killed-the-passover", Nisan 14, Lk22:7.)

(^(**)) It was one year after, in 2009, during my discussions with 'Eva', that I first learned of Jacob Lorber, a contemporary of Mrs White and the beginnings of the Seventhday Adventist 'movement'. I asked, Who, plagiarised from whom?— a question prompted by the virtually identical teachings of Lorber and White.)

"Calvary"

"Both the men who were crucified with Jesus had at first railed upon Him, and one under his suffering only became more desperate and defiant. But not so with his companion. This man was not a hardened criminal; he had been led astray by evil associations, but he was less guilty than many of those who stood beside the cross reviling the Saviour. He had seen and heard Jesus, and had been convicted by his teaching, but he had been turned away from Him by the priests and rulers." P 65, third paragraph.

The imaginations of E.G. White! This man was not too sinful; he was not himself to blame totally for his sin or sinfulness; Jesus was only fair to him. But truth was, this man, "*desperate and defiant*", was a hardened criminal, and of evil associations. He was guilty no less than any of those who stood beside the cross reviling the Saviour, and wicked not behind the other criminal crucified with him. He may have seen and heard Jesus before, which would have made of him a sinner for the worse. Against all human expectation this incurable murderer was converted, not by preaching from Jesus, but by the sheer power of the Spirit of His Grace.

Again the melodramatic speculating – trademark of the writing of E.G. White – is superfluous and simply untrue.

A Saving Guilt

"Among the passers-by he (the penitent thief) hears many defending Jesus." P 65/66. *"Never before was there such a general knowledge of Jesus as when He hung upon the cross. Into the hearts of many who beheld the crucifixion scene, and who heard Christ's words, the light of truth was shining."* p 65 §2.

Not all and everybody were totally wicked so as to crucify the Lamb of God. There were still the good ones who should not be counted with the rest, and who, were they in control, would not have crucified Jesus. Would John have crucified Christ? Would Mary the mother of Jesus? Would Joseph of Arimathea, or Nicodemus? So subtle is the suggestion, would one dare to say, Yes, they or any one, would, he must feel like blaspheming and himself a hypocrite. Not only are these **few** people by White's speculations exempted from having shared in the crime; "**many who beheld**" as well, are excused from the crime of having been accomplices in the killing of the Son of God. But truth is, that **whomsoever Jesus died for, He for their killing of Him, died for**. This the 'penitent thief' realised; and was saved; for him "*the light of truth was shining*". But he who does not acknowledge his own the very sin and guilt of

Being the crucifier of Christ, does not know Christ nor does Christ know him.

The Gospels tell us '*as when He hung upon the cross*' of no penitent but this only one; they tell us '*as when He hung upon the cross*' of only the unbelievers or the sharers in the ultimate sin of killing the Son of God. Among the passers-by like among the bystanders, there was not one not '*wagging the head*', physically or in the secret of the heart. There was no one that believed; no, not one! Again, it must be said, "*All his disciples forsook Him and fled!*"

"Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" the Son could ask the Father, but not men? **Therefore what false detraction**, "*Never before was there such a general knowledge of Jesus as when He hung upon the cross. Into the hearts of many who beheld the crucifixion scene, and who heard Christ's words, the light of truth was shining!*" What flatulent flattering of human depravity!

Never before was there such darkness regarding the knowledge of the Christ of God as when He hung upon the cross. In the heart of each who beheld and still beholds the crucifixion, the sin of vindictive disappointment, of avenging disillusionment and implacable despair, takes over total control. Each human being crucified, and crucifies, the Son of God, for to each, He was and is an offence, accusation and judgment; the tormentor of the conscience. To each to whom Christ Jesus has become or will become Saviour, He first blocks the way – He first becomes the Stone of Stumbling; the Stone struck by Moses and by every man that came into the world. Like to the impenitent criminal, so to Mary and John and Joseph, was and will Jesus be the Object of and Sufferer under their transgression, the Victim of every man's selfishness! Christ by all had been denied; or by none would have been accepted after.

Calling Jesus a liar

"I say unto thee today, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise. Christ did not promise that the thief should be with Him in Paradise that day. He Himself did not go that day to Paradise. He slept in the tomb, and on the morning of the resurrection He said, "I am not yet ascended to My Father." John 20: 17 But on the day of the crucifixion, the day of apparent defeat and darkness, the promise was given, "Today" while dying upon the cross as a malefactor, Christ assures the poor sinner, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." p 67 §3.

The Seventh Day Adventists talk of Jesus, '*sleeping in the tomb*'; even of 'resting' in the tomb! But the death of Jesus was His suffering the wages of sin— our sin! The **grave's** is no mere 'sleep', what, a 'rest'! Jn11:11, Jesus saying of Lazarus, "*Our friend Lazarus sleeps*" in Christ, is one thing; Jesus having died '*the second death*' for Lazarus, is another! How, we just aren't able to understand, but Jesus, while in the grave yet, experienced "*the pains of death*" still, for The Scriptures in so many words declare these "*pains of death*" were ended only when God had raised Him up again, Acts 2:24. Compare Jonah 2:6, "*Yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption.*" The "*corruption*" – death and "*the pains of death*" in the case of Jesus – ended when only and in that only, "*Thou hast brought up my life*". "*He who has the Son, has life; he who does not have the Son, does not have life!*" Christ **not before He had risen**, sealed his triumphant "*goings in*" and "*goings out*" (Ez43) through glorious suffering, glorious pains, glorious dying and glorious death (through the "glory" of indeed the Law, **2Cor3:6-11**, "that killeth"). Only in exaltation of resurrection from the dead, **perfected** Christ his **glorious** suffering. Then because of that, Jesus spoke the truth in every respect when He declared to the thief on the cross that that very day, in it and upon it the day of Jesus' speaking, he with Him would enter into, and with Him, would be, in paradise. Jesus' word to the criminal was His guarantee and oath to him, that he – like everyone saved through Christ – "*shall never see death*".

Death is the point of no return to an irreversible and eternal redemption to the saved. The thief the day he died, died in Christ, his "*life with Christ hidden in God*"; immortality had been awarded him. Christ had paid the wages, had presented the prize for his sins. The sinner forgiven in life, shall never see death in death – death that in Christ for him, had been the wages for his sin in Christ. The thief would never see death, but would continue in life forever. Christ most assuredly did promise the thief that he would 'with Him be in Paradise that day' and not a second later. He who has Christ, his soul has immortality; he who does not have Christ, his soul has not immortality – he has mortality. "Thou shalt surely die" ... versus ... "he shall never die". God speaks both words; and He speaks them both through Jesus Christ. "*For / as judgment have I come into the world.*"

But this – 'the mortality of the soul' – is major Seventh Day Adventist denominational doctrine and dogma (one of the '*pillars*' of their faith), so that the question must remain unanswerable whether it is the Seventh Day Adventist Church that became the prisoner of Mrs White, or Mrs White who became the prisoner of Seventh Day Adventism, its doctrine and its hierarchy. Adventists do not realise they contradict their own doctrine of 'the immortality of the soul' with their dogma of 'the soul-sleep' in death or the grave. But what can we do? 'No bridge is there one could build between faith and unbelief, but one's confession.' (Karl Barth)

For me, immortality of the soul in Jesus Christ, is major doctrine, the cry of my soul, the hope of my faith, the joy of my salvation.

John and Mary

"*At the foot of the cross stood His mother, supported by the disciple John. She could not endure to remain away from her Son; and John, knowing that the end was near, had brought her again to the cross.*" p 68 §2.

This is another of Mrs White's old wives' tales. Nothing of it 'is written' and everything of it therefore, is false. False, because unmistakably another of the oft repeated good talking of hers of just about every sinner who was involved in the last suffering of Christ. No, not John or Mary was too good and holy not to take the blame for Jesus' crucifixion and death. Like I or you, or anyone else, John and Mary were the murderers of the Son of God. Now tell that to a Roman Catholic, and get anathematised and cursed for antichrist; but tell it to a Seventh Day Adventist, and receive the mark of the beast on hand and forehead as well.

So far I could not see the slightest difference of essence or in principle between the Seventh Day Adventist and Roman Catholic views of Christ's suffering, dying and death. For both, the Gospel stops here; both regard Jesus' physical as virtually his exclusive suffering, and his death as his only merit. Neither knows what it was "*I cried by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord ... out of the belly of hell.*" Neither, is truly a 'Resurrection-Faith'! Both are 'blood-and-death'-religions proper.

When the Seventh Day Adventist refer to Jesus' resurrection, it will be as an accidental stepping stone to the '*Investigative Judgment*'. When the Roman Catholic may refer to Jesus' resurrection, it will be in desperate attempt to rescue Sunday-sacredness.

Denying Jesus' Faith

The nearer to the resurrection, the worse the theology and the more daring the imaginations of our drama-queen Mrs White ...

Pretends she, "Today" while dying upon the cross as a malefactor, Christ **assures** the poor sinner, Thou **shalt** be with Me in Paradise." She nevertheless asserts, "The Saviour could **not** see through the portals of the tomb. Hope did **not** present to Him His **coming forth** from the grave a conqueror, or tell Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice." p 69 §2.

Only two pages further on, Mrs White would say, "In those dreadful hours He had relied upon the **evidence** of His Father's acceptance heretofore given Him." p 71 §5. "In that dreadful hour Christ was not to be comforted with the Father's presence. He trod the wine press alone, and of the people there was none with Him." p 69/70. It is clear she was confused, and didn't know herself what she believed. 'Inspiration'? No! Besides the above being an oft repeated contradiction, what more flagrant negation can be found of Christ's declaration, "It is finished"—just before He died?

Ten pages on, p 79, last two sentences, Mrs White writes, "Christ Himself **fully comprehended** the results of the sacrifice made upon Calvary. To all these **He looked forward** when upon the cross He cried out, "It is finished." It is the **direct negation** of her own statement, "The Saviour could **not see** through the portals of the tomb. **Hope** did not present to Him His coming forth from the grave a conqueror, **or tell** Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice"!

What about Jesus' **confidence** the evening before, when He, already "knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, that He was from God and that He went to God, (rose) from the table"? "Now I tell you before it come, that when it come to pass, ye may believe that I Am He!" "Verify, verify, I say unto you, that ye shall weep and lament, while the world shall rejoice. And ye shall be sorrowful but your sorrow shall be turned into joy!" "The hour is come, glorify thy Son that thy Son also may glorify Thee. Thou hast given Him all power." "I have glorified Thee on earth: I have finished the work Thou hast given Me to do. And now O, Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine Own Self— with the Glory which I had before with Thee before the

world was." — A few statements from only one Gospel, but "The Saviour could not see through the portals of the tomb. Hope did not present to Him His coming forth from the grave a conqueror, or tell Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice"? — To think **this** with Seventh Day Adventists has become one of Mrs White's most popular 'testimonies'!

The darkness

"Vivid lightnings occasionally flashed forth from the cloud, and revealed the cross and the crucified Redeemer." p 70 §3 There is nothing of in the Gospels; it is Mrs White's fancy. "After a while ... **some** attempted to grope their way back to the city, beating their reasts and wailing in fear." §4 "And **all** the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts and returned", Lk23: 48, all together and **directly** after the midday darkness! It is unbelievable Mrs White's irresponsible dealings with — or ignorance of — the simplest of information. The darkness not **partially** "at the ninth hour lifted", but "Now / suddenly **from** the sixth hour there was darkness over **all** the land **unto** (suddenly / at once) the ninth hour" it ended totally. Mt27: 45. Another untrue speculation for which no Scriptural evidence exists, "At the ninth hour the darkness lifted from the people, but still enveloped the Saviour." p 70 §4. "The sun shone forth; but the cross was still enveloped in darkness. ... The fierce lightnings of God's wrath were directed against the fated city." p 71 §3. On p 72, §2, she for the third time makes the same unfounded assumption, "**Again** darkness settled upon the earth, and a hoarse rumbling, like heavy thunder, was heard. There was a violent earthquake." When the darkness had stopped just when the only earthquake occurred, it stopped at once, completely and finally. **Jesus had overcome.**

The Last Temptation

"The last opportunity to relieve His sufferings they (the priests) refused." p 70/71. Christ, refused the potion; no priests prevented the soldier who "offered (the vinegar) to Jesus".

The resurrected dead

"Sepulchres were broken open, and the dead were cast out of their tombs." p 72 §2. Another false impression of White's! "**The earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and**

many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." Mt27:52-53.

The Last Passover Sacrifice

"The priest is about to slay the victim; but the knife drops from his nerveless hand, and the lamb escapes." p 72 §4.

An unfounded assumption. Later that evening the Jews were going to eat their Passover Meal – a meal of the sacrifice from the afternoon and day before, because after their meal, they refrained not to enter into the palace of Pilate as they the very morning still refused to do. (Jn18:28, 19:31.)

Works-righteousness

"It was because the Law was changeless, because men could be saved only through obedience to its precepts, that Jesus was lifted up on the cross." p 78 §1.

This in itself must be interpreted as an obvious contradiction and total rejection of the Gospel. Mrs White makes it look as if men by their obedience to the precepts shall be saved. Of course she would have denied it, as Seventh Day Adventists vehemently in fact do. But she makes no effort to let one understand it is because the Law is changeless that **all** men must be and are **damned**. It is because the Law is changeless that **few** shall be and are saved— because through the obedience of **One** are **any** saved. For obedience on man's behalf and in his stead, was it that Jesus was lifted up on the cross.

I answer some of Seventh Day Adventist doctrinal error and heresy in Books 6/1 and 6/2 mainly; only incidentally here and where impossible to avoid. In my present undertaking I shall try to keep to matters of actual facts, in view of what the Gospels say against what Mrs White says.

"In Joseph's Tomb"

The Grave the Sabbath-Rest of Jesus

"At last Jesus was at rest. The long day of shame and torture was ended. As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath, the Son of God lay in quietude in Joseph's tomb. His work completed, His hands were folded in peace, He rested through the sacred hours of the Sabbath day." p 80 §1.

"At last Jesus was at rest"

'Rest' for God, is not lying still, dead still, doing nothing. His 'rest' for God and for his Christ, is Work, the Act – the Divine Willing and 'Energising' – the Divine Feat— of,

(1) "*the Exceeding greatness of his Power which He Worked*"; which He worked, in "*Finishing / Completing*" – in "*Perfecting*" – "*all the works of God*", Hb4:5;

2) in "*Finishing / Completing*" – in "*Perfecting*" – "*all the works (of God) which He had made / availed*" – i.e., the **Feat** or **Glory** of His "*accomplishment*" which He had **done / wrought**, Gn2:2;

(3) also in "*Finishing / Completing*" – in "*Perfecting*" – "*all His works which God created, and made*" – i.e., the created universe, Gn2:3,

"*Finished*", is how God in Christ, **rested**. In Genesis 2:2-3 these words are not used pleonastically. 'Work' and 'Rest' for God, are not synonyms; for God, His 'Rest', is the Superlative of His 'Works'. The 'rest' of God of and on the Seventh Day, for God was The Finishing of His Finishing of "*all the Works of God*"— not to lie "*in quietude in Joseph's tomb*" all the works of God **undone!** Dark **grave** was Jesus' 'rest', **not yet**; bright **day**, Christ's Sabbath's Rest "*from the dead*"!

The **grave**, *sin's wages*' purse and safe—extraordinarily in the case of Jesus who "*bare our sins*"— is symbol of 'finished' in the sense of kaput, nihil, the point of no return, void and emptiness! Domain of the dead, the tomb is token and seal on death's "*corruption*". The hyacinth does not grow in graves; the grave

hosts no gods or goddesses be she Serenity. The grave is no place of quietude, but the hall of haunting and feasting devils. Worshippers of satan frequent graves, because the grave has swallowed up life. Bones of the dead bestrew the vulture's table! The grave with fear drives out rest for sooth — were it not our Lord Jesus Christ **through resurrection triumphed** over **death**, and triumphed over **grave**. The grave with flames of hate drives out love, for sooth — were it not our Lord Jesus Christ is the Risen from the **grave** as He is the Risen from **hell** ... were it not Christ conquered, not only in, the grave, but from, the grave— through Love, "For God so loved the world", glory alleluia!

Therefore Christ 'rested' "*when God*" rested "*when He raised Christ from the dead*". God rested, and, Christ the Saviour, then, rested. "*For He that is entered into His Rest, as God He indeed from His Own works ceased.*" Hb4: 10. The Son as the Father rested when "*Suddenly there was a great earthquake, and the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came, and rolled away the stone from the door.*" Now, "*sing the song of Moses and of the Lamb!*" For "*Then shall be brought to pass that is written: Death is swallowed up in Victory.*" "*And I saw a Lamb stood on mount Zion, and with Him, hundred and forty four thousand!*" *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where, thy, victory*", now? "*Thanks to God who gave us Victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" His "*labour (was) not in vain!*" "*He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied!*" 1s53: 11.

"*At last, Jesus was at rest*". No! God never 'is at rest'. We cannot capture the deeds of God cerebrally. In "*the exceeding greatness of His Power ... energised*", therein, is God's 'rest', "*worked*"! Jesus Christ in "*resurrection from the dead*" and **from**, the grave, rested, '*at last*', and ultimately, 'rested'! "*The last enemy ... destroyed, is death*". Death's destruction was God's rest through Jesus Christ. Not sin, sinner, the wages of sin, or grave, could destroy the Christ of God – "*Persuaded that they should destroy Him*", "*the LORD bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought. He maketh the devices of the people of none effect.*"

"The last rays of the setting sun"

There is nothing wrong with this, "*As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath, the Son of God lay ... in Joseph's tomb*" ("*in quietude*" omitted). But there is something strikingly obvious before this, missing! Few (if any) Seventh Day Adventists have noticed; but there are no modern translators or reviewers of the old translations of the Bible who did not see it. So they changed it in the new translations so that everybody for ever after should gloss over what is here missing. I shall now bring forward that other deception of satan, that the death of Christ abrogated the Father's law of creation, that the sun should rule days. (Cf. p 77 §6.) Even if it take you hours, or days, or weeks or months or years, dear reader, understand what I here say, or you won't be able to understand the devil's deception and the passion of his deception, which was so strong that he not only deceived the Seventh Day Adventists, but all Christianity.

Now what is missing in Mrs Whites' statement, "*At last Jesus was at rest. The long day of shame and torture was ended. As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath, the Son of God lay in quietude in Joseph's tomb. His work completed, His hands were folded in peace, He rested through the sacred hours of the Sabbath day?*"

We have seen her say, "*Christ did not yield up His life till He had accomplished the work which He came to do, and with His parting breath He exclaimed, "It is finished."* **John 19:30**", p 73 §1. From here on, between John 19:30 and **Luke 23:53-56** inferred in her here quoted statement from page 80, §1, Mrs White wrote seven pages of inspiringly sound doctrine (which we not now of course intended to repeat). In this section Mrs White quoted from the Gospels, "*Matt. 26:39*", p 74 §5, and "*Luke 23:34*", p 75 §2. Every of her quotes from the Bible (these two included), in these seven pages was chosen for its 'theological' content. She makes no direct or indirect reference to or from any Scripture that might have had bearing on or that might have had implications for, **chronology**. It is only John 19:30 and Luke 23:53-56 that in these pages have implications of time that help tell us **when** the events recorded in these pages occurred. Reading these seven pages with only these two texts for information on the time and day and date of Jesus' crucifixion and interment, unequivocally creates the impression **all said therein**, happened on the **same day!** Reading, "*At last Jesus was at rest. The long day of shame and torture was ended. As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath, the Son of God lay in quietude in Joseph's tomb. His work completed, His hands were folded in peace, He rested through the sacred hours of the*"

Sabbath day", leaves no doubt Jesus was crucified and died the very day He was laid to rest, **Friday**. Reading "*The long day of shame and torture was ended ... in Joseph's tomb*", can mean but one thing, Jesus was crucified and died earlier on Friday, "*in the end of*" which, "*the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath*". Well, what is wrong with that? probably everyone will reply, Seventh Day Adventist and non-Seventh Day Adventist alike.

It's not so much that Mrs White places "*the last rays of the setting sun (that) ushered in the Sabbath*", too early – before the women had their preparations done. No, what is 'missing'; what is truly awry? What is missing are several – in fact, many – **Scripture-references and -inferences** to time, date and day in the context of the chronology of events, not mentioned, not looked at, and consequently not taken into consideration by Mrs White. Only thus in these seven pages of Mrs White's, could she have upheld, yea, vindicated, the impression Jesus was crucified and buried, both, the same day, Friday, before Friday ended and the weekly Sabbath began.

This is what I call hermeneutics by '*methodology*' (I learned the word from Seventh Day Adventists) – in which '*methodology*' creates its own meaning, and meaning of the text is retracted into and covered within method. Or call it tactics, for sinister motive. But it not nearly belongs to Seventh Day Adventists exclusively!

The most important Scriptural reference to time, date and day of such tactics not mentioned, not looked at, and consequently not considered in the context of the chronology of the events, is **Mark 15:42 / Matthew 27:57** – texts like Luke 23:48 and John 19:14 and 31, confirming. What does the omission of the 'time-texts', mean? It means, the left-out texts **incorporated** into reckoning and evaluating chronology of events,

(1) Jesus was crucified and died – as recorded – 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and that thereafter the **same day, everybody** – "*all the people that came together to that sight*" – "*deserted Him*" and the scene of the crucifixion, and "*returned*", each to his own place of abode during that Passover Season.

(2) It means, 6 o'clock with sunset, the long day of shame and torture, ended, and the next day upon which Jesus' body was **to be** laid in the tomb, **begun!** – In fact, it means, "*the long day of shame and torture*", '*was the day, before* Pilate "*granted Joseph*" the body "*to bury*"; '*was the day, before* Joseph "*took down the*

body" from the cross, and "*away*"; '*was the day, before*, Joseph "*prepared the body*" for burial "*according to the custom of the Jews*".

(3) It means, **after** the Son of God had been crucified and died – **after his work** of *that long day of shame and torture had ended*, He, the **following** day, 3 o'clock "*mid-afternoon*", **before** the *last rays of the setting sun ushered in the sacred hours of the Sabbath Day*, "*was laid*" in Joseph's tomb.

(4) It means the Son of Man, "*mid-afternoon*" (3 o'clock?), **rose** from the dead, death and the grave "*First Sheaf Wave Offering Before the LORD*", "*In Sabbath's time fully, after noon, before the First Day of the week*", "*the third day according to the Scriptures!*"

The greater context

Respect for detail equals respect for God's Word; neglect of detail equals disrespect for God's Word. One needs no knowledge of the Greek to see the detail – to see enough of it to the better understanding of and proper respect for, God's Word. What after respect for detail is of first importance for a right knowledge of the Word and Will of God, is simply 'good sense' (as Luther said), which one should never let go of with regard to the least of detail, and especially not, with regard to the larger and comprehensive concept one may be employed with. Mrs White totally fails in both. Read the following, keeping in mind she talks of "*In Joseph's Tomb*" – chapter and section devoted to when "*At last Jesus was at rest*".

"**Now** Jesus **rested** from the work of redemption; and though there was grief among those who loved Him upon earth, yet there was joy in heaven. Glorious to the eyes of heavenly beings was the promise of the future. A restored creation, a redeemed race that, having conquered sin could never fail— this, the result to flow from Jesus' completed work, God and angels saw. With the scene **the day upon which** Jesus rested is forever linked. "For His work is perfect;" and "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever." Deut. 32:4; Eccl. 3:14. When there shall be a "restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts 3:21), the creation Sabbath, **the day on which** Jesus lay at rest in Joseph's tomb, will still be a day of rest and rejoicing. Heaven and earth will unite in praise, as "from one Sabbath to another" (Isa. 66:23) the nations of the saved shall bow

in joyful worship to God and the Lamb." p 80, §2.

Keep in mind three things: (1) Mrs White supposed the whole period of the **Sabbath Day**. (2) She intended the full hours of the Sabbath that "*Jesus was at rest*", "*in the tomb*". (3) Mrs White '**links**' these two aspects in order to **validate** the Sabbath as Day of Christian Worship-Rest. :— "**Now** Jesus rested from the work of redemption; ... — **this**, the **result to flow** from Jesus' completed work, God and angels, saw. **With** the scene, the **day** upon which Jesus rested, is **forever linked**. ... the creation Sabbath, the day **on which** Jesus lay at rest in Joseph's tomb, **will still be** a day of rest and rejoicing. When there **shall be** a "restitution of all things .. "from one Sabbath to another" the nations of the saved **shall bow** in joyful **worship** to God and the Lamb." (I had to insert a comma or two for emphasis.)

"**This**" — Jesus' "*rest in the tomb*", according to Mrs White — is of such **virtue and consequence** that, without it, "**redemption**" could not have been; in fact, according to her, Jesus' '*rest in the tomb*' **completes** (or completed) '*redemption*' and '*restoration*'. Jesus' '*rest in the tomb*' meant much **more** than a doing of nothing. Jesus' '*rest in the tomb*' **in itself**, was of such tremendous **value** and **power** even angels would see and adore it. "*The scene*" had such "**result**" that "**flowed**" from it, "*the day upon which Jesus rested*", i.e., "*the day on which Jesus lay at rest in Joseph's tomb*" — the **Sabbath Day** —, "**is forever linked**", with, "*the creation Sabbath*" and "*the restitution of all things*".

What does Mrs White herself, do here? The same passage, emphasized from yet another angle — from the perspective of 'finished / completed / perfected' — "*Now Jesus rested from the work of redemption; and though there was grief among those who loved Him upon earth, yet there was joy in heaven. Glorious to the eyes of heavenly beings was the promise of the future. A **restored** creation, a **redeemed** race that, having **conquered** sin could never fail— **this, the result** to flow from Jesus' **completed** work, God and angels **saw**. **With** the scene (of such '*completed work*'), the day upon which Jesus **rested**, is forever linked. "*For His work is **perfect***;" ... the creation Sabbath, the day on which Jesus lay **at rest** in Joseph's tomb, will still be a day of **rest and rejoicing**." She allows herself the principle of association; of connection and relationship. A valid and applicable and indeed an absolutely relevant and necessary principle! Mrs White without questioning —'a priori'— decides on the principle of **cause and effect**; she brings into effect the principle of **merit and 'result'**. And she does so with respect to Jesus' '*rest in the tomb*', **for**, the sanctity and validity of the Sabbath Day for **Christian** Worship.*

Is it not precisely the principle from which the Church departed when it based its argument for the validity of the Christian Day of Worship-Rest on the **resurrection** of Jesus Christ? Why may the Church not have argued, '*The result to flow*' from Jesus' '*completed work*' in resurrection, God and angels saw? Why not, '*The day upon which*' Jesus '*conquered*' through resurrection, '*is forever linked*', '*with the scene*', of his '*rest*', by feat of resurrection from the dead? Why not, could the Church have reckoned, "*For his work is perfect*" ... '*the day on which*' Jesus **went out** of Joseph's tomb, '*will for ever be*' for the Church of Christ The Day of Rest and Rejoicing? — Why not? Why indeed, because what is it '*to rest in the tomb*' against to '*Rest*' in Victory of Resurrection and Completion of all the Works of God? **Why not**, if the Seventh Day Adventists may as above think of Jesus' '*rest in the tomb*', may the Church not think the same of Jesus' **resurrection** from the dead? Why may the Church not with regard to the Resurrection, do **just that which** Mrs White and the Seventh Day Adventists with regard to their supposed '*rest in the tomb*' of Jesus do, namely, to "**link together**" or associate it as **motive, reason, and basis**, with the Christian Day of Worship-Rest?

Karl Barth, when he weighed the authority by which the Church changed the Christian Day of Worship-Rest from the Sabbath to the First Day of the week, asked, "Was it not innovation when the primitive Church (so) decided?" He of course reckoned, No, it was no innovation, because the Church changed its Sabbath Day from the Sabbath to the First Day of the week on her conviction of the **worthiness and merit** of Jesus' resurrection from the dead --- '**on that day**' the First Day of the week (meaning Sunday! "**What is it** that gives this day its special meaning?" asked Barth.) There was — the Church might have thought —, '*the result from Jesus' completed work*' **through** resurrection from the grave; There was — the Church might have thought —, '*the scene of the day*', which '*forever would be linked with*' when '*Jesus at last rested*' **in resurrection from the dead!** "*For His work is perfected*" — the Church might have thought —, ... the Redemption-Sabbath, the Day on which Jesus **broke the bonds** of Joseph's grave. The Church might have thought "It is the Day the Lord has made", '*day of rest and rejoicing*'. **And that's why Barth did not think it 'innovation'**. So the Church **must** have reasoned (but— mistakenly, concerning **Sunday**).

While Seventh Day Adventists have always held the idea (or principle), the event makes the day, not the day the event, for authoritarian audacity, they have nevertheless taken **opportunistic advantage** of it — only for far less worthy and glorious a reason, having instead of His resurrection **preferred** Jesus' humiliated state

in death and grave for that 'work of redemption' and 'restitution of all things' – for 'Jesus' completed work' – for in fact, his "**rest**". They have taken Jesus' 'rest in the tomb', for their sanctification and remembrance of the Christian Day of Worship. They shall deny it, for as sure you live. But here, is, the evidence, that they do!

So we find fault to the left as well as to the right. To the left the Seventh Day Adventists have opted for Jesus' 'rest **in the tomb**' – the wrong, invalid, **event** of 'rest' – **a non-event**, 'in fact' – for the 'principle of association' to finding and defining the Christian Day of Worship-Rest. To the right, the Christian Church General has opted for Jesus' **resurrection from**, the tomb – the correct, in fact, no non-event, but the most valid and **energetic event of act of God** for basis and content of the Christian Day of Worship-Rest! But, unfortunately, the Church opportunistically and irregularly has hit upon the **wrong, most invalid and least Scriptural day of Sunday** for, and to, this end.

The General Church at least does not disregard and ignore the **Resurrection** – God's ultimate Work of Rest in the Completion of all His Works –, where the Seventh Day Adventists deliberately **gloss over and ignore** it, as were the Resurrection "a bare fact of no importance for the day upon which it happened" (A most commonly used phrase! I also have in my possession a personal letter from the "Voice of Prophecy" School, for proof.), staring themselves blind against and favouring a 'rest in the tomb', which was not God's Completing Act, or, the Working of his Rest, but a 'rest' of their imagination, for them, of determinative importance for the day upon which, according to **them, it**, Jesus' 'rest' happened in that it happened "**in the grave**"! (This page, 80, chapter 7, paragraph 2).

That is Seventh Day Adventism; that, is Mrs E.G. White. But not totally yet! Because for Seventh Day Adventists, "Without the resurrection, the atoning work Christ for us today is performing in heaven, would not be possible." ('Quoted' from hundreds, nay, thousands, of times in their literature and preaching.)

I wanted to deal with actual facts of events and circumstances, and not with doctrine, I think I said. But this showed how wrong 'actual facts', lead to wrong doctrine. So our effort to deal with just 'actual facts', served a good purpose: '**Actual facts', expose doctrinal error!** Let us go on with it, and stick to it.

"As evening drew on"

"As evening drew on, an unearthly stillness hung over Calvary. The crowd dispersed, and many returned to Jerusalem When (the fearful gloom) was lifted, they made their way to their homes in solemn silence." p 81 §3.

Naturally on the day of Jesus' **crucifixion**, after that He had died and the midday darkness had ended, 'evening' would have 'drawn on'. But it is **not written** –in no Gospel– that 'evening drew on'. Read Mk15:34 **to 41**; Mt27:50 **to 56**; Lk23:45b **to 49**; Jh19:28 **to 30**, where and when in **every** Gospel, day with 'afternoon'— **purely supposed**— was **ending**. We are talking of the day of **Crucifixion**.

But **mentioned** is it in fact of the day of Crucifixion that, after Jesus had died and the midday darkness had ended, "the crowd dispersed". It is written "**all the people that came together to see that sight, returned home**"— but **not**, "**as evening drew on**" or "**as the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath**", **but**, immediately, as soon as it became "**the ninth hour**" (3 pm.). **Nor** casually and gradually, here 'many', there a few others through the remaining three hours of the day. But at once and as one, everybody frightened by the, **one, earthquake** with all their might— with "**beating of breast**", "**returned (and / or fled)**" 'when suddenly' and for once only, the 'complete darkness' (p 69 §3) made way before the light of **mid-afternoon** again. In pandemonium, and in no "**solemn silence**", have "**they made their way to their homes**". (p 81 §3) It **is**, written in the Gospels. Read Mk15:34 **to 41**, and, Mt27:50 **to 56**, and, Lk23:45b **to 49**, and, Jh19:28 **to 30** again, and see, how and when, it exactly the same in **all** the Gospels happened, not less than three hours **before** sunset. That was the day of **Crucifixion!**

Now of the day Jesus was **buried** on, it is in fact **written**, that after Joseph had closed the door of the grave, "**It was (Friday) mid-afternoon-tending towards the Sabbath**". Luke 23 verse **54**. This now was the day of **Burial!** Naturally this day also **started**, and one should expect the fact **written** down. Well, so it is, "**When evening had come, it now being already Preparation Day, which is the Fore-Sabbath**" (Friday)! Read Mk15: **42**; Mt27: **57**; Lk23: **49**; Jh19: **31/38**, where and when in every Gospel, the day of Burial with "**evening**" was **beginning** and in fact had begun, "**already**". We are talking about the day of **Burial** that **ended** after Joseph had

closed the door of the grave and "*It was (Friday) mid-afternoon-tending towards the Sabbath*", Lk23:54b.

Lastly, with the very **same word** it was written of the day of Jesus' **interment**, "*It was (Friday) mid-afternoon-tending towards the Sabbath*" (after which the women went to prepare), is it written **also** of the day of Jesus' **resurrection**, "*It was Sabbath mid-afternoon-tending towards the First Day of the week when suddenly there was a great earthquake*".

So we are confronted with several and huge discrepancies throughout Mrs White's relating of events of Jesus' suffering, death and burial— discrepancies and irreconcilabilities due to and caused by **flat suppression of certain marked texts**.

We shall not pay attention to doctrinal issues, but shall try to concentrate on **factual** things, like time, place and persons, and "*events attending His resurrection*" (p 82 §3), burial and resurrection, because I want to keep this pamphlet as short as possible. It is going to be difficult, seeing actual facts and sound doctrine are so interrelated.

"For the bodies to hang upon the cross"

Still speaking of the day of **Crucifixion**, Mrs White writes,

"They (the priests and rulers) feared the results of that day's work. Not on any account would they have had His body remain during the Sabbath. The Sabbath was now drawing on, and it would be a violation of its sanctity for the bodies to hang upon the cross. So, using this as pretext, the leading Jews requested Pilate that the death of the victims might be hastened, and their bodies be removed before the setting of the sun." p 82 §3b.

The problem with Mrs White's statement again is **inobservant neglect** of the texts pertaining the **end** of **Crucifixion**-day, Mark 15:34 **to 41** / Mt27:50 **to 56**, Lk23:45b **to 49**, Jh19:28 **to 30**; and flat suppression of specific marked texts pertaining the **beginning** of **Interment**-day, Mark 15: **42** to 47 / Matthew 27: **57** to 61, Luke 23: **50** to 56 and Jn19: **31 / 38** to 42 — in between of which **two** days, **sunset** must be presupposed and must be recognised for it being mentioned, "*Evening had begun*". To ignore a Scripture is

to abuse that Scripture. (Like a child – one's responsibility – ignored is a child – one's responsibility – abused.) Mrs White obviously means the **weekly Sabbath** "*was now drawing on*", referring to the events of the current day, Friday. We again encounter her mistaken idea, that the burial, **also** occurred on the day of **crucifixion**, and **before** the sun had set on it. We see the same thought, "*The Sabbath was now drawing on*", which we have seen earlier, "*As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath*", p 80 §1. We see this, Mrs White not taking cognisance at all, of the texts that **started** the day of **Burial** in the Gospels, that **began**, the **Passover-sabbath**. And we repeat, there are **no such words or idea** to be found near '*the crucifixion scene*' in any Gospel as, "*The Sabbath was now drawing on*", or "*As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath*", **ending** the day of **Crucifixion!** It is, a lie! **Instead**, we have indeed read so much, read in so many words, read concerning both the Passover-sabbath and the weekly Sabbath, read, that they, the days of Burial and Resurrection, "*when-with-(the sun's)-light-tending, towards the Sabbath*", Lk23:54b, "*when-with-(the sun's)-light-tending, towards the First Day of the week*", Mt28:1a, respectively, **began ending!** Not the 'Inspiration' of the Seventh Day Adventists or, their 164 years of embarrassment, could make them open their eyes or change their view!

The scene and the day of **Crucifixion ended** with the mention of (1) the **time**, 3 pm., with the mention of (2) the **people** who saw the crucifixion, and with the mention or implication of (3) their **departure** from '*the crucifixion scene*' immediately and concurrently with the earthquake just after the unnatural darkness, three hours before sunset, just after Jesus had died.

The Scriptures, Mk15:42, Mt28:57, Lk23:50 and Jn19:31/38, apply to the started, starting and **prospective** day of Friday, and in themselves give **no retrospective** account of what had happened on the **previous**, crucifixion-day, Nisan **14 before** "the evening had come", but they show what **would** happen on the started and starting day. Because **from and with** Mk15:42, Mt28:57, Lk23:50 and Jn19:31/38 **on**, it's Nisan **15**, **Burial**-day, Friday – **second** 'first' day of Passover Season, called a 'sabbath', in Lv23:11b, and 'great / high day' in Jn19:31 — the first of the seven 'Days of Unleavened Bread Feast (Eat)'. *It would be no violation of its sanctity* for this 'sabbath' that *was now drawing on* if on it, its **purpose** would be fulfilled, that '*what remains*' of the Lamb of God – his body – **must** be laid in the tomb. Cf. Ex12:10b.

Mrs White has **no** Scripture for claiming, "*their bodies be removed before the setting of the sun.*" Neither does the world. I challenge the world and all authority to bring me its authority for this idea! It is not in the Gospels said; and it is not implied. Facts contradict it. Facts are that Jesus' body was removed **after sunset** during night, before **sunrise**. It was not left "*all night*", Dt23:31. Joseph removed the body of Jesus before **sunrise!** So on that same Preparation-Friday, **before** *the Sabbath now drawing on* – **before**, *as the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath* – Joseph and Nicodemus **had** laid Jesus' body in the tomb and **had** closed it. These were the events of the **second** day of the 'three days', "according to the Scriptures".

"Unwilling"

"Pilate was as unwilling as they for the body of Jesus to remain upon the cross. ... Thus in the offering of the Lamb of God was fulfilled the law of the Passover, "They shall leave none of it unto the morning, nor break any bone of it" Num. 9:12"

Mrs White supposes the Jews got restless just **before** sunset of Crucifixion-day, and so do most people. (But what stupidity to come to one's senses when the opportunity has passed— like I can catch a cricket ball or thought I could?) But no, actually their discomposure set in soon **after** sunset of Crucifixion-day, when Friday, the day of **Burial**, had already begun. The shocking fact the 'great sabbath' had already arrived, tells why as well as how the Jews became unsettled, and "*unwilling for the body of Jesus to remain upon the cross*".

From where their sudden "*unwilling(ness) for the body of Jesus to remain upon the cross*", now? Everyone the morning still – according to universal view a bare six hours before – wished only one thing, to have Jesus unjustly punished according to Roman law and crucified! (And, not knowing, unjustly punished in fulfilment of '*the law of the Passover*'.) Nobody ever wanted Jesus released from his sentence or removed from his cross **then!** Not until now, now that the '*great-day-sabbath*' of the Passover **had begun**, do they begin to realise the implications of their acts for themselves! Nobody except God, and Joseph (at first), wanted Jesus removed from his cross. Jesus said it was God who would *not allow Him to see corruption* in death – where else? Those who had a say among men, wanted Him to stay crucified until decayed / 'corrupted'. They wanted it satan's way! No one co-operated with God or shared His will— except the man He predestined to differ with all the rest,

Joseph of Arimathea. So not only was God's prophetic will exactly executed in every step of the way on this Passover, but also his Written "*law of the Passover*" – and according to that Law, the "remains" of the passover lamb had to be burned the day **after** it had been **slaughtered** on; **on** the day it had been **eaten**; not before it (— how nonsensical to think!) "*They shall leave none of it unto the morning ...*" but also, "*and that which remaineth of it until the morning, ye shall burn with fire*", i.e., ye shall return the 'remains' to dust, to earth— ye shall inter it --- on the same day --- after sunrise --- before sunset. What could be clearer? And, those who obeyed not this Law, were removed from the assembly of Israel and were killed!

From where then this 'unwillingness', "*The Jews ... that the bodies should not remain upon the cross ...*"? There was no unwillingness with any for the body of Jesus to remain upon the cross before! John's words reveal the Jews' **unexpected** concern; the **day**, **surprised** them! "*The Jews therefore —because it had become Preparation* (of the weekly Sabbath), "*already* (according to Mk15:42), "*and so that, the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day — for / because, that, sabbath, was high day* (of the Passover)— *asked Pilate that their legs be broken and they be taken away.*" Absolutely clearly and unmistakably the cause for and of the Jews' concern is given, is beforehand, and obviously, is the day specific— **the day of Burial beginning**. Do not search for other motives or reasons far. It is near; it is in the text and in the context of the text. It would be most embarrassing to the Jews, remained the crosses standing and 'THE KING OF THE JEWS' exposed to shame **on Passover-sabbath** – greatest day to their national pride and religious zeal. **They never thought of that**, when they wanted Him crucified the previous and by now, **past**, day! But God ... God put in Joseph's heart the "courage" to go and "beg" Pilate for Jesus' body to be buried, otherwise no one at any stage would have worried about Him in his humiliation, and He with the criminals, would have putrefied in gehenna / sheol. So now Jesus had received **proper** burial, "*according to the custom of Jews*". But the 'priests and rulers', **they**, knew nothing, and **they**, had **no say!** How insulting! Who, does Joseph think, is he!

"With a spear pierced His side"

"The priests and rulers were amazed to find that Christ was dead. Death by cross was a lingering process; it is difficult to determine when life had ceased. It is an unheard-of thing for one to die within six hours of crucifixion. The priests wished to make sure of the death of Jesus, and at their suggestion a soldier thrust a spear into the Saviour's side ... this was noticed by all the beholders, and John states the occurrence very definitely. He says, "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that saw it, bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled. ... To satisfy the priests, they (the soldiers) pierced His side." p 82/83-§1-2.

"He knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." So please take not offence if I show you quite a few inaccuracies; inaccuracies and therefore not truths; and because not truths, nothing *'that ye might believe'*.

"The priests and rulers were amazed to find that Christ was dead." You will read in vain for this; it's not there. The priests and rulers, on the contrary, thought Jesus still lived; that's why they wanted the legs of every of the crucified be broken, not so much to quickly die but so as to be taken away to 'hell' where they may have died after much longer than they would, had they been left on the crosses. So the priests and rulers, 'found', nothing. It was *"after these things"* – after the Jews' request in Pilate's palace to have the crucified taken down; after the *"evening"* was spent, and Joseph had *"(gone in and beseeched Pilate"* to have Jesus' body for burial. He then must have gone to Golgotha, (just in time) to see how a soldier pierced Jesus' side. So not even the soldiers were sure Jesus was already dead; how could *"The priests and rulers (be) amazed to find that Christ was dead"* even before they went in to Pilate, and without, before or after, having seen? If they knew Jesus was dead, they would not have asked for the bones of the crucified to be broken!

"The priests wished to make sure of the death of Jesus, and at their suggestion a soldier thrust a spear into the Saviour's side." The priests cared not. They wished Jesus' legs broken and He – alive still – *"be taken away"* to the refuge dump (*"... a burial ground especially provided for such criminals."*, p 83 §5) to die there – as long as He was removed from sight because of the

pending –already begun– **'great day'** (*vis a vis* the Roman suppressor— the description is not used in the Old Testament). *'The priests'* also suggested nothing to any soldier. Nowhere is it written priests were at the scene of the crosses after *"everybody (had) returned"*. On the contrary, it is clearly written in such a way as were present besides the soldiers, the solitary witness of the piercing. "He that saw", was one; it means, nobody else was there, or knew. It could only be Joseph who asked for Jesus' body, to bury it according to the custom of the Jews – for which task he only, obtained permission, for which task he only was capable and equipped, and he only, was **predestined!**

"With the death of Christ the hopes of His disciples perished. They looked upon His closed eyelids and drooping head ... They saw only the cross and its bleeding Victim. ... Even in death, Christ's body was very precious to His disciples. They longed to give Him an honored burial ... " (p 83-§4, 5) ...

Simply untrue as well as quite unreal! Circumstances around the 'scene' of Jesus' dying until much later after Joseph had gone in to Pilate *"after this"* (the Jews' request) and *"evening had already come"*, and asked for the body, and it was granted him – far into night of the day Joseph would still bury Jesus on – are not the circumstances or time one would expect any except the guard near the crosses. One must not forget the fact, too, **everybody** had **left** the scene of the crosses afternoon before sunset on the day before, and also, that **nobody** is said afterwards **returned!** Nobody stayed behind. Nobody again appeared on the scene of the Crucifixion **at any time**, but Joseph, who, for the first time, *"Now, evening already had come"* (... and *"After these things ..."* of the Jew's request), *"came"*, and *"boldly"*, but *"secretly"*, *"came and went and asked"*.

"John with the women had remained at the cross"

Says Mrs White – above quoted, "John states the occurrence of the piercing of Jesus' side) *very definitely.*" She implied there what she here affirms, p 83 last lines, "The disciple John with the women from Galilee had remained at the cross. They could not leave the body of their Lord to be handled by the unfeeling soldiers and buried in a dishonored grave."

On p 68 in the first half of §2, Mrs White has said, "At the foot of the cross stood His mother, supported by the disciple John. She could not endure to remain away from her Son; and John, knowing that the end was near, had brought her again to the cross." She continues in the second half of the same paragraph, "Christ ... said to her, "Woman, behold thy son!" Then to John, "Behold thy mother!" John understood Christ's words, and accepted the trust. John at once took Mary to his home, and from that hour, cared for her tenderly." This scene occurs before the darkness, just after "the soldiers had crucified Jesus", Jn19:23a. **It is not said John returned!** John did not, 'remain at the cross!' It is not true, John "brought her (Mary) again to the cross!" Mrs White obfuscates the most simple facts. Why? Because she has read other people's views, not the Gospels; and used the other people's views for her own, 'words of **inspiration**' – double treachery!

Who buried Jesus, and where?

"In this emergency (of the disciples' lack of "authority", "influence" and "favour" to get Jesus 'honorably' buried) Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus came to the help of the disciples." p 84 §1-2. "While John was troubled about the burial of his Master, Joseph returned with Pilate's order for the body of Christ; and Nicodemus came bringing a costly mixture of myrrh and aloes. ... The disciples were astonished to see these wealthy rulers as much interested as they themselves in the burial of their Lord." "The help of these rich and honoured men was greatly needed at this time." p 84 §5.

It would appear the **personae**, the disciples, and specifically John, were present at, were involved in, and were "as much interested in the burial of their Lord", as were the two "wealthy rulers" – from Joseph's initiatives, 'until the very end' (as J.C. Ryle would have said). Mrs White in fact refers to John as helping with the interment of the body, "... the Redeemer was borne to the tomb. There the **three** disciples ..." p 85 §1. Well, the presence of any of 'the twelve' disciples at any stage of 'the scene' of the burial, is **untraceable** in the Gospels, most noteworthy, that of John, since it

is expressly stated he **before the midday darkness**, took Mary to his home— and is never mentioned as having returned to the cross. That's 'a bare fact' for you now! Sentimental untruths, the lot! All betray but one source, tradition, not the Scriptures; not 'Inspiration'!

Another gloss is obviated: The **locality** of activities. Mrs White's portrayal pictures the disciples and the two 'rulers' as being occupied with the burial, right **under the cross**, at its foot, on the roughness of the 'land'! The stand of the cross was practically adjacent to the garden in which the tomb was, "It was near Calvary, and (Joseph) now prepared it for Jesus", p 85 §1. But the Gospels say Joseph "took the body away" – from the cross that is – for him to prepare it for burial (which was part of burial "*according to the custom of the Jews*").

And, what is more, Mrs White undoubtedly supposed the **circumstance**, as amidst the **tumult**, under which Joseph there and then after Jesus had died – with the crowd and 'priests and rulers' pressing upon him – prepared the body. According to her, "the disciples feared to show themselves openly as His followers". p 84 §5. She supposes the crowd's presence while the body was being removed for burial. Which would have meant Joseph **had to leave the body** just there while he had gone to buy the linen – which everything he had done so far, shows he would not do. It would have **destroyed** his whole endeavor as well as wholly his original plan. Therefore Joseph acted **unobtrusively**, "*in secret for fear of the Jews*", because **they would not have it** that Jesus received proper burial. **What might** the crowd have done with the body while Joseph went to buy the linen? what would the priests and rulers? the soldiers?! **While it is written**, "*Not a bone of Him shall be broken*"?

It also would have meant the **Jews knew**, that Joseph buried Jesus – which they, conspicuously **did not**, as every given in the story of the Gospels will indicate.

"Gently and reverently they (—'the poor disciples' with the help of the 'two rich and honoured men', Joseph and Nicodemus—) removed with their own hands the body of Jesus from the cross." p 84 §6. An oversight? Just a few lines up, Mrs White wrote, "the disciples feared to show themselves openly ...". But **John** (19:38c), says, **Joseph**, "boldly" Mk15:43b, nevertheless wisely, and "secretly, for fear of the Jews", Lk23:50a, asked for the body; **then**, "came therefore and took (down) the body of Jesus (and) away." And **Luke** says, "**This man** (Joseph), **he**, took it down." And **Matthew** says, "When the evening had come there came ... **Joseph** ... **He** went to Pilate, and **he**, begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body be delivered (to him). And when (this man) **Joseph** had taken the body (down and away) **he**, wrapped it in a clean linen cloth." (It was only at this point in time and progress that, according to John, Nicodemus appeared on the scene.) And **Mark** says, "And now when it had become evening because the Preparation has started ... **Joseph** of Arimathea ... went in boldly unto Pilate, and **he**, begged to have the body of Jesus. ... And he gave the body to **Joseph**. Then **he** (Joseph) bought fine linen, and **he**, took the body down, and **he**, wrapped Him in the linen, and **he**, laid Him in a sepulchre."

What Nicodemus did, was only contributory. Of the disciples, no Gospel mentions anything as far as the whole process of the burial was concerned. Nicodemus also came long after Joseph had the body taken down, away, and handled in preparation for burial. **Joseph** therefore, 'single-handedly', but, it must be understood, with the help of the guard / soldiers, removed the body from the cross— obviously as **Pilate** must have **commanded** them via the centurion: "**Pilate marvelled / wondered / doubted if** (Jesus) had been dead already: So he called the centurion, and asked him, if and how long Jesus had been dead. When Pilate knew (it) of the centurion that Jesus had been dead already, he gave / handed over / allowed / **commanded** the body, to Joseph." That was, "**After** Pilate had known the centurion in the matter and he confirmed that Jesus had been dead already", or, "After Pilate had consulted the centurion and learned from him that Jesus had been dead already".

Gospel-facts cannot be reconciled with the idea many others other than Joseph were involved with the preparation for burial of Jesus' body. It is not possible. These **two men** only, are specifically, **mentioned**. John never features! The Scriptures told us, he took Mary home; he did not return— it's not written! Even 'small stuff' like the Singular Verbs, won't allow more than one person involved with the interment— at least for most of its night-time. But for 'inspiration', even the impossible is possible. Is that really what Seventh Day Adventists mean when they speak of, 'The pen of inspiration ...'? Because 'testimonies' like this, must mean Mrs White overrules the plainly stated facts in the Gospels.

Mrs White is correct; or she is wrong. Everything proves she is wrong, and that the Seventh Day Adventist Church **has done worse than she**, for having enforced her writings upon its followers for 'inspired' and in agreement with Scripture. Seventh Day Adventists have had more than a century and a half (1844 to 2008 = 164 years) to notice these discrepancies and glaringly obvious contradictions between her writings and the Bible; they have not noticed; because they dared not study or criticise; they have paid no attention, and have done nothing about it. No, they have hardened their attitude and narrowed their outlook. They have condoned and accepted myriads of fanciful grotesqueness, and not only have enlarged, embellished and polished it as a club of rule for themselves, but also for a rod to judge others. And I have barely scratched the surface.

'The Galilean women'

"The Galilean women came to see that all had been done that could be done for the lifeless form of their beloved Teacher. Then they saw the heavy stone rolled against the entrance of the tomb, and the Saviour was left at rest. The women were last at the cross, and last at the tomb of Christ. While the evening shades were gathering, Mary Magdalene and the other Marys lingered about the resting place of their Lord, shedding tears of sorrow over the fate of Him whom they loved. "And they returned, ... and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56." p 85 §1

I wonder how many mistakes of actual fact a Seventh Day Adventist would be able to notice in this statement. This it will look like, after the Seventh Day Adventist has reviewed the passage for mistakes and discrepancies: "*The Galilean women came to see that all had been done that could be done for the lifeless form of their beloved Teacher. Then they saw the heavy stone rolled against the entrance of the tomb, and the Saviour was left at rest. The women were last*

at the cross, and last at the tomb of Christ. While the evening shades were gathering, Mary Magdalene and the other Marys lingered about the resting place of their Lord, shedding tears of sorrow over the fate of Him whom they loved. "And they returned, ... and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56." --- With nothing changed! So, to help them, I'll indicate where they must look for those lurking mistakes; because in there are mistakes – several, literal, factual, mistakes!

"The Galilean women **came** to see **that all had been done that could be done** for the lifeless form of their beloved Teacher. Then they **saw** the heavy **stone** rolled against the entrance of the tomb, and the Saviour was left at rest. The **women** were **last** at the cross, and **last** at the tomb of Christ. While the **evening shades** were gathering, Mary Magdalene and the other **Marys**, **lingered about** the resting place of their Lord, **shedding tears** of sorrow over the fate of Him whom they loved. "And they returned, ... and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56."

Twelve or thirteen mistakes? These may in more than one way and of different kinds. There are the 'interpretative' and 'literal'; there are the 'added' and 'mentioned'; there are the 'emphatic' and 'incidental'. How do people read the Scriptures!?

(1) "The Galilean women **came** ..." The women "**came**", "**with Him, from Galilee**"; they 'came' not to the funeral. (2) The women did not '**come**'; they "**followed behind / after / in procession**". It is a blatant lie "The Galilean women came to see that all had been done that could be done". There were **several** women at the crucifixion. Then on Friday as the two men led the procession, there were **but two, who "followed after"**! Luke 23:55, "**And the women who came with Him from Galilee, also followed after** (Joseph and Nicodemus), **and saw** (inside) **the sepulchre, how his body was laid down** (by the two men)." The women partook in no preparations of the body whatsoever. They 'came' not, "**to see that all had been done that could be done for the lifeless form of their beloved Teacher.**" The women could have had no idea of what Joseph the evening before had undertaken until he – it seems – called them to come join in the procession. **All that could be done, had been done** by Joseph and Nicodemus. We have only the facts on which to build our conclusions. We cannot hover or sear on 'inspirations'.

"Then they **saw** the heavy **stone** rolled ...". This is not too serious an imprecision. The women nevertheless, it is written, "**saw the sepulchre, and how his body was laid down.**" The implication is, the women "saw" Joseph rolling the stone into the opening. They before that, were able to watch "**how his body was laid down**", which implies, they could see **inside** the tomb. Matthew actually informs us, "**There was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting, over against the sepulchre**", obviously looking inside the tomb and seeing "**how his body was laid down**". Mt27: 61.

"The women were last"

"The **women** were **last** at the cross, and **last** at the tomb of Christ." Untrue! After 'the cross': "**There were also women** (there)', Mk15:40; which implies, there were men, mainly. Now read Luke's account: "**All the people** (all men and women together) **who came to that sight** (of the **Crucifixion**, mark well!) **seeing the things happening ... turned around and went back – also all his acquaintance** (men **and** women) **who were present, even the women (who) stood far away, seeing these things, (returned).**" All as they came, saw, and returned – no one stayed behind, man or woman. That "**everybody returned**", is the main idea. Their 'seeing', only explains **why, when, and how everybody, "returned"** – **at once and together. While seeing** / Because they have seen / After having seen' – it's all the same. Fact remains, there were no 'last'; "**everybody**", '**dispersed**'. This now what we are speaking of, happened on **Crucifixion-day!**

"Mary Magdalene and the other Marys"

"Mary Magdalene and the other **Marys** **lingered about** the resting place ..." Mrs White supposes **three** women, Mary Magdalene, 'the other Mary', **and**, "Mary the mother of James and Josés" – Mk15:40, Mt27:56.

Now read what occurred **after** these verses. Matthew records the breaking of the **next day**, with, "**When evening had come**". It's the umpteenth time Mrs White in her 'passion', **overlooked this text!** Taking into account just one single, actual, fact Matthew supplies us with, it's **impossible** Mrs White glossed over! It is impossible to

imagine how she glossed over so grossly as nearby, exactly, clearly, and unambiguously, Matthew **named** the **three** woman in verse **56**, and **named**, not three, but **two** women, in verse **61**! This is no error of the manuscripts; there is nothing wrong with the Greek text. There are no variants that have the third woman mentioned in verse 61 or have her left out in verse 56; there's no hint of whatever kind, in the context, that the third woman must be supposed in verse 61 or omitted in 56. Learned men (like John Wenham) have ad nauseam given explanations for the 'glaring contradiction', and most others foolishly have never noticed. But to heed facts – factual facts – in this instance is rebellious treason and artifice! It beforehand for the Seventh Day Adventists and the Church at large, is profanity to just look in the direction of the verses in between verses 56 and 61, specifically, verse 57, and use, common sense! 'Use a better Translation!' is all they could answer.

I beg you, dear reader, r-e-a-d, these verses; r-e-a-d them open eyed and open minded; read them honestly. And after that, be courageous! Because intelligent and learned as well as clever and shrewd men have come that far, but, after, have lacked the courage to keep their honesty up and their eyes opened, and lacked the will to keep their minds straight. Out of the window for them with the virtues of closet-Christianity, the prince of which is honesty! 'Into all the world' for them with the vices of bureau-Christianity, the prince of which is affectation! White washed graves! The best of English the best to get the furthest from ordinary correct truth, from the uncomfortable, from the correcting meaning of the most simple and least imposing language of the Text. Matthew 27 verse 57 and source, Mark 15:42, mean what they say, and say what they mean. No higher or lower authority or greater or '*lesser light*', can or may guard or open their 'true meaning'. They say the Crucifixion and the Burial with its preparations, fell on two **separate** days. And the factual fact of that, explains all 'differences' – which are no differences, but are unmistakable, unmistakable factual facts of actual facts of the two days, each day's truths, its own, in its own right, and within its own hours. 'Good sense', says Luther. Common sense will do, and will do better than too much of genius. I simply say this, Don't you – whoever – dare change the Text!

Mrs White **errs**. There were **not, three** women "*about the resting place*". They were not the women "*among others*" at the **crucifixion**— Mt27:56! Mrs White – like almost everybody else – is **totally blind** for verse 27 and the **different 'Marys'**!

A. At the Crucifixion—

"*There were / present*", "*came together*", "*stood*"— Mk15:40a, Mt27:55a, Lk23:48a, 49c,
 "*Mary Magdalene and the other Marys*"— Mk15:40c, Mt27:56b,
 "*among*"— Mk15:40b, Mt27:56a,
 "*many (other) women also*"— Mt27:55a, Mk15:41b,
 "*afar off*"— Mk15:40a, Mt27:55a, Lk23:49d,
 (but the mother of Jesus, "*standing by*"— Jn19:26)
 "*looking / beholding*"— Mk15:40b, Mt27:55b, Lk23:48b, and
 "*returned, breast beating*"— Lk23:48c.

B. At the Tomb—

"*There was sitting over against the sepulchre*"— Mt27:61a, c,
 "*Mary Magdalene and (the other) Mary*"— Mk15:47a, Mt27:61b,
 who "*followed after*" (Joseph and Nicodemus)— Lk23:55b,
 "*and beheld*"— Mk15:47b, Lk23:55c
 "*the sepulchre and how his body was laid*"— Lk23:55d
 "*and they returned and prepared spices*"— Lk23:56a-b.

C. 'A' occurred **before** "*evening had come*"— Mt27:57, Mk15:42;
 'B' occurred after "*evening had come*"— Mt27:57, Mk15:42,
but only later, was finished, **before**,
 "*afternoon tending towards the approaching Sabbath*"— Lk23:54.

Second delivery

Ellen White versus Matthew

This made worth this study:

The more forceful in contrast, the brighter shines the Gospel-Truth **in the resurrection** of Jesus Christ from the dead.

In the resurrection of Christ, God, is God's Witness, and His Glorified Christ, and His Holy Spirit. What happened in the Resurrection in the grave of Joseph of Arimathaea in the Person of Christ in the body of his flesh laid in it in death, happened in the innermost Sanctuary and Most Holy of the Holiness and Glory of the full Fellowship of the Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Spirit— happened at the Right Hand and on the Throne of the Presence and Majesty of God in heavenly realms.

Just before daybreak

"The night of the first day of the week had worn slowly away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak, had come. Christ was still a prisoner in His narrow tomb. ... and behold, there was a great earthquake ...". p 90 §1.

"Christ was still a prisoner in His narrow tomb." We have paid attention to Jesus' supposed "rest in the tomb" already. Just strange kind of 'rest' this was, I thought to point out!

"The night of the first day of the week had worn ... away. The **darkest hour**, just **before daybreak**, had come. ... and behold, there was a great earthquake ...". Point in time: Resurrection-time ... asserted without one word of Scripture for support!

"This chapter is based on **Matthew 28:2-4, 11-15**", reads the sub-heading. I just thought, **Why, is verse 1 omitted?** Is it perhaps because Mrs **White** was unable to quote it verbatim? I'll repeat this in bold: **Is, or was it perhaps, because Mrs White or / and the publishers was / were unable to quote Matthew 28:1 verbatim?!**

I am unable to answer on Mrs **White's** or the publishers' behalf. All I can say is, "The night of the first day of the week had worn slowly away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak, had come", is a **very far cry** from

Matthew, 28:1, "In the Sabbath, dawn towards the First Day of the week"! "The **night** of the first day of the week ... **worn away**. The darkest hour, just before **daybreak** ...", is **halfway through**, the First Day of the week, **morning!** "In the Sabbath, dawn towards the First Day of the week", is, literally as well as idiomatically, "In the Sabbath, **afternoon towards** the First Day of the week"!

The English word '*dawn*', has acquired the 'idiomatic' meaning of early morning. Yet the application in **Matthew 28:1-4** demands the word's original by no means archaic meaning, both 'literally' and 'idiomatically', as the English Dictionary will explain (I have Collins here), **the last part of the first of two periods before the second**. See for yourself!

In my first delivery, I gave the precise rendering for the Greek. I am not here going into the linguistics. You may read 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace', 1 / 2, 'Resurrection'. I can just say, I have been unchallenged now for more than three decades on my

published stand or 'thesis' on the literal Greek, "*In Sabbath's-day's fullness, while-being-light-having-inclined, towards / before the First Day*" ('Opse de Sabbahtohn, *tehi epifohskousehi, eis Mian Sabbaton*'), means "*mid-afternoon of the Sabbath*"— absolutely literally by no means not idiomatically as well, as the etymology of the word amply proved.

You may tell me what audacity to think anyone will challenge such a silly 'thesis'? If a man hasn't got an answer against you, he answers in one or all three of the following ways: First, the most common way (– because of the most common ailment of human nature, **fear** –), he'll answer you with **courtesy**— Hy sal jou heuning om die bek smeer tot jy siek is van die soet! Tell the man how intelligent he is, how noble his cause, what great job he has done, how high the standard – anything but give him the impression you are not interested, or not capable to answer him, or too fearful and comfortable to go against the status quo of your own clique or clan. Next, just as common, don't give an answer, or try to give an answer; just **ignore** him, forget it— guaranteed the most effective way to get rid of the sot. Never attempt to give him a straight denial and tell him how stupid he is! That will be gas on his Weber! Last, but not least, **pretend** you're interested, look serious, ask him to explain, use the time up, keep him on the line, make him think he is convincing you. Meantime behind your eye sockets, work out your monthly budget, think of your next trip overseas, whatever. Give the man a taste of the pleasure to have an audience. It will be your last hear of or from him. There's another strategy, Let him sweat the **small stuff**. Rub it under his nose when he spells 'stalward', or mistypes 'testomonies', when he writes 'Armenianism', when he confuses Arius for Arminius, or Arminius for Pelagius, or when he says Seventh Day Adventists started in 1844, and so on. Another help— **Confuse!** Highjack his subject; divert his enthusiasm, create rabbit trails, divide his attention, and so on. But none as good as **compliment, disregard and pretend**; flatter, forget, and feign. Vlei, vergeet, vertoon. But you see, **Detract!** It works! Let's get back to the subject!

"In Sabbath's-day's fullness, while-being-light-having-inclined, towards / before the First Day", is what is written in **Matthew 28:1**, and that's why Matthew 28:1 is omitted here, in fact scratched, from the relevant Texts for Mrs **White's** chapter, '*The Lord is Risen*', to make way for her false insertion of "*night ... worn away ... darkest hour, just before daybreak*". Which text, which Gospel is that? I can't say it comes from any! *Why not? Doesn't Mark say so? Doesn't Luke say the same, and John?* I reply, Neither! *Are you blind?* No, I'm not. Mark is the one who says "*just before daybreak*". Luke

says, "darkest hour". No one says, "night", or, "night worn away". John says "darkness", not 'night', to be exact; but he says "**early darkness**", which is dusk "**before darkness**". So where did Mrs **White** get her garbled, "night ... worn away ... darkest hour, just before daybreak", from? Not from Scripture, but from juggling the concepts in the Synoptists like marbles of the colours of the rainbow, praying they might with much shaking arrange in the sequence of the rainbow.

But where, o where, is Matthew 28, verses **5 to 10**? How is it possible these verses could be left out while dealing with, "The Lord is risen"? **How** was the Good News originally broken; **who** broke the news; **when** was it made known; and **where**? Because **each** of these vital questions, **in so many words**, is **nowhere else** answered in the New Testament, but in Matthew 28: **5!** In fact, yes, nowhere else! I mean now, as far as circumstantial evidence is concerned. Not those truths that it in factual fact of actual act was God who raised Christ. We cannot now be engaged by those 'higher' aspects of Truth. Like I said in our first discussion, here we are engaged with factual acts of actual facts – with the 'literal' things; the earthly things that accompanied the resurrection of Christ, like **time, locality, people**.

It is no wonder then – as we shall see – having kept these text **out of sight** so as to keep them out of **mind**, Mrs White completely got lost with regard to the actual facts of the factual acts with regard to the Crucifixion. (Just wait a bit, we'll get there!) The **reason**? That she disregards verses **5 to 10** of Matthew 28, and consequently is unable to answer **any** of the questions of **How** the Good News was broken; **Who** broke the news; **When** it was made known; and **Where** it was made known. See you there!

In the meantime, one thing is for sure, Mrs White (or was it the editors) was **careful** in selecting her Scriptures (for her)! It proves – it does not just 'indicate' or 'allude' or whichever smart word for 'prove' – it **proves** she as well as the editors understood perfectly well, the real meaning of, 'opse de Sabbatohn, tehi epifohsk-ousehi, eis Mian Sabbaton'— with, or without academic background in the Greek language! They are inexcusable, and they prove themselves, inexcusable. They knew Matthew 28:1 is irreconcilable with what Mrs **White** wrote and believed! They knew, just like translators of newer 'Translations' know, Matthew 28:1 is irreconcilable with the idea Jesus rose on Sunday morning. But the 'translators', have the knife by the handle, and they could chop and change the text for us unfortunate mortals – or so they think, until this day.

It should be clear, what I have said, I say to all, not only to Mrs White; not only to the Seventh Day Adventists; but to Christianity in general, who refuse to accept or acknowledge the King James Version and Revised Standard Version are right, that Matthew 28:1 states that Christ rose from the grave, "In the Sabbath", "On the Sabbath", and "towards" the First Day – before it; not on the First Day.

I summarise, to see the **sequence** of events through the eyes of **Mrs White**: Chapter: "*The Risen Lord*". **When?** No, **not** Matthew 28:1, "*In fullness of the Sabbath, its mid-afternoon*", but, I, Mrs **White**, say, "*The night of the first day of the week worn away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak.*"

"*The Risen Lord*" --- **Who** would have known? No, **not** Matthew 28:5, "*Explained to / answered the angel the women*", but I, Mrs **White**, say, "*They (brave soldiers) see Jesus come forth from the grave! ... The Roman guard beheld Him! ...*" I, Mrs **White**, say, no angel explained; rule it out! I say, it wasn't the women told – told by the angel. We have something (not old wives' tales) to go on here – we have eyewitnesses! I, Mrs **White**, say, "*They (brave soldiers) see Jesus come forth from the grave, and hear Him proclaim over the rent sepulchre, I am the resurrection and the life. ... (the soldiers) saw ... Christ came forth from the tomb glorified, and the Roman guard beheld Him. Their eyes were riveted upon the face of Him whom they had seen in the judgment hall ... In this glorified Being they beheld the prisoner ...*" Page and line: 90/18, 26-27, 91/1, 21-24. Virtually one page, with several indicative, false, statements. On its last line, an indirect statement: "... they hurried on to the city, telling those whom they met the wonderful news." We have conflicting 'testimonies', doubtless! **Matthew** now gets his turn to tell his version of the event ... Matthew the reciter, Matthew the elocutionist, the teacher, the Apostle, Matthew the writer, **proclaims and declares**:

"*Explained* the angel to the women, "*In the end of the Sabbath, mid afternoon tending towards the First Day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to see the grave. But, suddenly was there a great earthquake! For the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled the stone back from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment White as snow: For fear of him, the keepers trembled, and fell down as if dead.*" **And he told** the women: *Now don't you, be frightened, because I know, you have been looking for Jesus who was crucified. He isn't here, because as He had told*

you he would, He is now risen! Come, have a good look at the place where the Lord lay."

What have I done with the text?

(I did something **with** it; I did nothing **to** it.) I took the 'explanation' / 'answer', out of its literal, written position, and put it where it contextually – for nearer focus on the Resurrection –, **applies**. The angel 'explained to / answered, the women'— what happened, how it happened, and where and when it happened. Matthew wrote his exordium or preamble to his Resurrection-anecdote, **in between** the angels' 'answer' or 'explanation' of the **Resurrection**, and his **injunction**— "the angel told the women, Go tell!"— The Proclamation of the Resurrection-Gospel. Matthew put the angel's 'answer' and 'command', **together**, and **centrally**, **in between** Victory and Mission; in between Fountain and stream; in between Announcement and Pronouncement. The word '**answered**', refers to 'first, **above**'— the Resurrection; the word '**told**', refers to 'further, **down**'— "Go tell".

But both words, "explaining" and "told" – one expression, 'apokritheis ... eipen', 'answering ... said', reach from left, and, from right; it holds together, 'the above', and, 'what follows'; unifies inseparable, verses 1-4, and, verses 5-8; relates, what happened on the day before, "On the Sabbath", and, what happened on this day of, 'answer and command'-'apokritheis ... eipen'.

Matthew most effectively brought together the section before and the section after; masterly joined, Resurrection and Proclamation, by placing "*And the angel explained to the women, and told them: ...*" right between the two. I attempted to focus in on Matthews' focus. Does anybody think I violated the Scripture? Then please feel free to make your suggestions how to better combine and conceptualise the first four verses of Matthew and verses 5 to 10 together? Matthew, **for perfect clarity**, placed the angel's answer or explanation to the women in the position we find it— **This is how we know, this is how Jesus' resurrection happened— how, where, and when; this is our source**. The 'explanation' is placed as prescript to **both** the Resurrection, **and**, the Command to Go! The Resurrection is God's perfecting all His works— is God, having entered into His Rest. The Command is the angel's, handing over the Message to the first missionaries.

Matthew places the whole of the occurrence of the Resurrection – including the identification of the day it happened on – literally, chronologically, and in principle and importance, **before**, the

Commission. Without Resurrection, no Mission. Matthew's reader should know who is the **source** and who the **informant** of all knowledge – the knowledge of this the all encompassing and saving Truth of Christian Faith, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. It is not man, of man, by man, but for man and to man, from God, through his chosen '*sentinel*', "**the angel to the women ... to the disciples**" ... "**into all the world**".

Now this is what **Matthew** meant how you shall know unto the salvation of your souls— "*Answered and explained the angel to the women ...*". "*God raised Christ from the dead ...*". "*No one can see God and live.*" Mrs **White** has all the way been cheating, teaching strange doctrine— the doctrine and commandments of men.

(1) Who first came to **know** of Jesus' resurrection, the soldiers or the women? Mrs **White** says the **soldiers**; **Matthew** says "*The angel explained to the women and told them ...*"!

(2) **When** became it known first that Jesus rose from the dead? Mrs **White** says, when He **rose** – **as** Jesus came out of the tomb – the guard saw Him; **Matthew** takes for granted the plain fact **nobody**, knew of or saw Jesus' resurrection. He does **not say**, but one should infer, the angel, **next morning**, told / answered / informed / explained to the women about what had happened on the day before, "*In Sabbath's fullness, mid-afternoon tending towards the First Day of the week*".

(3) **How** was the news first made known? Mrs **White** says the soldiers, by **seeing** and **hearing themselves**, were first to know; **Matthew** says, the women were "**informed / told**", by the **angel** who "**explained**" the resurrection to them.

(4) Whom did Jesus **first appear** to? Mrs **White** wrote, He was first 'seen' - "*looked upon / beheld*" by the "*brave soldiers*" of the "*Roman guard*"; **Mark** wrote, 16:9, "*He, the Risen, first to Mary Magdalene appeared.*" See also **John** 20:11 further.

(5) Who, first **proclaimed** the knowledge of Jesus' resurrection? Mrs **White** says, "*((T)he Roman guard*) ... *hurried on to the city, telling those whom they met the wonderful news.*" **John** records, "*Jesus saith unto her, Go to my brethren and say unto them ... Mary Magdalene went and told the disciples.*" 20:17-18. And **Matthew** records, "*They (the women) departed quickly from the*

sepulchre with fear and great joy; and **did run to bring** his disciples word. And as they **went to tell** his disciples, Jesus met them, saying, All hail! And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: **go tell** my brethren ... **they, were going / hastened**— and obviously must actually have told the disciples. (Verses 7 and 16, they should meet Jesus in Galilee.)

The **women** were the first '*sentinels*' of the **Resurrection**; and, they were the first '*sentinels*' of the **Gospel** of our Lord Jesus Christ. The 'gospel' that not in the first and in the last, in part and in whole, in essentials and essence, is the Gospel of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead in the flesh of his glorified body, is a strange gospel, and its sentinels messengers of antichrist.

Mark well ... The **Proclamation** of the Gospel starts nowhere else than "... *from the grave*". "**They (the women) departed quickly from the sepulchre**". The **Salvation** in Jesus Christ **begins, with and in** his resurrection, **proceeds "from the dead"** (which is Life), and is **proclaimed**, beginning at, "*from the grave*"; not by infidels, but by **believers**. "**They (the women) departed, quickly, from the sepulchre**". It starts and ends with and in, **Life**— with "**quickly**". "**Come quickly Lord Jesus!**"— Jesus Christ, "*Life Giving Spirit*".

(6) **Believing by sight?**

Another instance of Mrs **White's** authority over the Bible— **She** says: "At sight of the **angels and** the glorified **Saviour** the Roman guard had fainted and become as dead men." P 91 §5. (I won't even mention the plural! **White**: "*angels*"; **Matthew**: "*angel*".) **Matthew**— more precisely, the angel, even more exactly, True Inspiration, tells us – three-fold witness! – "*For fear of him (the angel), the keepers trembled, and fell down as a dead.*"

Mrs **White** elaborates on the majesty and awe of the **angel**, "*clothed with the panoply of God*", "*the mightiest of the Lord's hosts*". But her praises are hollow, because the guard "*look upon the face*" of this angel whose "*countenance was like lightning*", **unperturbed!** They don't "*fall down like dead*", as **Matthew** thought.

"At the resurrection they saw the brightness of the angels illuminate the night", p 91 §3, yet the brightness of them all together, could not knock out the guard! Yes, the soldiers remain conscious and after, remembered every detail God hid for all men else, even for

his Elect. The guard look the angel in the face; they "*see him removing the stone as he would a pebble*". The guard in fact watch the greatest work the exceeding greatness of the power of God has worked in his eternal existing, the act of God's final rest, God's rest in the resurrection of Christ from the dead Yet they live? are not even become unconscious?! They stagger not, nor lurch or reel— but live and tell! God must have made the angels, it seems, a little lower than man?

To me there is something sinister about Mrs White.

The guard even at **seeing Christ rise** from the dead, '*fainted*' not.

"*The Roman guard beheld Him. Their eyes were riveted upon the face of Him whom they had seen in the judgment hall ... In this glorified Being they beheld the prisoner ... This was He who had been laid in Joseph's new tomb ...*" p 91 §3, 4. The guard stayed fully conscious, comprehending everything they were seeing. They saw the **Resurrection** wherein Christ "*vanquished satan and the powers of darkness ... (and) swallowed up death in victory*" (par. 3b)

Only and at the very last, "*At sight of the **angels and** the glorified Saviour, the Roman guard had fainted and become as dead men*"— opening line of paragraph 5, p 91, 6 lines from the bottom, at the end of these two pages (90-91) We have found all these false statements on just two pages— **where, Mrs White**, describes ... Jesus' **resurrection!** Meanwhile, **Matthew**, in these words – first, before anything else –, wrote, "*When suddenly the angel of the Lord descended ... and came ... and for fear of him*—this servant-angel— *the keepers / soldiers / guard ... became as dead*"— a rational sequence, **at once with**, the angel's **descent**.

But the guard —according to Mrs **White**— for a while, while Jesus **rose, and for a while, after He had risen, stood up**, first, **against** the descending angel with the appearance like lightning and with thunder of a great earthquake, and next, **against** the rising and to them appearing Jesus as he **leaves** the grave. "*Christ came forth from the tomb glorified, and the Roman guard beheld Him. Their eyes were riveted upon the face of Him ... In this glorified Being they beheld the prisoner whom they has seen in the judgment hall ...*"— page 91, paragraph **four**. **Fifth** paragraph, page 91, "**At sight** of the angels and the glorified Saviour the Roman guard had **fainted** and become as dead men. **When** the heavenly train was hidden from their view, they (the guard) **arose to their feet** ... and made their way to the gate of the garden ...".

Now that excludes and makes impossible that the guard for one moment could have been unconscious! Here is made clear Mrs White for appearance of respect for the Scriptures only, artificially, as hypocritical precaution to save face, inserted **Matthew's** statement of the guard who like dead men fell down. She could better have left it out or denied it altogether, and her credibility would have suffered less! She premeditated and dishonestly camouflages the guard's 'fainting', by connecting it in context, **not** like **Matthew** does **at first with** the appearance of the angel **before** he had opened the grave and **before** the Resurrection had occurred, but **after** Jesus' resurrection and while **after** He had come out of the grave, **in order to** instead of the Father, make the **angel** the caller from the dead of Jesus! Premeditated— it is the only possibility! (Cf. Ro6:4b and 1:23a.)

Mrs **White** implies the guard **at no stage** was truly unconscious, and never and far from "were like **dead men**", **belying her insertion of Matthew's phrase**— The guard **kept 'looking'** on, **conscious** eye-witnesses, of every Mystery of the **Resurrection!** So " *The soldiers told all, just as they had **seen** it ... they bore testimony to the **resurrection** of Christ ... the **truth**. With painful utterance they said, It was the Son of God who was crucified; we have heard an angel proclaim Him as the Majesty of heaven, the King of glory.*" I, with painful utterance, must declare, Which every word of Mrs E.G. **White's** is **surmising**; which every word of hers, is **feigning**; which every word, is **treachery** — which every word is, " *a lying report!*"

"The guard saw", or, the women were told?

The Gospel '**from**' the grave **on**, 'goes', is 'taken', 'into all the world', not by the Roman guard, but by the disciples – the women, without them having **seen** the resurrection. Because " *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the **Word** of God.*" Ro10: 17. " *Whom, having **not seen**, ye love, in Whom – though now you **see** Him **not** yet in Him believing – ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.*" 1Pt1: 17.

I have re-written this 'study', I cannot recall how many times. At the very first attempt, I made this observation, 'To me there is something sinister about Mrs White. Each time I rewrote my study, different things I have not before noticed, forced itself to my attention — things I never thought possible Mrs White or anyone on this earth able to imagine. Every time of review and doing over, I

was more reluctant to accept the truth of my new findings. All seemed so unreal— so sinister! But with the many unavoidable conclusions come together in the larger picture of Mrs White's teaching on the Resurrection-event, everything in the smaller, became clearer; very clear and focussed— to my utter disbelief. What I have found, is what you hear today. It is amazing; it is alarming and frightening. But what you are going to read, is Mrs E.G. White's 'Inspiration' and 'Testimony', precisely uncovered for what it really is: blasphemy!

Faith cometh by hearing

Mrs **White** has the guard remaining conscious and fully aware throughout Jesus' resurrection, in order to become the **witnesses** and '**sentinels**' of his resurrection— **as were** Christ's resurrection **not** the throne of the immediate presence and act of the Almighty Father (in whose Presence no mortal can come, and live, because this Mortal is putting on Immortality!).

"Mrs **White**, the servant of the Lord"— as she is called by the Seventh Day Adventists – **only at this point** in time and **against Matthew** the publican and servant of the state – declares, "**At sight of the angels and the glorified Saviour the Roman guard had **fainted** and become as **dead men**".**

It is Mrs **White's** conceptualisation. The SDA dogma of an 'investigative judgment' demands, that Jesus – while He was on earth – could not be Priest or be raised **by the Father**. **Here we see the worm of corruption that "pervert(s) the Gospel of Christ."** Galatians 1: 7. It is the teaching, the Father at no point when Christ was raised, was present with Him; that Christ rose without the Father being 'there'; that He rose not at hearing the Voice and Word of His Father **from Himself!** But this sophistry is " *another Gospel that is not another Gospel*", but an abomination which blasphemes against the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Power of God, the Height of whose Glory is the Triumph of His Christ who was "**raised in / by the Glory of the Father**".

In verse 1 of Galatians 1, we read: "**God the Father, Who raised Him from the dead**". This is the distinctive mark of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This if you believe you are a Christian, and if you do not believe, you are a cult of the devil. The **Father** was with Christ and in Christ, before Him and behind Him and beside Him, under Him and over Him, "*When **He**, God— the Father, "raised Christ", God—the Son, "from the dead"*", Ephesians 1: 20.

This is **how** the Gospel began:

"When He **raised** Him from the dead." GI1:1.

"Like as Christ was **raised up** from the dead by the glory of the Father."

Romans 6:4.

"The God of peace that from the dead **brought again** our Lord Jesus Christ." Hb13:20.

This is **Who** raised Christ:

"**God the Father** Who raised Him from the dead";

"Like as Christ was raised up from the dead by **the glory of the Father**";

"**The God of peace** that from the dead brought again our Lord Jesus

Christ". "**Peace from God the Father**", Ro1:7, 1Cor1:3, 2Cor1:2, GI1:3, Ef1:2, Phil1:2, Hb13:20.

This is **when** the Gospel began:

"**When** He raised Him from the dead";

"**Like as** Christ was raised up from the dead **by the glory** of the Father";

"The God of peace that from the dead **brought again** our Lord Jesus Christ".

This is **where** the Gospel began:

"When He raised Him from **the dead**";

"Like as Christ was raised up from **the dead** by the glory of the Father";

"the God of peace that from **the dead** brought again our Lord Jesus Christ".

This is **whence** the Gospel began:

"When He raised Him **from** the dead";

"Christ was raised **up from** the dead by the glory of the Father";

"the God of peace that **from** the dead brought **again** our Lord Jesus Christ".

This is **hence** the Gospel was **sent**:

"Jesus saith unto her, **Go** to my brethren and **say** unto them ...

Mary Magdalene went and told the disciples." Jn20:17-18.

"**They (the women) departed** quickly from the sepulchre and **did run to bring** his disciples word.

And as they **went to tell** his disciples, Jesus met them

Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: **go tell** my brethren ...

they, were going / hastened"

"**They (the women) departed** quickly, **from the sepulchre**".

The Sinister

Who raised Christ from the dead?

Almost audibly answers the devout Seventh Day Adventist, 'We read her (Mrs **White's**) Testimony in the Spirit of Prophecy, 'The Desire of Ages', chapter, "The Lord is Risen", based on Matthew 28:2-4, 11-15,

"The soldiers see him (the angel) removing the stone ... and **hear, him, cry, Son of God, come forth**: thy Father calls Thee. They see Jesus come forth" "... based on Matthew 28:2-4, 11-15"! Based on the Word of God; based on what the soldiers had seen; based on 'Inspiration', based on 'the Spirit of Prophecy', the **angel, called** Jesus. Jesus was called by the angel **to go to the Father ... after having been "taken up into heaven"**, Acts 1:11, **not when He rose from the dead!** (Cf. 'Dead Sea Scroll on Stone', Israel Knohl 2008)

John 20:17 and Hebrews 8:4', say the same devout Seventh Day Adventist, 'tell us why Mrs **White** declares it was the angel who 'called' Jesus to "**come forth**", that is, to '**come out**' of the grave. '**Come out**', your Father is **not here**; He is **not in there** with you, He **calls** you through me, his messenger, 'angel'. Mrs White is a word-artist; her canvas does not show the Father, not because "Thou shalt make no image" of Him, but because He is **far away**, 'in heaven', 'in the sanctuary in heaven' – that's why He sent **me**, his **angel**, to '**call**' you! (Compare with Jacob Lorber.)

Who raised Lazarus from the dead? **How**, with which **Words** and with which **Voice**? — "**(Jesus) cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth!** And he that was dead came forth." Jn11:43/44.

Do I argue from something's absence? If you think so, hear this, Mrs **White**,

"**He (Christ) slept in the tomb, and on the morning of the resurrection, He said, I am not yet ascended to, My Father.**" p 67 §3.

The Father wasn't present when Jesus was raised from the dead, is her whole point. Jesus made no atonement on earth, He was not Priest of God on earth, He first had to 'go to heaven' (From where the Father sent the angel to go and 'call' Christ from the grave.) where the Father waited for Him 'in the first 'room' of the 'sanctuary in heaven', and there, where and when He would be with the

Father, **there** will He 'make **atonement**' for the sins of the whole world. Mrs White will not have, the **Father**, to raise Christ from the dead! More than enough is it to know – to have discovered in fact – the **basis** of all Mrs White's draconic dogma, consists in the **alleged absence of the Father** in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. Not I, but Mrs **White**, argues from absence, from her concocted absence of the Father in the resurrection of Christ. According to Mrs **White** the implication is the Father also did not **descend** to Christ. If the Father was not there, then **whose voice** cried the **word**, 'Come forth!?' With justification, **who**, does Mrs **White** say, raised Christ from the dead? In this place, by logical implication as well as by written word?

Of **Jonah** who is a type of Christ: "*The shipmaster came to him, and said to him, What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God might think upon us, that we perish not.*" (1:6)

The Call of the Caller from the dead, is Call obeyed, is Call answered, is Call returned— returned by Him who has the Power over death and grave.

"I remembered the LORD: and my prayer came in unto Thee, into thine holy temple. I will offer unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that I vowed. Salvation is of the LORD." (2:7,9) Christ "*by the glory of the Father*" was raised from the dead.

The obedience, the answer, the return, the Call of the Called from the dead is by the Power of Him who calls from the dead and grave. "**According that God was able to raise Him up, even from the dead; from whence also He received Him in (Truth).**" Hb11:19. (Of Christ even more than of Isaac.) "*Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment, I have received from my Father.*" John 10:17-18.

Jesus obeyed the Father's Call when He laid down his life. "*I came to do thy Will, o God!*" Jesus obeyed the Father's Call when He took up his life again. No man took from Christ his life— not man or angel; no man called Christ from the grave— not man or angel. The Cry of Life, the Voice of the Father was it, which it had to be, that called Jesus Christ both to lay down his life and to take up his life again.

The Call, the Cry, the Voice, is the Father's, or Christ died not for sin, nor rose from the grave for righteousness.

This is antichrist that says Christ came not **into** death in the flesh, but feigned; this is antichrist that says Christ came not **from** death in the flesh, but came in the minds of man. This is **antichrist** that denies the Power of **God** the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit called the Son of God from the grave of the dead!

If it had been one or two, even three, literal, factual mistakes or doubtful instances, Mrs White still might have been regarded honest, ordinary and well meaning. Just one instance of wrong or doubtful 'testimony' though, seeing her Church and she insist she is 'Inspiration', 'the Spirit of prophecy', 'the Lord's servant', etc., should prove her a false prophet. But, with **every page bristling** with mistakes and falseties ... one should ask oneself, **what is it I'm wasting my time on?** But there are honest people out there, who are deceived. (1) And more, there is a Truth of the Word, mutilated. (2) I have a duty, may only one other than myself in this big world read (3) There is the Sabbath of the LORD your God, the Lord's Day, at the mercy of the Seventh Day Adventists (4).

A man who is not sure of himself, resorts to aggression. In physical combat the losing man more and more relies on defence, because his body— by the reality of his humanness, forces him. In 'spiritual' or 'religious' warfare, the loser more and more relies on attack, by the surrealism of his arrogance and temerity. With her every next statement Mrs White becomes more aggressive and more assertive.

On which day, did God raise Christ up?

If not **on** any **one** day of God's creating, the resurrection of His Christ happened, to no day in or of the times and seasons of God's creating or appointment, give it meaning! But **in that** the resurrection of Jesus Christ **indeed** happened on **the** one day of God's creating, appointment and Promise, **therefore**, to **it**— to **that** day, the event of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, **gave meaning!** Not the event of Jesus' stay in the tomb gives meaning – not what Seventh Day Adventists and Mrs **White** call, Jesus' "rest at last" – but the event of his **resurrection** — what **Protestant Christians** understand is Jesus' 'last' and ultimate 'rest' – what they, view as the finishing of all the 'works', of God! Now, 'concerning the which day' did 'God, thus, speak?' 'In sundry times in time past', like, as well as and exceedingly better 'in these last days?' *By his Son Whom He hath appointed? "Hath appointed Heir of all things, by Whom He hath made also the worlds? "Who, being the Brightness of His Glory, and the express Image of His Person, Who, upholding all things by the word of His Power, when He by Himself had purged our sins, sat down at the Right Hand of the Majesty on High ... as He hath obtained a more excellent Name", the Name of Christ and Lord by virtue of Triumph, Feat and Victory over death and grave in Resurrection from the dead? 'Concerning which day' did 'God, thus, speak', of "His Own Rest"? Of which day did God speak, "For God thus concerning the Seventh Day spake: And God the Seventh Day from all His works, rested!"? **Which** 'Seventh Day' did God thus speak of? **Of the day**, God thus concerning "all His work which God created and made", "spoke and it was" – no other than the '**creation-Sabbath**'— the Sabbath Day of the Fourth Commandment— the Seventh Day concerning the which **God, in, through, and by Jesus Christ, in, through, and by, the raising of Him from the dead** in deed and act of the finishing of his work ... His work of redemption, "rested"!*

It is not for us to find out that day; it is for God who knew his own times and days before, and who had made them known after, through and in and by Jesus Christ, through and in and by resurrection from the dead! So no one doesn't know. The whole world knows and long since knew, and acknowledged, yet won't accept for the purpose and end of worship of the Lord of the Lord's Day, least, the Seventh Day Adventists and Mrs White. First to reject are they; and first to replace with own innovation, are they. And with what more horrible substitute than theirs, Jesus' 'rest in the tomb'?

In between 28:1 and 28:11

Nobody living in that day, alive, received an inkling of knowledge of the actual facts of the event of Jesus' **resurrection** from the dead and grave. **Matthew** had just given the full **explanation** from the mouth of the angel to the women in 28: 1-4; what would he have needed the guard for as witness to the Resurrection? 'Angel to the women', is the key to understanding the Resurrection as well as the Mission.

The guard – from the nature and force of the appearance of the angel like lightning –, were **unable** even to have discerned the angel. One struck unconscious by lightning does not remember as much as having been struck. He until or after he has come by will not know or remember anything within, of, or from, that moment, or anything after it ... until he wakes up again. Only from consciousness on, will he know and remember. To divide between moment of consciousness and moment of unconsciousness is impossible.

All the guard remembered is what they **consciously** were able to register, **which was**,

(1) "**Morning after Friday**" (Sabbath morning)— **Stated:** that they were **stationed** and that the grave was **sealed**. 28: 61f.

(2) **Next, "Sabbath's afternoon"**— **Stated:** "**Then suddenly**" No having seen of the angel even, its appearance having been "**like lightning**". 28: 1b.

(3) **Next, 'Sunset, twilight before or after?, by inference**— The guard recovered now, register: An **opened** tomb, an **emptied** tomb, a **missing** body. Think: '**The Jews!**' [28: 11]

(4) **Next, Morning** (by inference Sunday after sunrise)— **Stated:** "**The watch came and announced**" 28: 11.

The guard could not know of any detail in between 28:1b, and 28:11. They couldn't make head or tail of the bigger picture after, either. They were dumb-stricken, because they were blind-stricken, and, deaf-stricken; were stricken in fact, unconscious – Mt28: **1b**. Therefore to in the case of the guard make an argument from **silence**, is to make an argument from a **given reality**. The fact Matthew in these lines records no detail of actual events inside or outside the tomb, explains the very fact the guard reported no detail in verse **11**. Even more important, the guard had no obligation to the priests. Matthew **because** the guard owed the

priests no explanation, recorded no detail other than he did.

(Just mentioning facts, the White-way— The guard had left from the grave "when the heavenly train was hidden from their view". p 91 §5. The guard were the first observers of the resurrection; up to this point in time "when the heavenly train was hidden from the (guard's) view". One cannot make out from Mrs White's writing if the Saviour was part of the train, and it's impossible to understand whether she meant the train was hidden as the result of the guard's fainting, or was hidden through having ascended back to heaven again. But these are of no importance, actually, except, If the Saviour then had gone up to the Father, what then about Mrs White's arguments He hadn't gone up until 'ascension day'?

"When the heavenly train was hidden from the (guard's) view", the women haven't been near the grave. So the guard had left after which, the women must have arrived, and saw the resurrection and were spoken to by the angel ... second time. We shall encounter this discrepancy again in my third delivery.)

'The soldiers were horrified ... the testimony they feared ...'
Who let the dogs out? Watch who runs for holes under fences!

Mrs **White**, "(The soldiers) made their way to Pilate, but their report (of the Resurrection, acc. to her) had been carried to the Jewish authorities, and the chief priests and the rulers **sent for them** (the Roman guard) **to be brought first into their presence.**" p 92 §1.

Who **initiated** the 'meeting'? **Matthew**, "*Some of the watch came into the city, and shewed to the chief priests*", Annas and Caiaphas. Rather than a visit they were called to, this is a 'visit' from the guard, ominous and austere— a visiting as it were from the messengers from the **grave** ... '**hell!**' and nowhere to hide, or, escape.

"Some of the **watch** came into the city, and shewed to /imposed upon the chief priests everything (they **knew**) that happened (at, or rather to, the grave). And when **they** (the chief priests) had called the elders to the meeting too, and they (priests and elders), had consulted with one another (not with the guard), they paid the soldiers much money." **Matthew** 28:11-12.

Messengers from the grave, bringing, death

"Here the priests overreached themselves. How could the soldiers say that the disciples had stolen the body while they slept? If they were asleep, how could they know? And if the disciples had been proved guilty of stealing Christ's body, would not the priests have been the first to condemn them (the guard)? Or if the sentinels had slept at the tomb, would not the priests have been foremost in accusing them to Pilate? The soldiers were horrified at the thought of bringing upon themselves the charge of sleeping at their post. This was an offence punishable with death. Should they bear false witness, deceiving the people, and placing their own lives in peril? Had they not kept their weary watch with sleepless vigilance? How could they stand the trial, even for the sake of money, if they perjured themselves?

In order to silence the testimony they feared, the priests promised to secure the safety of the guard, saying that Pilate would not desire to have such a report circulated any more than they did. The Roman soldiers sold their integrity to the Jews for money. They came in before the priests burdened with a most startling message of truth; they went out with the burden of money, and on their tongues, a lying report which had been framed for them by the priests." p 92 §3, 4.

Mrs White and Seventh Day Adventists sell their integrity for a dogma that from the first has brought upon them nothing but shame, but which they to this day cherish with blinding passion.

The guard were fools. But they were not stupid fools; they were foolish fools. And yes, the "**lying report**" was not from the guard to the priests and elders. The soldiers never told the priests they were "**sleeping at their post**". They were never asked to answer 'Yes', or, 'No', on such a question. The priests, never asked the soldiers to say they were "**sleeping at their post**". That to suggest, is Mrs **White's** own '**lying report**'.

Matthew witnesses the soldiers did **not** sleep; **therefore**, they never **told** anything of the kind. They had nothing of the kind to confess. They didn't tell, they didn't confess; not because it would be suicidal, but **because they did not sleep**. That they accepted bribe was for greed. The guard realised there would come nothing of the priests threats in any case. History proved them right; nothing ever came of the Jews' incriminations; into the bargain they lost their money.

That the guard must (please) **say** that they **slept**, was the suggestion the **priests** made to the guard, that is further corrupted by Mrs White to, that they (1), **must admit** (To tell a lie is not the same thing as to admit a truth.) ... (2), that they **on duty** slept! The Jews did not bluntly put it to the guard like that.

The Jews were masters of the art of subterfuge and whether or not the guard understood, makes no difference. We know what we know what Matthew knew the guard knew, and that's all, and because from **Matthew** and not from **White**, is enough.

The idea that the guard slept, came from the priests— **not, to put the blame on the guard for the missing body of Jesus, or to put the blame on the disciples**, but as a poor consolation for themselves. **The idea Jesus was risen**, killed them! Their proposal was their last feeble denial of the Man of Nazareth, that He was not the Son of God, come in the flesh, and now, **come again from the dead in the flesh; come in glorified body of the Man of Nazareth by resurrection from the dead**. This, the Jews knew, was the truth—the Truth they with reason-consuming hate, feared; the Truth they with reason-consuming fear, hated. The Jews knew very well nobody's ever going to worry about or ask after the crucified or their doom. The opened tomb and missing body for them meant **Life after death ... hell for them**.

That's why Matthew virtually **interweaves the two anecdotes**, the story of the Risen Jesus appearing to the women, and the Sadducees' last resistance against Life after death, swept away.

But **even the priests** were unable to think that the guard slept **on duty**; it would not have helped in any case! The priests had no axe to grind with the guard? Nor with the disciples, for that matter. Their anguish was incurable ... 'After death' was their death's dread, whatever the guard or disciples did!

"**All** the things that **were** done", which, as far as the soldiers knew, was, **nothing!** If the soldiers were afraid – which I cannot see anywhere – they still should have thought, Our mutual loyalty to Caesar; we may have to report to the governor. If we lie, our witness will soon contradict. So stick to the bare facts, fellows! Which bare facts and true report in **Matthew 28: 11b-15**, contain **purely result**, results which in this case, are clearly implied but nothing more than implied. This the guard were **sure** of, they knew, their mutual loyalty. They were Roman soldiers; they had their honour; they had their duty; they were under oath with their protector the Caesar and Roman law; they had nothing to fear in all the world as long as they stuck to and lived by the rule of the ruler!

What makes the Jews think the governor will believe their – of all people their, story, they slept?

Matthew would not leave out to mention, 'on duty / at post', had the Jews used the words because his report is precise! And the **Jews** would not leave out to mention, 'on duty / at post', had the guard been guilty of it – what an opportunity wasted! Too big a White lie! A little white lie maybe, the temerity of perhaps, will do the trick, "**Please say — if, you know, you are asked about the gone body — if you are asked, say, the disciples stole the body away, after, while we took a nap, will you?**" The priests (discerning sneering, thinking, Don't let us overplay our hand now!), Here's a small money for you – O, it's not that large, it's nothing between friends, you know!

The very fact the **priests** proposed a purely circumstantial, 'possible', solution – however fickle – implies the guard reported no more than just circumstantial, observable, possible, 'reality'-facts— because factual and actual. The implications of which could be **but one of two** non-circumstantial, non-observable, and supposed-only thoughts, reasoned-out possibilities, both actually 'impossibilities': **Either** Jesus **rose** from the dead, **or**, the body was **stolen**. And **if** the body had not been **stolen**, there could **only be one** possible impossibility left, that Jesus **rose again!** Which would become, and which in fact became, apparent to the Jews' eternal **shame**. But at this stage they did not yet know! For Jesus not only rose from the dead and from the grave again, but He also appeared to many after— proving the story "until this day commonly among the Jews reported" a 'lying report'.

The factory of confusion

The whole 'issue of the guard', reverts to **who originally** catapulted the crucifixion, but **eventually** attempted to **undo** it: the **Jews!** But the inference is supposable only on the **fact** that **nobody yet knew of the resurrection**. The Jews wanted it be known to all **he was dead**, but the **empty tomb** – **all** that the guard actually knew –, indicated He **must** have been raised from the dead ... **Unless** of course – thought the **Jews**, not the guard –, unless of course the guard could **witness falsely**, and "Say, while we slept, his disciples came and stole the dead away."

The Jews' '*lying report*' was meant to **rule out** the possibility both undeniable and improvable, that Jesus was **alive**. So, not the guard or the Jews **actually knew**, that Jesus then was risen!

That is why Matthew recorded, “Now when they (the women) were **going ... (to) go tell** (his) brethren (that He really appeared to them), ... some of **the guard came** into the city and shewed unto the chief priests.” “Now **when (or ‘as’) they** were going ...”. The women went, and the guard came, **simultaneously**; the guard **without** knowledge of the risen Christ, the women **with** the knowledge!

But Mrs **White**, **directly contradicting Matthew**, enunciates, the guard both **witnessed and reported** the resurrection. To her also, belongs the *‘lying report’* the guard, to save their own skin because they knew, had to tell “If asked”, that they, **the only witnesses**, must please lie, and instead of the truth which they knew, must tell the lie they did not know, and “Say, his disciples, while we were sleeping, came and stole the body away.” The **guard, because they “saw”** Jesus rise, must now stop the spreading of the truth and **deny their knowing**. For having accepted the Jew’s **bribe**, they must tell **yet another** lie of having slept while the disciples came and stole the body away! And to this **second** ‘lying report’, Mrs White added her postscript, that the guard admitted they slept **“at their post”**. That’s what Mrs **White** teaches.

Matthew teaches only the truth of the middle ‘lying report’ here referred, *“If asked, say, his disciples, while we were sleeping, came and stole him away.”* It’s still a ‘lying report’, but it is not Matthew’s or the guard’s – it belongs to the Jews.

But the guard could not be blackmailed **if they knew not** of the resurrection. Now, the tables are turned, and the Jews, are the incriminated; the guard now can blackmail the priests! Guard: You must have stolen the body! Priests: No, we did not. But let us come to an agreement here; let’s compromise. We give you large money, and you say if asked his disciples came by night while we slept and stole him away. Both parties thus agreed to incriminate the innocent disciples rather than accept most obvious probability, that He rose from the dead. And they all lived happily ever after. “So they took the money, and did as they were requested: and this explanation of the whole matter has been commonly rumoured among the Jews until this day. No believer or non-Jew ever has fallen for it. It bluffed the Jews and the Jews only.

Some general observations

Jesus was no wanted criminal of the Roman authorities! His ‘case’ was of no interest to anybody but his foes and followers. So if blame had to be put on anyone, it would exclude the guard; it would have to be decided between foe or friend. Where were His friends? The one suspect at the trial denied Him thrice in a matter of hours. The Man stood alone. O yes, there were his mother and the fisherman, John. But both left long before the real calamities started; they not even knew He died that day still, and couldn’t have known He was removed or buried, at all. So they’re ruled out. What could they have done for Him anyway since the poor wandering Prophet was against expectations buried in a rich man’s tomb like a lord? They wouldn’t have been able to do better – why removed the body? There was that other fellow with the noble features, but he, we believe hanged himself. What the heck the rigmarole for – let the dead dogs bury their own dead, what do we care? There is no case no court or governor would not throw out there and then. Only the Jews; they had that obsession about their king of ridicule; they only are loath enough to try incriminate others for having stolen the body. Their own story betrays them for being the culprits. And what could the Governor gain tolerated he their whining all over? Truly a dead body and its fate couldn’t be a concern for Roman authority. Roman law however had been satisfied— it was unable and unwilling to have anything further to do with a victim punished and already done away with. From here on, actually from before here, let the dead Jews bury their own dead. (It was actually a Prophecy, this, the dead Jews must bury their own dead; a Prophetic Word, fulfilled now.)

Pilate washed his hands – he **distanced** himself from the whole affair of Jesus’ **crucifixion**. He from then on, couldn’t care less! Nevertheless, the Jews after sunset that day once more vexed him for the **bodies** to be removed. And yet again the third time when the Jews unnecessarily (they got what they wanted, did they not?) in their fanaticism (in the early morning hours of their own Sabbath), showed him no respect, but woke him from sleep to have their, resented grave **guarded and sealed**. Pilate, obviously irritated, for last got the Jews off his back, *“You have your guard! Go seal the grave your way!”* Have it anyway your way, just don’t bother me again, I don’t care about your petty issues!

Who, on earth, would believe or mind noise from the Jews a fourth time — The guard slept? On duty? Ha! Arrest the pests!

Recovered

The guard then, of their unconscious unconsciousness **recovered**— their unconscious unconsciousness they never so much as became aware of, or that they unofficially had gone off duty for for a while — recovered, **Observe:** One, **Open grave**; Two, **Empty grave – no body**; Three, **Sunset already?! ... Think:** One, **Opened grave**, Plus, two, **Emptied grave – no body**, Plus, three, **Sunset ... = ?**

Caucus! Deliberate, ponder, remember, think, calculate Anyone's idea?— Nobody? Nothing? ... except— except, yes, them **Jews!** But wait! Twelve o'clock our watch will end; we mustn't show ourselves before then, or it'll complicate things further!

"They came"

So, sunrise: **Went** they, to go get those grave-robber priests, **who else? Enter** they the city, "**Bursting in** finding the (two) high priests (together)", 'We **came** to **tell you**, the grave is open and the body gone! You hear? You understand— **you!?**' The guard **threaten** the Jews, with, and for, **reason**; enough reason to have told the priests, You are going to the cells, now!

The guard, "*came into the city and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done*". Marshall, "*Of the guard coming ... announced all the things having happened.*"

Emphasis by having words **said last**, have them **understood**, **first**. "*All the things ...*" must go before. Not their unconscious experience, but, "all the things that happened" — **observable** things, the guard's **driving force**, **spell danger** for the Jews! "*All the things having happened, the guard coming ... announced (to) the high priests ...*" The guard "*shewed / announced*" ('apehngailan')— The guard "*forced in on / imposed upon / impunged*", the priests. The guard '*coming, telling the priests, 'come' nor 'tell' to cringe, but to avenge.*

Now who are the confident, who the fearless, who the over-towering? — and **Who**, the timid, who, at wit's end, who, the terrified, the **desperately conniving?** The guard?, No! the priests! Were the guard terrified at the prospect of having to answer for sleeping on duty? What!? From "all the things that had happened", from Matthew's Text? No! the ones who come up with that idea clearly are **they who get panicky**— who would "*pay large money*"!

The guard bribed the Jews? No! the Jews bribed the guard! Who had guilty conscience? The Jews were the ones eaten by fear. Jesus was the unjustly condemned victim of **Jewish** hypochondria!

Did the guard sleep, off duty or on duty?

Neither is **ever mentioned a question or fact**, except in apologetics. Both 'possibilities' purely are supposed ... in apologetics! But what is supposed yes, but nevertheless supposed, is sure, are the actual facts, (1) That the **guard** were the **aggressive** and fearless, the intimidating and demanding; and (2) that the **priests and elders** were the timid and **intimidated**, the fearful and threatened.

That the guard must tell, "If asked", that they slept, was not the groping of the guard for the only tree branch overhanging the flooding river that swept them with. That the guard must tell, "If asked", that they slept, is the only lifeline without anchorage the **Jews** cast across the turbulent stream to drown themselves with. Because now it no longer is a question of 'What if ...' with regard to the **guard**; but of, 'While it is so that ...', with regard to the **priests and rulers**.

The guard did not go to the priests 'for help'. (That's an illusion.) The priests did not send for the guard to sort things out with them (That's a **White** lie); The priests expected no visit from the guard. That was their darkest dream come real.

What brought the guard to the home of the high priest? The guard's imposing upon the priests was pure aggression of frustrated duty — the law's avenging with absolutely **no** ulterior motive, but, perhaps, blackmailing.

The suggestion that the guard slept— the proposal that the guard should **tell** that they slept— were the **Jews'**. The Jews in their **desperation**. They knew as well as the soldiers did, that the soldiers did not sleep, on duty or while 'at their post'. But, "*If asked*" — say the priests, **to save face**, "*If asked*" — the very motive that made the Jews ask Pilate to have the body they, had had crucified, removed again, "*If asked, please say you slept*"? That is the request, the last straw clutched at, the lying, dying arrogance of the shamefaced. The guard realised the Jews' embarrassment, and capitalised on their predicament.

The **priests** nevertheless never suggested, 'Say, we slept **on duty**'; that would be stupidity far exceeding even the foolishness of the priests and elders. To 'Say, we slept **on duty**' would be

condemningly self-implicating for the guard. Insinuated the priests such a thing, the guard might have killed them there and then!

::: What was the guard's **lie** then, for they did lie? Their lie was their agreeing to and accepting the bribe, their agreeing and accepting to lie with the Jews— to shift the Jews' illusion of implication off from them, onto the disciples. :::: The guard went in to the Jewish priests, arrogant but innocent; they came out from them, corrupted liars. They went in with confidence; they must have left in fear. They scored a few bucks from the deal though, at a price which Mrs White well describes, "*they sold their integrity to the Jews for money*". An unblemished integrity had theirs been until now. God saw; "*He will laugh at the trial of (his) Innocent!*" Ps9:23. "*He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the LORD shall have them in derision.*" Ps2:4. Were only the guard a bunch of fools who fell for the priests' shrewdness? No, the priests were a bunch of fools who fell for the ruthless cunning of the guard! Non the less, money blinded the reason of the guard and corrupted their morals. Money blinds the reason of all men. The priests had no morals left to corrupt— they "*gave large money*".

Did the guard agree to confess something '*punishable with death*' but they were not guilty of? The guard were fools, as their accepting the bribe, proved. But they were not that ignorant, as to plead their own execution. Not even the priests and elders, contended the soldiers slept '*at their post*'— would the guard? The guard not before the priests or governor, or before any of 'the people', admitted they slept '*at their post*'! Not then or until today. That's the Jews' ultimatum to the guard that Mrs **White** conjured up. The guard having slept at their post— on duty, is not suggested or hinted at in Matthew 28:11b-15. It's a chimera of apologetic's.

Deserted grave

"Here the priests overreached themselves. How could the soldiers say that the disciples had stolen the body while they slept?" ... "If they were asleep, how could they know?" ... of the resurrection?

Matthew says the soldiers told everything that happened— everything that happened **before** the disciples – allegedly – would "come at night". The guard told only the truth— that they were conscious of; the wisest truth that made the high priests panic like deserted puppies. But who ever said the guard knew? The one who asks the question says they knew— Mrs **White**. So she must have presumed they knew, before she asked.

On the other hand, one of the guard has to tell (This now is my own story),

'The person who the first wrote the story down, was one **Matthew**, a publican of no small means, who didn't need to lie for money, a follower of this 'Christ'. The story goes he drew the sword that severed the ear of a servant who found himself among the mob that arrested the crucified. I also heard it told it was a fisherman, Peter Simon. (Cf. Lk22:49, Mk14, Mt26) Quite dauntless pike man I think he was— who is not likely to tell lies but feared nothing but the Truth. He is it I hear, who broadcasts— as he asserts he heard from certain women (that's all I don't like about him or his story ...) – from certain women, who again, were told by an angel, imagine! Anyhow, he is the one who stands behind the rumour it was us the guard, all one hundred of us No wait, he actually reckons, "*Some of the watch, came into the city, and reported to the chief priests all the things that happened*". Now I was one of them, you know. And what does this Matthew say the guard knew? He reckons, we couldn't know nothing! Which of course is also true. We have in fact found the tomb opened, and the body, gone, because we hadn't seen or could remember nothing. Of lightning, I only have heard; this Matthew tells it struck us down, which also he can be right about. There's nobody with another story! The Jews though – they who hate us Romans so, they hated this deceased twice as much – they have their own story; thought we would fall for it, savages! But we didn't know about anything that happened really, because somewhere in between, we were like prostrated dead – tells this man Matthew. He also has to say an angel, told the women all, as I've said, next morning. I cannot say he tells the truth, but I can't say anything against what he circulates for fact either.'

Nothing else, nothing more. The guard knew nothing; mentioned nothing, and so **Matthew** mentions not a thing— not so much as suggests, a thing! The guard knew nothing; so says **Matthew**, despite 'Inspiration' better informs us. Mrs White has it that the guard knew **everything** because they had **seen** everything and had **heard** everything that happened with Jesus while He rose from the dead and while He went out of the grave. Lucky SDAs, Mrs **White** paid attention to so much detail! Unfortunately we cannot find her facts in any Gospel. ("*The trouble with us, Seventh Day Adventists*", a pioneer Adventist in South Africa once told me — I knew him well), *the trouble with us is, we know too much!*" His exact words. Reckon!

"If the disciples had been proved guilty of stealing Christ's body, would not the priests have been the first to condemn them?"

'**Proven**', guilty? By what evidence? Evidence the priests had? Evidence the guard had? Evidence the disciples had? 'Evidence', no one has ever produced?

'**Guilty**'? '*Guilty of 'stealing Christ's body'*? Which had never been proven was stolen? For the 'stealing' of which, nobody has filed complaint ever? '*Guilty*' by what system of Law, 'Roman Law'? Nevertheless, had this farcical funk be taken seriously, "*If the disciples had been proved guilty of stealing Christ's body, would not the priests have been the first to condemn them?*"? What fool would deny? Which Jew— which high priest of the Jews would not take hold of the 'evidence' to prove their case Jesus never rose from the dead? Stupidest question ever asked, "*If the disciples had been proved guilty of stealing Christ's body, would not the priests have been the first to condemn them?*"!

Matthew says, actually, "This saying is commonly reported – among the Jews – until this day" (15), and no one has ever been taken to task, no Jew, no Roman, no man, for that! The guard told the truth to the priests, it's as simple as that; they lied not. I don't think they ever after found it necessary to lie to anybody about having slept— after duty or on duty! It's the Jews who stood ashamed. It's among the Jews the story had become popular; not among the Romans or the Greeks.

"Or if the sentinels had slept at the tomb, would not the priests have been foremost in accusing them to Pilate?"

Sure they would! But the evidence or witness of the priests – if they had any –, would be no better than 'circumstantial'— they weren't '**there**', **when**, it happened; they did not **see**, **as**, it happened; so what could their 'lying report' have helped? The fact the priests never accused the guard to Pilate, proves the issue neither was that the guard slept, on duty, 'at their post', or off, after, duty. It proves, 'sleep', at no stage whatsoever, had been a factor in the issue. It is impossible to be so naive to reckon the priests – any promises of them regardless – would not have accused the guard to Pilate, had they slept! Whether the guard slept or not is never an issue; the priests were the ones who for their worries and obviously false promises, never slept. So what's the point arguing? The Jews were the implicated, and showed themselves the troubled in conscience about something incomparably greater than to cheat a guard.

"The soldiers were horrified at the thought of bringing upon themselves the charge of sleeping at their post."

Of course! But who talks of *sleeping*, "*at their post*"? Mrs **White**; not **Matthew**. Would they *bring upon themselves the charge of sleeping at their post*? Who would? Did they create the possibility? They have yes; **but not** by having slept or having slept at their post, or by ever having told anybody. But by having **accepted bribe**. Were they *horrified at the thought*? They accepted the money without hesitation; so they weren't as far as sight could tell. The guard not in the least cared, frankly. The Jews – the priests and elders – were the ones horrified; not at the thought of bringing a charge upon themselves or, upon the guard, **but at the thought Jesus had risen from the dead**. They in fact assured the guard, 'Don't you worry, if ...'— which exactly shows the guard, were not the ones afraid, but the pretending **Jews!** A fearing man is scared by a mouse. Mrs **White** simply breaths up ghosts to run for; for them you must run away backwards! The Jews' real fear, Mrs White never perceived. **Matthew** kept perspective, and with it, his cool; his story is not of anyone afraid, except the Jews, and he pictures a well satisfied group of Roman soldiers who behind the priests' back, jeered, 'Gotcha!'

"This was an offence punishable with death. Should they bear false witness, deceiving the people, and placing their own lives in peril? Had they not kept their weary watch with sleepless vigilance? How could they stand the trial, even for the sake of money, if they perjured themselves?" ...

Well answered, Mrs **White!** The whole and only 'issue', rests on supposition, If Had they not And obviously the attitude of the guard was, if heaven falls we'll wear blue helmets. "So they took the money" 'Serves them right, those Jews!'

The guard were the only ones who knew about the open and empty tomb. Let's keep to **Matthew's** facts— They knew the guard slept not; would not give the idea a thought! They at some stage recovered but wouldn't know how or when; they found opened and emptied grave. The centurion at the cross already realised this Man was no ordinary. "All these things that happened" ... maybe He had a point! The guard suspected Jesus was risen, I have no doubt. And they with glee grasped the opportunity to play their game of terror on the Jews. The guard broke in on the home and found, "priests". Both high priests, this hour of day in the one's house? Who's the scared here? The guard? The soldiers now ordered the priests to go find the elders and bring them to meeting. The guard told the

priests; not vice versa. Now you quickly sort out your nonsense, Jews; we're waiting for you. The actual 'council taken', was between the Jews – between the priests and the elders, and they – the Jews, in fear born from guilty conscience, "gave large money unto the soldiers". (A guilty conscience brought about by two things, first the fact they had an innocent man crucified. But not so much that, but, being priests, they knew the Scriptures – they knew all the Scriptures by heart! The Scriptures scared them to death. The Scriptures they knew so well, foretells this Man Jesus whom they have crucified – in fulfilment of the very Scriptures. Who's afraid here? The guard? If the guard feared, they, may have tried to bribe the Jews! They more probably would have been on the run though, by now, and would not have been here still.

The Roman guard "*came, and showed the high priests*". They came to them; they went after them. The guard had no concern the body was gone, but the Jews were horrified at the thought of a risen Jesus! Hear, you terrified louts! 'Please, men of the governor's guard, we beg you, don't let this become known under our people! We beseech you, take this money, only keep things quiet! Tell if you're asked, his disciples came by night and stole him while we slept? Please?' Who is pleading, here? The guard?

"If this comes to the governor's ears, we, will persuade him and make sure nothing happens to you." That is the typical and unmistakable language of the guilty. I say it again, you can put your money on it, the victim of his own conscience will make his creditor feel and even believe he is his debtor. It's a law of human nature, tested and controlled by many a person of experience. The guard did not fall for it. Matthew with his 'guard episode', **proved the priests' guilt**. He does not try to prove the Resurrection; **Matthew already believed** when he wrote his gospel.

Of course it's not only Mrs **White** who chased after traditional rabbit-trails; all Christianity did, like myself with regard to this guard-story for many years.

"In order to silence the testimony they feared, the priests promised to secure the safety of the guard"

'They', the priests, feared, says Mrs **White**! The Jews – not the guard – were the ones frightened by the implication of an opened and emptied tomb, **the implication of the resurrection of Jesus**. These two high priests were Sadducees who did not believe the resurrection. They nevertheless believed the Scriptures enough to be scared by it. They feared their own people, and they feared

Jesus, but most, they feared His Resurrection! The guard feared none.

*"... saying that **Pilate would not desire** to have **such a report** circulated any more than they did" ...*

is the contortion of Mrs White's. The guard did not go to Pilate (as Mrs **White**, not Matthew, claims), because they feared him. The governor was the one the guard had no reason to fear; he was 'on their side', as good as they were 'on his side'. The guard went straight for those who feared them, the governor's deputy ... the priests!

Slept the guard, it wouldn't mean a thing that they should have feared! The very fact Matthew not in any way contain the idea of the guard having slept "*at their post*", 'on duty', shows who the real fearing party was; not the guard, but the priests who conceived the idea! But just as much as Matthew not in any way contain the idea of the guard having slept "*at their post*", 'on duty', just as much – or as little – does Matthew contain the idea or does Matthew hint at the idea that it was the guard, who feared! Yes, in fact! Where does Matthew say, or how does he intimate the guard, feared, because they slept, because they slept on duty? He does nothing of the kind.

Slept the **guard**, slept they **after** their watch, **fearless**. Feared the guard, feared they for nothing! So, it's useless information for 'resurrection-apologetics'. But slept the **priests**, feared they, and slept they **never**, but stayed up through the night until the guard found them next morning in great distress. That, is significant information for 'resurrection-apologetics'. That is what **Matthew** informs us about and gives us insight into. It has clear meaning for 'resurrection apologetics'. **It means, Jesus as He foretold, rose from the dead!**

However then, why would Pilate have been angered by the fact the body was gone? Not the words or the idea can be said are that of **Matthew**. The Jews feared God (in a negative way). They pretended they were not afraid of Pilate. 'Pilate's my buddy, I'll sort things out for you my mates.' Have I heard that in my life before? The betraying sham of the insecure pretentious. A fellow once was unable to honour his purchase of my house. When I claimed it back, he adamantly tried to persuade me I could buy 'his house' again, for such and such a bargain! This man **Matthew**, he knew human nature! Anyway **Pilate wouldn't have cared less**. He **officially "gave the body"**, to Joseph, and Joseph could do with it whatever he liked, and had all the right to change graves even if he so wished.

Pilate **could** not have cared less! It was **the Jews, from the beginning**, who were so afraid they did not know what to do, John 19:31.

Why centuries of clumsy apologetics the guard had to stand in for the Jews' predicament?

"They stole Him"

Here is something else ever and anon overseen. The Jews did not say, Tell, the disciples came by night and stole 'the **body**'; they said, "and stole **Him**"! The Jews believed, they were absolutely sure, Jesus **lived**, and just **as much as they were convinced, feared they**. Now one understands their fear! But the guard during the whole of the affair of the meeting, or before, or after, never, showed fear. Tradition mesmerises, obfuscates, blinds, causes mental-block. Tradition is strong!

So it's not only Mrs **White** and the Seventh Day Adventists who in actual fact do not have a clue what they're talking; it has been all of us. Some 'saints' of two millennia ago, started the rumour, and we have all forgotten to go read the Scriptures; we all ignored the fact, God has His Word.

A Christian Faith

The Gospel, is not the belief of 'an open tomb' or of 'an empty tomb'. Unbelievers believe 'an open tomb' ... 'an empty tomb'. First they desired Him crucified; now they want Him vanished. For an open or opened tomb, an empty or emptied tomb, a stolen or a missing body, is not what Christian Faith believes in or is about, but what Roman soldiers and Jewish high priests believed in. The message of an open and empty tomb is feared and loathed as coming from hell; in its demure the ungodly unite against the Gospel of Christ and the Christ of the Gospel. Antichrist makes an idol of the empty tomb of the same grandeur as its images of a crucified and dead Christ. The latter they hang on their necks; the former on the altar of their hearts. There is no power in the crucifix as there is but emptiness in the open tomb.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ is proclaimed *vis a vis* the message of an open and emptied tomb. The Gospel is the Faith of the Risen Christ, of Jesus whom God the Father raised from the dead. The Gospel is the Light of the Power of God that overcame darkness and death,

and is believed in unto eternal life. We see Jesus, the Glorified and living Christ, no empty tomb before our eye of faith.

May God keep us on the narrow road, narrow though it be, and steep; but straight and upwards, unto that day we shall see Him face to face, and shall rejoice.

Third delivery

Ellen White and Sunday- Tradition in Embrace

"Priest and prophet have gone off the road ... they err in vision; they stumble in judgment ... To whom shall he teach knowledge, and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? ... The Word of the Lord to them was law upon law, law upon law, line upon line, here a little, there little, that they may go forward, but fall backwards, and be snared, and broken, and taken."

Is28:7-13.

Resurrection or Appearance?

To prevent confusion of things said by whom, I shall now also "underline" Mrs White's statements.

"The night of the first day of the week had worn slowly away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak, had come. Christ was still a prisoner in His narrow tomb. ... "And behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven." Clothed with the panoply of God, this angel left the heavenly courts. The bright beams of God's glory went before him, and illuminated his pathway. "His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men." ... At sight of the angels and the glorified Saviour the Roman guard had fainted and become as dead men. When the heavenly train was hidden from their view, they arose to their feet, and ... and made their way ... The earth trembles at his approach ... and as he rolls away the stone, heaven seems to come down to the earth. The soldiers see him removing the stone ... and hear him cry, Son of God, come forth: thy Father calls thee. They see Jesus come forth from the grave. ... As He comes forth in majesty and glory, the angel host bow low ... An earthquake marked the hour when Christ lay down His life and another earthquake witnessed the moment when He took it up in triumph."
p 90 §2, p 91 §1, 5, 2.

*"This chapter (was) **based on** Matthew 28:2-4: 11-15" ...*

*"This chapter is **based on** Matthew 28:1, 5-8: Mark 16:1-8: Luke 24:1-12: John 20:1-18" ...*

"On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... Ignorant of what was even then taking place, they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" They knew that they could not remove the stone, yet they kept on their way. And lo, the heavens were suddenly alight with glory that came not from the rising sun. The earth trembled. They saw that the great stone was rolled away. The grave was empty. ... Mary Magdalene was the first to reach the place: and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples. Meanwhile, the other women came up. A light was shining about the tomb, but the body of Jesus was not there. As they lingered about the place, suddenly they saw that they were not alone. It was the angel who had rolled away the

stone. ... about him the light of the heavenly glory was still shining ... The women turned to flee, but the angel's words stayed their steps. "Fear not ye," said he: "for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead. Again they look into the tomb, and again they hear the wonderful news. Another angel in human form is there, and he says, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but He is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." pp 96/97.

More than one, separate, individual, visits

Whether or not any or all Gospels are 'reasonably well represented' in White –anywhere–, two things are one hundred percent accomplished by such 'representation' as in Mrs White's, One, each and every Gospel **text** is one hundred percent perverted and falsified; Two, each and every Gospel **narrative** is one hundred percent perverted and falsified.

And to what end? In order to transform different and individual 'visits to the tomb', into the one and instantaneous **coincidence** of the women's visit, of Jesus' **Resurrection**, and of his **Appearance**— to what end? In order to crown and sanctify **Sunday** as the Day of Resurrection-Faith's Worship-Rest— to what end? In order to **abolish** "The **Seventh** Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God".

Mrs White is co-labourer neither last nor least in the effort. "He shall speak great words and shall think to change times and laws".

To what good is all this 'hair-splitting' some have accused me for? **To distinguish** between things the **Gospels distinguish between!** The Gospels never assimilate the four accounts of the four Gospels. The Gospels do not even assimilate the individual accounts within any one Gospel. Don't let us join, what God has seen fit to keep separate. Deal with the facts, not with our own innovations and sentiments.

I believe each Gospel tells the truth, nothing but the truth, and all **the truth of all it tells of the truth**. We can find the whole truth but not all its components in any single Gospel. But we find the whole truth— the whole Gospel, in **all and each** of the Gospels' distinguishable but inseparable accounts, **together**. 'Together'—

different things taken together— not different things assimilated, fused and brewed into a personal or traditional concoction. Which way would you prefer to deal with the Scriptures? Would you rather allow each individual story to tell its own story, or would you try your hand at playing diatessaronist or conflationist like Mrs E.G. White and tradition too many times already have produced?

More than one story, more than one visit, or chaos and irreconcilabilities ad infinitum! More than one story, or justified reason for cynicism and scorn on the Gospel accounts of Jesus' resurrection and appearances. But no! we rather change God's Word, than ours! And deeper and deeper into quicksand of human obstinacy sink plain reason and truth.

But why should I be the one who must apologise for using a **multiple-visit solution**? Everybody does! Mrs White uses the principle as Christian tradition has done for the duration of Christianity! But I don't know what I'm talking!?! Yes in fact, Mrs White here supplies us with her versions of **how many** visits to the tomb!

First, it's the guard. All right, theirs is no visit; they were stationed at the grave. So be it! So after the guard had **left**, "the women made their way". But – and this is a very common view – "The women had **not all** come to the tomb from the same direction. Mary was the **first** to reach the place ...". The women must have arrived in at least two different 'groups', making it **two** visits, one after the other – to begin with. Next, Mary Magdalene goes back to go tell the disciples Peter and John, who then came to the tomb; so Peter and John's was the **third** consecutive visit.

Now for Mrs White's unique version of the story. Mary "had followed the disciples" and **again** showed up at the grave; that's **four** visits now. Jesus appears to her. "And Mary went her way to the disciples." (98/2)

Tradition has it though – in this case in agreement with the Gospels of Mark and John – that Jesus "**first** appeared to Mary Magdalene", **Mk16:9, Jn20:11f**. So does Mrs **White** tell us, the **other** women had not yet seen the Lord. The other women's visit to the grave was just before Jesus appeared to them. This visit of the women then had to have been the **fifth** visit to the tomb on the Sunday morning.

So what's so strange about 'my' view of **different visits to the tomb**? I also say there were each of these very visits, but I just don't squeeze them in into zero tolerance in time; I spread them

out over the reasonable period the Gospels allow and in fact demand - the whole of the Saturday night.

To know what really is strange, rather look at **five** different visits to the tomb, **all within** the compass of, **from** "the night had worn away ... just before daybreak" – when the ('first') angel descended, **Mt28:1**, (see 90/1-2) –, **until**, "even then" (identical time) with reference to **Mk1:2a and 2c** (see 96/2, "very early" 92/1)! Within a matter of no time at all! (Which, by the way, was the greater miracle, the Resurrection, or the visits?!) **Five visits to the tomb**, with all the events and all its evidences, gone, **within** "the moment when He took up (his life)"?! In fact –strictly reckoning the White way– these five visits plus their events, plus all the evidences / results, plus all their evidences / results vanished, happen in **less time than no time**, because — reckoned the **White** way :— **first** event, Luke "deep(est) morning (of night)", is **later** in time than the **last** event, Mark (and Matthew), "very early ('the night had worn away ... just before daybreak')". That's asking **just too much** of common sense.

No two accounts of visits to the tomb may or can be identified, or they will and must be confused and in fact be either strangled and suffocated together, or be mutilated and cut apart and to pieces. To bring into one single event all actions of everyone, and all time indications of every Gospel, and all acts of God through every agent or medium, is not to maintain the unity of the Scriptures— it results in its opposite, in the fragmentation of every single event, every action of everyone, of each time indication of each Gospel, and all acts of God of whatever agent He might have used in the working out and revelation of the Gospel of the Resurrection of Christ. To ferment, brew and distil in stupefying inferno half a dozen vintages, unrecognisably destroys the character of each and all.

Luke and Mark do **not** have the **same** event under consideration; they are telling different stories, each in its own right; each in its own **time!** Neither of Luke, Mark, and John in 20:1-10, tells of an Appearance – far less of the Resurrection (as tradition holds). There are just two Appearances on Sunday morning recorded, John 20:11-17, and Matthew 28:8-10. There is no Resurrection recorded as happened it on Sunday morning, no, not one! There is only the circumstantial events of the Resurrection as happened it "In the Sabbath"— Matthew 28:1-4, recorded as "answered and told the angel the women" (on Sunday morning)— Matthew28:5.

- (1) **Luke** recorded the women's **first**, originally **planned** visit to the tomb.
- (2) **Mark** recorded their visit of **disillusionment and re-affirmation**.
- (3) **John** recorded Mary's **trust and vigilance** rewarding "**stand**"-visit.
- (4) **Matthew** recorded the other women's **courage of despair and elucidating** visit to the tomb.

- (1) **Luke** gives the time of "**deep morning**", 'darkest hour', after midnight.
- (2) **Mark** gives the time or '**very early sun's up-coming**' before sunrise.
- (3) **John** gives the time a **gardener** would have come on duty, just after sunrise.
- (4) **Matthew** gives no time; his time must be **deduced** from John's anecdote and the statement in Mark 16:9, that "*The Risen Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene first, **early on the First Day of the week***". What possible objection could be raised against this plainly Scriptural sequence of visits ... but tradition's vagaries?

There were but **two more** 'visits to the tomb' by women,

- (1) Mary Magdalene, who first saw the stone and who, virtually as having seen the stone, ran back, **John 20:1-10**;
- (2) The considered, desired, willed but never realised visit, "*To go have a look at the grave at the very moment there was a great earthquake*", **Matthew 28:1**.

By recognising and accepting these, six, visits, each of them and all of them, it is not necessary to take away or add or change a word or phrase or context or meaning of any, in the least. Yes, the Word says, Thou shalt not take asunder that God put together; but the Word also outright teaches, Thou shalt not put together that God separated. To "rightly divide the Word of God" means to rightly hold together things that belong together and as far as they belong together; to maintain in whole each whole. Own agenda is forbidden. God willed Jesus would rise from the dead "In Sabbath's-time"; so happened it. Mrs White is doing her best to prove God's Word for confusion.

Matthew in White, but not White in Matthew

False claim one

"*The Lord Is Risen*" — Mrs White does **not** 'base' the Resurrection on "*Matthew 28:1*". That, we have seen already, and shall now continue to show.

Mrs White, under her heading to chapter 8, "*The Lord Is Risen*", had given us the most important information for a true understanding of **her** message with that chapter. She assured us, "*This chapter is based on Matthew 28: 2-4, 11-15.*" (Yes, she supplied the full stop.) In my second delivery I pointed out the difficulty created if one leave out specifically verse 1 and verses 5-8, or 5-11, while dealing with the Resurrection.

Not even Mrs White's resolve, she was not going to use Mt28: 1, was trustworthy, because she obviously could not have helped but employ verse 1 in her contemplation of the event of the Resurrection. It should be impossible for anyone, when working on the Resurrection, to ignore verse 1. To announce before you have started, you're just going to ignore verse 1 of Matthew 28, is not very clever.

Mt28:1 is pivotal, simply because it is the **only** Scripture in all of Scripture that directly implies and refers to the event and the temporary and tangible circumstances of the event of Jesus' resurrection. It is not in the least surprising therefore, despite the claim verse 1 is not under scrutiny for the consideration of the Resurrection, to find verse 1 summarily quoted in the second paragraph of the first page of the chapter, **scarcely ten lines** from the top!

If any man shall take away of the words

Nevertheless, that in itself doesn't mean so much as the **covering up** which the use of this indomitable Scripture received under the pen of Mrs White. I am counting my words! By **leaving out** the most striking feature or aspect or force of verse one, its unequivocal **time-statement**, "*In the Sabbath*", Mrs White has actually disguised the text with her usual parlance of earthquakes and shining lights dispersed commodiously opportunely and inopportunely throughout the episode.

By having **omitted also** Matthew' mention of the **women** who at the very moment of the "*great earthquake*", "*set out to go have a look*

at the grave", Mrs White has further weakened Matthew's time-clause consisting of all the time-phrases contained in verse 1, **together**. "*Set out Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to go have a look at the grave*", is as integrally part of Matthew's statement of day and time of day, and of event and circumstances of event, as e.g., the key-word, "Sabbath's". Mrs White's neglect to use Mathew's time-clause where it is supposed to be used, reserved it adulterated for her next chapter, where she – unlawfully – has smuggled it in into **Luke's** description of the women's visit to the tomb after midnight Saturday night.

Having **mixed** unrelated bits of Scripture, 'here a little, there a little', the effect has become as stupefying as had strong drink been taken. (See Is28:10, 7)

Who would have recognised "*And behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven. Clothed with the panoply of God, this angel left the heavenly courts. The bright beams of God's glory went before him, and illuminated his pathway. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men*" for verse 1 of Matthew 28 after 'Inspiration' has assured you, "*This chapter is based on Matthew 28: 2-4, 11-15.*"? Truth is, this 'quote' of Mrs White's, is for that matter not a 'quote' at all, but in all, is a 'lying report'.

Why does Mrs White go to all the lengths to first tell her readers forget about verse one now, and next to employ it but **with its most distinctive aspect, its time-statement, replaced with something from nowhere?**

Do you recall where Mrs White wrote of the Jews' conference with Pilate when they asked the grave to be sealed and guarded? The Scripture naturally, was Matthew 27:62-66. Mrs White then commented, "*They could not rest upon the Sabbath. Though they would not step over a Gentile's threshold for fear of defilement, yet they held a council concerning the body of Christ.*" (88/3) Where Matthew did **not** directly say it was the Sabbath, but only implied the fact, Mrs White without difficulty recognised the plainest of inference that it was "*upon the Sabbath*". But where Matthew **directly** mentioned the fact it was the Sabbath, **there**, Mrs White chose to obfuscate and obscure the easiest and most obvious of actual facts.

Besides Mrs White's subtle corruption of John 18:28, why the Jews "*would not step over a Gentile's threshold*" as were it "*for fear of defilement*" as in itself their reason, and not, "lest they be defiled

but that they might eat the passover", besides that, it's a minor thing. It seems as soon as Mrs White touches the Scriptures she corrupts them! What I want to underline, is this, **Matthew** mentions the securing of the tomb on the implied **Sabbath morning**; and Mrs **White** admitted that it was unmistakably the Sabbath Day that was implied. Where **Matthew** then uninterruptedly, in fact, logically as well as chronologically uninterruptedly and continuously as **contra-event** of the grave's securing on the same day that Sabbath Day, recorded Jesus' **resurrection**, "In the **Sabbath**", **there**, Mrs **White** turns the blind eye; or, more accurately, there, Mrs White draws the blinds on Matthew's mention of the **Sabbath**. She strikes out from Matthew's tableaux of the Sabbath Day on which the grave the morning had been sealed, Jesus' resurrection from the dead its very afternoon.

The **Sabbath morning**: All attempts to **hinder** Christ's resurrection; "**But, in the Sabbath's afternoon**:"— still on the Sabbath, in fact "*In Sabbath's fullness of daylight*" ... "**Behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven.**" *Clothed with the panoply of God, this angel left the heavenly courts. The bright beams of God's glory went before him, and illuminated his pathway. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.*"

The inescapable fact doubly ensured by Matthew that it was the Sabbath Day in which Christ rose from the dead, first by context of 27:62 to 28:5, and then by mention in verse 1, of uninterrupted eventual and chronological sequence, is what Mrs White deliberately tried to prevent from getting noticed. I cannot for a moment believe Mrs White in her heart knew not and understood not, that, **according to Matthew 28:1 in the context of 27:62-66**, Jesus' resurrection occurred on the Sabbath Day! Not after all this! She lacked the courage, and she lacked the ability, and she lacked the honesty ... in the face of her brethren and sisters of her 'Movement', to accept and defend the truth of the fact.

So she said, "*This chapter is based on Matthew 28 ...*" from verse **2** on, be careful— I exclude verse **1**; and don't go further than verse **4**! Indeed, most remarkable of all, is that she said, "*This chapter is based on Matthew 28 ...*" from verse **2** on, but be careful— I exclude verse **1**, and be even more careful to take note that I exclude verse **5**! It is just unbelievable! Imagine, "*This chapter*", based on, "**The Lord Is Risen**"— "*is based on Matthew 28:2-4, 11-15*", **No** verse **1** ... (1) **No**, "In Sabbath's-time"; (2) **No**, "*Set out Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to go have a look at the grave*" ...

How is that, possible? Incredible! ... this as far as Matthew **27:62 to 28:4** is concerned!

But here, is the zenith of incredibility: Concerning **28:5**— **No** verse **5** ... (3) **No**, "*The angel answered / explained to the women, and said ...*". How is anybody ever going **to hear of, to learn about, to believe in**, "*The Lord is Risen*", **had not** "*The angel informed / explained / answered the women*": "... *In the Sabbath's fullness ...*"? Nobody would ever have known, "*Explained the angel*" not, and "*Told the angel*" not "*the women*"— who thus, and then, when told and when answered, were **enabled and commanded to go**, to make known, the Good News! Without verse 5 of Matthew 28, and without The angel answering / explaining to the women, telling them ..., the whole Gospel of Jesus' Resurrection from the dead, would have remained a sealed book. The very existence of Christianity depended on this mystery having been **made known**— audibly and not by sight, and which only God was mighty to do and for which **only God had an angel sent**.

So Matthew called the angel who rolled the stone out of the grave's opening, "*the angel of the Lord*", that is, "messenger of the Lord", "the sent of the Lord", the "commissioned of the Lord". **This** 'messenger' (it seems to me), was the **very** angel who "*Answered and told the women ...*" the next morning after that Jesus "*In the Sabbath's fullness*" had risen from the dead by the Power invested in Himself and in the Full Fellowship of God— the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. **This** 'messenger' (it seems to me), was the **very** angel who "*answered the angel, and told the women ...*" (Matthew 28:1-8)— **each and every word of what happened yesterday, "In the Sabbath ..."**.

For this reason and for nothing in all the universe else, that God's way isn't good enough, that Faith by hearing comes and not by seeing isn't good enough – for its denial rather, and for its exact reversal, that man shall live by sight and not by faith, Mrs White took upon herself the calling to ensure mankind shall be initiated into the mysteries of believing by seeing. So she wrote '*The Desire of the Ages*', chapter 8 and 9, "*The Lord Is Risen*", and, "*Why Weepest Thou*".

False claim two

"*This chapter* (*"Why Weepest Thou"*, p 96f) is based on Matthew 28:1...", claims Mrs White.

The **first sentence** of '*this chapter*', reads,

"On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?""

Since "Matthew 28:1" is the first text claimed for 'basis', it should be justified to expect the statement, "On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"", and in particular the time-phrase, "On the first day of the week, very early", **to be contained in "Matthew 28:1"**.

I still must meet the Seventh Day Adventist who ever questioned Mrs White's assertion "Matthew 28:1" forms the basis for her statement "On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"". I have met but few non Seventh Day Adventists who have given it a thought the generally accepted opinion, 'On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"', might not be based on *Matthew 28:1*. The power of tradition!

Matthew 28:1 in White?

"On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"? ...

(1) "On the first day of the week"— which Matthew 28:1 does **not** contain; which Mark 16:2 **does** contain; which Luke 24:1 **does** contain; which John 20:1 **does** contain; which John 20:11f does **not** contain;

- (2) "... very early"— which Matthew does **not** contain; which Mark 16:1 does **not** contain; which Mark 16:2 partially, **sort** of contains; which Luke **does** contain; which John does **not** contain;
- (3) "... (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with"— which Matthew does **not** contain; which Mark does **not** contain; which Luke only, **does** contain; which John does **not** contain;
- (4) "... taking with them, precious spices"— which Matthew does **not** contain; which Mark does **not** contain; which Luke only **does** contains; which John does **not** contain;
- (5) "... they drew near the garden, saying as they went"— which no Gospels contains = 4 '**nots**';
- (6) "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"— which only Mark **does** contain = 3 '**nots**'.

How well is "Matthew 28:1" represented in, "On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?""? **Nil** out of 6 times! **Zero percent!** Mrs White's claim, "This chapter is based on Matthew 28:1, 5-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-18", as far as "Matthew 28:1" is concerned, therefore, is **100% false**.

And while we're on the subject,

How well is John represented? 1 out of 6 = 17%.

How well is Luke represented? 4 out of 6 = 67%.

How well is Mark represented? Two and half out of 6 = 42%.

How many 'only' cases are there?

Matthew – nil;

Mark – 1 (6);

Luke – 2 (3, 4);

John – nil.

Luke in White, but not White in Luke

Therefore, White's version 'based on' **Luke** no doubt, looks like this, "On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?""

Of this, what is not genuinely 'Luke', is the dual statement, "... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"" To which Gospels then, do these two statements, "... they drew near the garden, saying as

they went, Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?” actually belong?

The statement, “... they drew near the garden, saying as they went”, belongs to **no** Gospel! “Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?”, belongs to **only Mark**. Therefore, Mrs White’s statement, “On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour’s body. ...”, **up to here**, reasonably accurately represents **Luke 24: 1**. Please note, verse 1, only; not verse 2 as well.

And please note, ‘reasonably well’, because both the phrases, “very early”, and, “made their way”, are doubtful, strictly speaking are erroneous, ‘translations’.

Mark in White, but not White in Mark

“Very early”:

If taken for Luke’s, he, actually says, “deep(est) early-morning”, from ‘orthrou batheohs’.

If taken for **Mark’s**, he, actually says, “very early”, from ‘lian proh-i’.

Mark uses a **second** expression though, to tell what he actually meant with saying, “very early”— he also says, “**sun’s rising**”, from ‘anateilantos tou hehliou’.

Luke’s “very early” therefore was **much earlier** than Mark’s “very early”. Luke’s was just after midnight. (More or less what the ‘darkest hour’ of morning would have been, quite a few hours before, when ‘night has worn away’.)

Mark’s “very early” therefore was **much later** than Luke’s “very early”. Mark’s was just before sunrise. (More or less when ‘night has worn away’ and quite a few hours after ‘darkest hour’ of morning.)

I have said no Gospel contains this, “they drew near ... (saying) as they went”. First, Matthew and John do not in any way relate a ‘coming to the grave’ of, or, by any women – plural. Only Luke and Mark do. So am I contradicting myself by denying, “(the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices?” I answer, for good reason I insist I do not contradict myself. The

reason is the **manner** in which it is said “(the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices”. Neither Mrs White’s exact words, nor the grammatical mode she uses, is that of the Gospels.

To state that **Mark 16** anywhere says, “they drew near the garden, saying as they went, “Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?”” is more than an obvious blunder, because no less than an **obtrusive innovation** of Mrs White’s imagination. It is obvious, I say – so obvious:

-----**Mark**-----**White**-----
 They **come upon** the sepulchre-----they drew near
 And said-----saying ... as they went
 Who, for us, will roll away the stone?-----yet they kept on their way

The women spoke **after** they arrived-----spoke **before** they arrived

As clear as that. Luke and Mark don’t use Participles to say “they drew near the garden, saying as they went”. Both Luke and Mark use Indicative, active, finite verbs. “They came (Luke) / They come (Mark)”. “They came / come **upon** the grave” – both; not as if on their way to, the grave, not, “drew near ... as went”. The women had had come, they had had arrived, before they spoke a word. **Luke**: “They came ... they found ... entering they **found** not”— no ‘speaking’ whatsoever! **Mark**: “They come ... they **said** ... looking up they **see** ... entering they **saw**.” All continuous action is **after arrival**; none is before arrival.

Confusing Resurrection, Visits and Appearances

“On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour’s body. ...”.

“What”, according to Mrs White, “was **even then** taking place, (as) they drew near the garden, ... as they went”— in other words, **before but virtually simultaneous as** the women arrived at the tomb? It cannot have been anything but the Resurrection! Yet, the guard “**even then**” as the women arrived, is nowhere to be seen? And what else than by the lightning of the appearance of the angel who moved the stone away, could “the heavens suddenly (be) alight with glory that came not from the rising sun” (96/2), yet the angel is nowhere? In less time than “when the heavenly train was hidden from (the guard’s) view” arrive the women, and the guard is gone already, but not the light of the angel nor the earthquake spent?

For having said, Mrs White (or / and the editors) refers: "*This chapter is based on Matthew 28:1, 5-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-18.*" For the time of the **Resurrection**, Mrs White gave us **no** reference from Scripture. She **left out** Matthew 28:1 in her list of Scriptures "*This chapter*" – "*The Lord is Risen*" – "*is based on*"— Remember? page 90. Instead of Matthew 28:1, Mrs White gave us this, "*The night of the first day of the week had worn slowly away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak, had come.*" We found that no Gospel could be opened at such a Scripture; Mrs White made her statement up herself. She gave her own fabrication that in no single Gospel or in all combined, can be identified.

Now for the **Appearance**, Mrs White in fact **does** refer to "*Matthew 28:1*", but she does **not quote** it! Instead, Mrs White **again** supplies us with her **own** concoction, "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb.*" "*Matthew 28:1*", is that what she said? It is! ... which again, does not come near what **Mt28:1** says, "*In Sabbath's fullness, afternoon tending towards the First Day*".

Confusing 'Luke' and 'Matthew's', 'visits'

"*This chapter ("Why Weepst Thou", p 96f) is based on Matthew 28:1...*", claims Mrs White.

I have said Mrs White 'reserved' the first part of Mt28:1 for later. While she told us she is not going to use Mt28:1 at all, she in fact did use it, but did not use its time-clauses! Now Mrs White has formulated supposedly, Matthew's time-clause, using Luke's terminology ... more or less. Mrs White for basis of this chapter told us she is going to use Mt28:1— not so? She did! Well then, we have read the chapter a hundred times, and couldn't find Matthew 28:1 under the heading of this chapter, "*Why Weepst Thou?*". Mrs White forces us to accept "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"*" for the first verse of Matthew 28 ... despite the 100% irreconcilability of the two texts, as we have **already** seen. "*Yet they kept on their way. And lo, the heavens suddenly were alight with glory that came not from the rising sun. The earth trembled. They saw the great stone was rolled away. The grave was empty.*" (96/2)

- (1) "*Yet they kept on their way.*"— Which Matthew does **not** contain; which Mark does **not** contain; which Luke does **not** contain; which John does **not** contain. Four 'nots' = 1 falsity.
- (2) "*And lo, ... suddenly*"— Which **only** Matthew **does** contain; which Mark does **not** contain; which Luke does **not** contain; which John does **not** contain. Three 'nots' and 1 'only'— **Matthew!**
- (3) "*And lo, the heavens suddenly were alight with glory that came not from the rising sun*"— Which no Gospel contains. Four 'nots' = 1 falsity. But let us say "*the heavens suddenly were alight with glory that came not from the rising sun*", but from the **angel** of the Lord. Which Gospel tells us of the brightness of the angel? **Only** Matthew.
- (4) "*The earth trembled.*" Only Mt28:1, only once, tells of "a great earthquake". Another '**only** Matthew' case.
- (5) "*They saw the great stone was rolled away.*" What a gross lie – in every respect and especially in its subtlety, it cannot be improved on! Don't worry, I know it's not that the women were beholding as 'the stone was being rolled away'; I can see "*was rolled away*" is a Participle.

But **who**, "*saw the great stone was rolled away*"?

Mt28:1 has no human witnesses; **Lk24:2** states the women "**found** the stone was rolled away from the sepulchre"— confirming something they **already knew** (something Mary must have told them). **Mk16:3-4** says the women inspected the stone, and concluded it needed an unusual power to fling such a huge object "out of the doorway uphill"— the women's re-affirmation of what they already had found according to Luke, only in greater detail and astonishment. Then **John**, of course. But John, where Mary "had had stood at the sepulchre", 20:11f? Cannot.

Then John 20:1. ...

Mrs **White**: "*They saw the great stone was rolled away*"? ...

John: "Cometh **Mary** ... and seeth, the stone taken away from the sepulchre"— **singular**, "Mary"; not, "*they*" (Mrs White), 'the women'; not "*they*" (Mark), who asked in wonderment, "Who will roll away the stone out of the door of the tomb for us?"

Was *this chapter ("Why Weepst Thou", p 96f) based on Matthew 28:1?* Not on **any of any** of the Gospel accounts!

Confusing Mark and Luke

Mrs White:

"On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body."

Here, in **Luke 24:1** at last, and nowhere else, do we have Mrs White's "*night of the first day of the week ... the darkest hour ... come*". That, was not, when "*night ... had worn ... away ... just before daybreak*" though— as in **Mark 16:2!** That, was **soon after midnight**, after 12 o'clock Roman time, Saturday night, which in Bible language, was "**deep(est) morning** ('orthrou batheohs'), upon the First Day of the week", **Luke 24:1a!** That, "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body*", was **Luke 24:1** and **Mark 16:2** after Mrs White has woven them into one fabric. (I recall the Old Testament has a Law that forbids different fabrics to be used in one texture; and another of an ox and a donkey should not pull together in the same yoke.)

White: "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb*".

Luke 24: 1a, "*On the first day of the week, deep(est) morning*".

White: "*... taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body.*"

Luke 24: 1b, "*... they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared*".

Now we have two similarities on which to 'base' our conclusion Mrs White's statement, "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body*", is supposed a reference to, and in fact is meant a diction from, **Luke 24: 1**.

But:

White: "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices ... they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"*"

"*Taking with them, precious spices*" can **only** be found in **Luke**, "*bringing the spices which they had prepared*". The adverbial phrase of time, "*very early*", resembles **Luke's**, "*orthrou batheohs'-deep(est)*

morning (of night)", **but also Mark's**, "*very early-'lian proh-i'*". So, **which** of **Luke or Mark** does Mrs White try to present to her readers? She might have thought she presented both, in fact all four Gospels, because all four Gospels are a priori in perfect agreement; therefore whichever phrase is mixed up with whichever phrase from whichever other Gospel, all in all in the end must agree, and having listened to one will be as good as having listened to all, and having listened to all, one has listened to each ...

Mark says, "*very early*"; **so** says Luke. Matthew does not. Mark though, **also** contains "*sun's rising-'anateilantos tou hehliou*"— which **no** other Gospel contains. Only **Luke**, mentions "*bringing the spices which they had prepared*". But only **Mark**, contains "**Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?**"

Now it seems Mrs White's "*based this chapter*" on **Luke**, when considering her combining, "*(the women) made their way to the tomb*", and, "*taking with them, precious spices*". Then again it seems Mrs White's "*based this chapter*" on **Mark**, when considering her combination of, "*saying as they went*", and, "**Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?**"

Mrs White's words, "*very early*", say nothing, because Mark's 'lian proh-i' can mean "*very early*", just like Luke's 'orthrou batheohs', can mean "*very early*". **But**, most significantly, **Luke's** 'orthrou batheohs'-'**deep(est) morning** (of night)', cannot possibly mean, **Mark's**, 'anateilantos tou hehliou'-'**sun's rising**'. Luke's is just after midnight; Mark's is just before sunrise.

The reason for my 'hair-splitting'? No, it's not hair-splitting; it is rightly dividing the Word of God! But my reason? **To show the time involved, the time's course, the elapse of time between the visit that took place shortly after midnight, and the visit that took place shortly before sunrise.** The difference could have been between say a maximum of 5 hours and a minimum of say 4 hours. That would be the time in between the women's visit when they took their spices with to anoint the body, "*based on Luke 24: 1-12*"; and their visit to the tomb that Mary "*had had stood after at the opening of the grave*", where Jesus a little later appeared to her and she thought He was the gardener "*based on*", not, "**John 20: 1-18**" (**White**), but, "*based on*" **John 20: 11-18** (**John**)!

The words or any idea like "*(The women) made their way to the tomb*", do **not** occur in Mark 16 verse **1**, or, Mark 16: **2-18!** "**Sun's rising**" from 'anateilantos tou hehliou' in Mark, is **much later** than Luke's "**deep(est) morning** (of night)" from 'orthrou batheohs'.

Luke's "deep(est) morning", was when "*(the women) made their way to the tomb*", when "*they drew near the garden*"— **not**, as Mrs **White** says, "*saying as they went, 'Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?'*", **but**, as **Luke** (in her words) says, "*(The women) made their way to the tomb / they drew near the garden ... taking with them precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body*".

Mark's "Sun's rising", was when "*very early in the morning the First Day of the week, they come upon the tomb as the sun rose. Then said they under themselves, because looking up and seeing it was exceeding great, 'Who would have rolled for us the stone out of the door?'*" Mark 16: 2b-3— **not**, Mrs **White's**, "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb*" but,

Mark's, "*they come upon the tomb*"; and **not**, Mrs **White's**, "*taking with them, precious spices*", but

Mark's, "*said they under themselves, because looking up and seeing it was exceeding great, 'Who would have rolled for us the stone out of the door?'*"

Mrs **White** so entangles the two visits they should appear the one and same visit of round about sunrise Sunday morning, **making the Resurrection**, round about **sunrise Sunday** morning. **Voila!** But According to **Mark**, it must be inferred the women had been at the tomb **before**. The women's visit in **Mark 16:2-8** to the tomb is to re-affirm the findings of their first visit to the tomb, Luke 24:1-8.

"*Very early*" better corresponds with "*darkest hour*", because the "*darkest hour*" cannot be "*just before daybreak had come*", but must be **much earlier**. Even to say "*just before daybreak had come*", scarcely makes sense, because "*just before daybreak*" is "*before daybreak*"; and, when "*daybreak had come*", is **after** "*daybreak had come*".

The women's **second** visit to the tomb?

First visit: "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb*" being nearest equivalent of **Luke's** anecdote of the women "*taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body*"! **Luke** recorded the earliest and first visit **when, not knowing yet** the body was gone, the women brought their Friday afternoon prepared **spices with**, with which to anoint the body. They would not **after that they had found the body was gone**, have brought spices.

Second visit: Therefore **Mark** says nothing of spices having been brought with to the grave; he must have recorded a **following and second** visit. **Luke** mentions the **earlier** time, "deep(est) morning (of night)", **Mark** the **later**, "very early sun's rising".

So, the women asking in **Mark**, "Who, for us, will roll away the stone?", ask in amazement **at the size** of the stone and the impossible feat to have removed it, 'for us'. "And they, looking up (to where it lay), noticing the stone was very large, said among themselves, Who shall (have) rolled away the stone for us?!" The stone was rolled away already; they don't wonder as if the stone still had to be rolled away and— they don't wonder, as if they had not yet seen. The women are standing in front of the tomb and looking up at the stone, are amazed at the sheer power that threw such heavy and unwieldy an object away uphill. And in amazement "Say they one to the other, Who could have done it for us?".

It is wrong to say "*Mark 16:1-8*" contains only the double time-indication, "*On the first day of the week, very early*", because "*Mark 16:1-8*", has **two** statements of time. The **first** single-time-statement in verse **1**, tells of **three** women who "*after the Sabbath had gone through*", went to buy spices. The **second** dual time-statement— here under consideration, tells **neither** of the time of the Resurrection **nor** of the time of the Appearance, but of women who a second time, **visited** the tomb, "*very early, sun's rising*". No appearance has yet occurred. Just so in, Matthew 28:1 to 8, no appearance has yet occurred. "*The angel answering the women*" on Sunday morning – **before** Jesus had appeared to the other women – "*informs them*", about the Resurrection that had happened "*on the Sabbath Day*" **before**.

Mrs **White** **confuses** both Saturday **afternoon**— Matthew 28:1, and Saturday **evening** "*after the Sabbath has gone through*"— Mark 16:1, with Sunday "*morning very early before sunrise*"— Mark 16:2-3! Mrs **White** **mistakes** "*the rising sun*" of Mark 16:2-3 for **Matthew's, Sabbath's-afternoon!** – "*And lo, the heavens were suddenly alight with glory that came not from the rising sun*", but from the **angel** of Matthew 28:1— the angel "*of the Sabbath's afternoon*", who rolled the stone away from the opening of the grave.

There is no angle from which to view all these frantic, futile, and **unnecessary** attempts to reconcile times and events of the First Day of the week, of Appearance-day, of 'Sunday'. It's not even comical. It's scandalous. It is a blemish on the name of Christianity

and faith. Are Christians that fatuous? To appear not so feather-brained, Christianity has always tried to defend their **self-created** 'glaring discrepancies', by saying they should be ascribed to the 'individual points of view' and 'own individuality' of the Gospel-writers. Today we have to hear, it's all because of the **reader's** 'individual point of view' and 'own individuality' ('dynamic-equivalent') – or of both author and reader. I think such excuses equally show laziness, anxiety and unbelief, or blatant haughtiness. I don't know what to call it when some say it is 'the Spirit of Prophecy', or, 'Inspiration'.

Conclusion, Christianity generally is squarely facing the challenge to accept the 'viewpoint' of **more than one visit** to the tomb after Resurrection and before first Appearances. That will require the inevitable and unavoidable accompanying factor of **more than one time**, each visit having had its own time of occurring in night or day of the First Day of the week, Sunday.

Still some people say I just hide my ignorance behind verbosity. Let them please explain that to me in plain words and with facts.

"What was even then taking place"

And "what was even then taking place", was not the Resurrection, but only the women's own "(coming) unto the sepulchre", **Lk24:1b**— because the women brought their spices and ointments with, for the obvious reason to anoint the body (presupposed it was still there) (... approximately ten to eleven hours after the Resurrection the day before, "Sabbath's afternoon" about 3 pm., **Mt28:1!!**)

"What was even then taking place" during the first visit of the women to the sepulchre, was not the Resurrection, but only that they "found the **stone** rolled away", **Lk24:2**— just like Mary must have told them after she earlier that very night "On the First Day of the week, while being early / fore-darkness / dusk still", **Jn20:1a**— had seen it "taken away from the sepulchre", **Jn20:1b**.

Mary noticed the stone removed, and nothing else; she could not tell if the body was there no more. She thought it must have been stolen because she had seen the grave opened, yet would not believe it, and still believing Jesus' body was intact, she with the other women – we must assume –, went to do what they originally on the **day** of interment **had** decided to go do as soon as they being **Jews**— the **Sabbath for them would be over**. But because of the earthquake and having learned of the guard's appointment –

we must assume –, the women must have decided to wait until the **guard's watch would have ended**. The watch would last "until the third day had been over" (Mt27:62-66) ... which for a **Roman** guard, would end **midnight** (12 pm., Saturday night).

Confusing Matthew and Luke

Mrs White:

"They drew near the garden ... they kept on their way ... the heavens were suddenly alight ... The earth trembled."

Mrs White is busy with the women who "very early made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices." No Gospel than **Luke's** relates the spices which the women brought to the tomb. But Luke mentions nothing of "the heavens were suddenly alight ... The earth trembled". "The heavens were suddenly alight ... The earth trembled", are occurrences immediately associated with the resurrection. Jesus' **resurrection** occurred, **as** "the heavens were suddenly alight" by the angel whose "appearance was like lightning", "**when** suddenly there was a great earthquake" and "the earth trembled"— **Matthew 28:1!** Mrs **White** tries to fuse the events of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew **into one**, which she or nobody is able to do. Yes, she falsely **identifies** Luke's story with Matthew's in 28:1-4. By having assimilated **events** of the resurrection with the very **moment** of the women's goings to the grave, **Mrs White has made the time of Jesus' resurrection, the same as that of the women's "(drawing) near the garden"**. Only she – unlike tradition – doesn't make the **women** the eyewitnesses of the resurrection because she had made the **guard** the eyewitnesses already. But that changes nothing; it worsens the fraud, for Mrs White has now falsified **both** the record of Luke **and** Matthew, and in more than just one way.

Mrs White **confuses** Matthew **28:1** where **Matthew** says, "In **Sabbath's** fullness, mid-afternoon now tending towards the First Day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out to go have a look at the grave / went with the purpose to see / to look at the grave, when suddenly there was a great **earthquake** for the angel of the Lord descended ... his countenance was like **lightning**", **with Luke, 24:1**, as were it **Luke** who says, "On the first day of the week, very early" when the "heavens were suddenly alight" (and) the earth trembled". Luke does not say anything like it. Mrs White's is a false conglomeration of the two Scriptures and their different and diverse but never divergent events and times.

"They saw that the great stone was rolled away"

Mrs White: "They saw that the great stone was rolled away" ... Again, either a subtly misleading, or an obviously negligent observation. For neither John nor Luke nor Mark says what Mrs White makes it **appear** they said.

John wrote, "**Mary** Magdalene seeth the stone taketh away from the sepulchre." He does not write, "**They saw that the great stone was rolled away.**" John then says immediately, "Then she runneth".

Luke writes, 1:1b-2, that when the women "came upon the tomb", they "**found / confirmed** the stone having been rolled away from the sepulchre" ... **just as** Mary must have told them, **Jn20:2**.

[Mary told not only Peter and John, but all who were present at "their own home" (10)— "**we** know not", Jn1:2d.] "**Then entering** in they found / confirmed not the body". The Luke-visit proved Mary's observation and suspicion from her earlier visit— **Jn20:1-2a**, correct. The Luke-visit gave the women reason "to think over / remember what He has told you", Lk1:6, so they "found", when they "went" – **Luke**.

Mark is it who only, speaks of the women's observation that the stone was— comparatively, "**very great**", because they "correlating / calculating / looking up / reconsidering, **observed** that it has been cast up and backwards away". Mark's is the women's follow-up operation, the concluding confirmation of their worst fears after the findings of their first visit (Luke). Jesus died, was buried, his body is gone, the angel says He lives, and will meet Peter in Galilee ... Just too much for them to contemplate, the women "**flee away** from the grave and **tell nobody** anything"!

Matthew minutely describes the **actual event** of the angel who removed the stone and then sat on it – events Mrs White attributes to Luke!

Vividly "described / explained / answered the **angel** (to) the women"— an observation by sight of no human being. We do not know if the angel who "told the women" was the same as the angel who removed the stone, and it does not matter. All we absolutely for sure do know, is that **Matthew's event 'answered'**— the event of the **Resurrection**— is not the event of **any** other Gospel, and that although its occurrence was the **first** in time and sequence, its events and eventualities were only **made known** with the **last and latest** of the women's visits to the tomb. The angel's "describing / answering / explaining to the women", was what has made the remarkable difference between the women's reaction according to

Mark, and now that they are actually told exactly how the Resurrection happened. Therefore, Mrs White's seemingly innocent statement, "They saw that the great stone was rolled away", is a calculated perversion of every one of the accounts of the four Gospel writers, at one blow.

"Mary Magdalene was the first to reach the place: and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples."

A statement no fault to be found with— except— if understood in **own context!** In own context of, **whom?, where?, what?, and when?** A to the eye faultless statement, in every word and idea has become corrupted under 'the pen of Inspiration'!

Where?

White: "(1) the **other women** came up. (2) A **light** was shining about the tomb. (3) the body of Jesus was **not (found)** there. (4) As they **lingered** about the place, (5) suddenly they saw that they were not alone. It was the **angel.**" **Five** discrepancies, five contradictions, five corruptions.

John: "On the First Day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene **unto the sepulchre** and **seeth the stone taken away** from the sepulchre. Then **she runneth** and came to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple." — Statements about movement, locality, direction, object, action.

Who?

White: "**other women** came up ... **they** lingered about".

John: "cometh **Mary** Magdalene" ... John is telling of **Mary Magdalene**, of no one else. He tells of Mary only who '**came**'; of Mary only, who '**ran**'. **Nowhere whatsoever**, does John refer to **other women**. Not before in context – at the Crucifixion – not in context after – at Jesus' Appearance to Mary. The event cannot be confused with an event in which other women were involved. Another White lie!

What?

White: "(1) they made their way to the tomb (2) taking with them spices (3) what was even then taking place (the Resurrection) (4) they drew near the garden (5) saying as they went (6) the heavens were alight with glory / A light was shining about the tomb / light of the heavenly glory was still shining (7) The earth trembled (8) They saw that the great stone was rolled away (9) The grave was empty / the body of Jesus was not there (10) the other

women came up (11) they lingered about the place (12) they saw that they were not alone. It was the angel (14) The women turned to flee (16) but the angel's words stayed their steps. (17) "Fear not ye," said he; "for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead. (18) Again they look into the tomb (19) again they hear the wonderful news. (20) Another angel in human form is there, and he says, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but He is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again".

What?

John: "Cometh Mary Magdalene unto the sepulchre and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth and came to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple."

Most of the twenty 'whats', Mrs White **falsely**, associates with Matthew, Mark, and Luke! You can make your own comparisons. Multiply your results with one another; you'll end up with legions— **legions of lies that equal zero truth and spell crazy confusion.**

When?

(I'll restrict myself to literal time indications; circumstantial indications can only confirm over and over again what literal indications will have proved unmistakably, already. I also before have referred to the aspect of time rather extensively.)

White: "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them spices*". We have seen this, because of the women "*taking with them spices*", corresponds with **Luke's** record which was not a record of what happened after the Resurrection as Mrs **White** says, but of a **visit** to the grave of just after midnight, four to five hours before the first Appearance and 15-16 hours after the Resurrection.

John: "**When yet being early- / fore-darkness** (dusk of evening)" before totally 'night', or, the part of night **before** the middle part of the night.

Luke: "**Deep(est) morning** (darkness of night)". Time? '*Darkest hour*'— **after midnight**, and irreconcilable with any other time given in any other Gospel! Conclusion: Each Gospel contains its own

story, each story having possessed its own time-slot in day or night.

Mark: "Very early, **sunrising** / just **before, sunrise**".

Matthew: Matthew itself, gives **no** time for **when** "The angel answered the women" and the subsequent appearance to the women while on their way to the city. Because the Appearance is the determining factor of time of the angel's telling— not the Resurrection — Matthew's implied-only-time of day for 'The angel explaining to the women', must be **deduced** from both the fact that **Mark** in 16:9 states that Jesus "As the Risen, **first appeared** to Mary Magdalene **early** on the First Day of the week", and that **John** 20:11-15 states, that Jesus appeared to Mary about the time a **gardener** should begin to work, which normally would have been '**sunrise**'.

Therefore, Mrs White's timing in every respect of the events of Jesus' resurrection as well as appearances, is irreconcilable with any of the Gospels' given events or times of the visits to the tomb. And so is tradition's.

Thought now we should have heard everything? We haven't seen halve of Mrs White's confusion and obfuscating yet! How is that possible? By this totally lost and mesmerized misunderstanding of hers of John 20 the **first two** verses, **with and for**, John 20 verses **11 to 17!** (**Tradition** just a much.)

Mrs White describes the chronology of John 20:1-2, "*Mary Magdalene was the first to reach the place: and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples.*" Just what John says.

But, Mrs White also states, "***Mary had not heard the good news. She went to Peter and John with the sorrowful message, they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him.***" (97/3)

We are confronted by two questions here, **First**, Did Mary know for **observed fact** the body was gone? **Next**, What, while Mary had been going to the disciples, and while having followed them back to the tomb, happened with the other women?

Did Mary see the tomb was empty?

Did Mary **convey** to the disciples her '*sorrowful message*', because she had **seen, inside** the sepulchre that "*the Lord (was) out of the sepulchre*"? Then, Did Mary, because she had **seen**, tell the disciples, "***they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre***"? Then, because she had **seen**, why did she not also **know**, "***where they have laid Him***"? Or, **who**, 'they', were?

There is of course one answer. (Don't say 'solution', because there's no 'problem' or 'question' here. Everything is very plain, in fact.) There is only one answer, Mary **did not see, inside** the tomb! To depart from the supposition Mary with this, **her first visit** to the tomb, saw inside the sepulchre, cannot be possible, or one must plainly be dishonest and so assume. That is the **logical** side of the answer.

Then there is the **believing** side of the answer. Believe what John wrote – nothing more; nothing less, and John tells you, Mary saw: "**The stone**", not, 'The sepulchre'. And John tells you, Mary saw the stone, "**Rolled away from**, the sepulchre", not, 'The tomb was empty'. Factual act believed: Mary did **not see** inside the tomb; did not— could **not, know**, the body was gone; or, taken away; or, stolen. Actual fact believed: Mary surmised; she **supposed**, she **feared**; she knew no better because she had not seen inside the tomb.

Mary did not actually know because she did not **actually see inside** the sepulchre! Mary only vented her fears, her suspicions, to the disciples! She could not tell anything **except** what she had seen, that the stone was removed, for fact, because she actually had seen it. Mary only did what John recorded she did, and which Mrs White confirms she did, "*Mary Magdalene ... upon seeing that the stone was removed, ... hurried away to tell the disciples.*" That is the full content of John 20: 1-2.

Alright then, what Mrs White has written, "*Mary Magdalene was the first to reach the place; and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples*" (96/3), is true and correct. But she **also** wrote, "*... She went to Peter and John with the sorrowful message.*" Which should mean, that Mary also must have **heard**, '*the sorrowful message*'; or, which should have implied, Mary actually **saw herself, inside** the tomb, that the body was gone. Which both of course, are false assertions— Mrs White's, false assertions. And also the false claims of tradition, to the detriment of the Gospel Message.

What happened at the grave while Mary had been going?

"*The women had not all come to the tomb from the same direction. Mary was the first to reach the place; and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples. Meanwhile the other women came up. A light was shining about the tomb, but the body was not there. As they lingered about the place, suddenly they saw that they were not alone. ...*" (96/3)

"*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... Ignorant of what was even then taking place, they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" They knew that they could not remove the stone, yet they kept on their way. And low, the heavens were suddenly alight with glory that came not from the rising sun. The earth trembled. They saw that the great stone was rolled away. The grave was empty. ...*"

Let's put the words in Mrs **White's chronological disorder**:

- (1) *On the first day of the week, very early ...*
- Mary was the first to reach the place; and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples.*
- (2) ***Meanwhile the other women came up.***
- (3a) *they made their way to the tomb ... they drew near the garden.*
- (3b) *Ignorant of what was even then taking place,*
- (4) ***A light was shining about the tomb, but the body of Jesus was not there.***
- (5) *As they lingered about the place,*
- (6) ***suddenly they saw that they were not alone. It was the angel who had rolled away the stone. ...***
- (7) *about him the light of the heavenly glory was still shining ...*
- (8) ***The women turned to flee, but the angel's words stayed their steps. ...***
- (9) *Again they look into the tomb, and again they hear the wonderful news.*
- (10) ***Another angel in human form is there, ...*** pp 96/97.

This is the women's **only** visit at the tomb (Mrs White presupposing). "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body.*" This— undoubtedly from the mention of the "*precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body*" which the women were "*taking with them*", is the women's visit described in by **Luke in 24:1 to 10**.

So Mrs white states "*The women had not all come to the tomb from the same direction. **Mary was the first to reach the place: and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples. Meanwhile the other women came up.***" Fine. Then,

1) then tell your readers, Mrs White, what you and they may read in **Lk24:1?** **Who**, were the women "**and**", the "certain other women, **with them**, came unto the sepulchre"? Did they come "with", **Mary**? Or is Luke telling a different story than yours?

2) then tell your readers, Mrs White, what you and they may read in **Lk24:9-10?** **Who**, were the women who **together** – as they came – **left**, the tomb to go tell the disciples? "It was **Mary Magdalene, and** Joanna, **and** Mary of James, **and** others (who) **with them** **returned** from the sepulchre and told these things to all the rest **which** (all together) **told** these things unto the apostles."

Therefore, **why** does Mrs White say, "*Mary was the first to reach the place: and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples*"? Because she **confuses** John's story in 20: 1-10 for Luke's story in 24: 1-10!

Of course Mrs White is going to contradict herself again, where she will refer to the John 20: 1-10 passage. (See p 33.)

What happened with the guard?

Last time we have heard of the guard from Mrs White, she wrote, "*At sight of the angels and the glorified Saviour, the Roman guard had fainted and become as dead men. When the heavenly train was hidden from their view, they arose to their feet ... they hurried on to the city, telling those whom they met the wonderful news. ...*" (91/5)

When was that?

"**When the heavenly train was hidden from their view**".

When was that?

"(An) **earthquake** witnessed the moment when He took (His life) up in triumph." (91/2)

Where does this fit in, in the above?

During: (2) **Meanwhile the other women came up.**

(3a) *they made their way to the tomb ... they drew near the garden,*

(3b) *ignorant of what was **even then taking place.***

So, this is how Mrs White's chronology now looks:

(1) *On the first day of the week, very early ...*

Mary was the first to reach the place; and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples.

(2) **Meanwhile the other women came up.**

(3a) *they **made their way** to the tomb ... they drew near the garden, ignorant of what was **even then taking place** ...*

(3b) (An) **earthquake** witnessed the **moment** when He took (His life) up in triumph ... **At sight** of the angels and the glorified Saviour,

(3c) *the Roman guard had **fainted** and become as dead men.*

*When the heavenly train **was hidden** from their view, they arose to their feet ... they hurried on to the city, telling those whom they met the wonderful news. ...*" (91/5)

When was that? When

(3) "*the Roman guard had **fainted** and become as dead men ... **When** the heavenly train **was hidden** from (the guard's) **view***" ... **but, while** there **still** was

(4) *A light **shining** about the tomb,*

(5) **As** they (still) lingered about *the place*, and **while**

(6) *(about) the angel who had (just) **rolled away the stone** the light was **still shining.***

If this is not simultaneous, at once, **together**, then what is? Which means, the women had arrived '*the moment*' that Jesus came forth from the grave **at the sight** of the **conscious** guard— the women there, but seeing nothing? If evidence for the story 'his disciples came by night and stole him away' was needed, surely the guard should have met face to face with the women then and there while Jesus rose from the dead? How muddled can things get? Or is it the things that get muddled, or the minds of some people? **Forcing in into one very exact single moment of time all and every of the events and circumstances preceding and surrounding the Resurrection,** is the formula and catalyst for the White farrago inside the cauldron of tradition.

Relation between John 20 verses 1-10 and verses 11-18

White: "*Mary had followed John and Peter to the tomb: when they returned, she remained."* (97/3, 5)

Let us begin this story at **its beginning!** Not where Mrs **White** has squeezed it in! Where did Mrs White thrust this story in as with regard to **time of day?** To formulate the question correctly: **From where** did Mrs White **drag** verses 1-10 – the visit of the two disciples to the tomb – **in, towards**, and in terms of time of day **immediately** and **continuously before**, John's anecdote of the first Appearance?

John 20:

"**1**, Comes Mary on the First Day of the week, when being yet early darkness, to the sepulchre, and sees the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Immediately therefore she runs and comes before Simon Peter and before the other disciple ... and says to them, They took away the Lord out of the tomb ...! Immediately therefore rushed forth Peter and the other disciple and went to the tomb. So ran the two together; the other disciple ran faster than Peter, and he arrived at the tomb, first. Not entering for haste, he, leaning over, sees the linen ... Catching up came Peter, and he, entered the sepulchre, and notices the sheets. ... Then therefore entered also the other disciple who got to the tomb first. ... For not yet understanding the Scriptures, they again returned to their own home." End of act, end of pericope, end of present period, — "when being yet early darkness".

Beginning of pericope verses 11-18— "*Now Mary had had stood without before the sepulchre: and as she wept, she stooped down, looked inside the tomb, and sees two angels."*

Does literal positioning contextually demand uninterrupted chronological sequence? Must, by every relevant factor, verses 11 further, logically as well as sequentially, without a break follow on verse 10? (Mrs White not only makes Mary, but all the women, wait from soon after midnight until soon before sunrise.) These are forced, unreasonable, unnatural, and unsustainable claims. As is evident from the contextual content of John's relating, as well as from bringing together all the Gospel accounts, there exists an obvious time-differential between verses 11 further —the story of Jesus' appearance to Mary — and verse 1-10 — the story of Peter and John's inspection of the grave.

That time-differential will demonstrate in the successive visits the women paid the sepulchre during the course of the night-half of the First Day of the week.

John **specifically** mentions "*the two disciples*", **Peter and John** going to and returning from the grave— Mary features nowhere.

Mary now, just after she had told Peter and John, "*when being yet early darkness*" (John 20:1), must from the disciples' abode have made further contact with the other women, because soon after, **just after midnight**, "*Deepest morning hour, the women came unto the sepulchre bringing their spices they had prepared, with them.*" (Luke 24:1) We are only told what we are told: *Mary had **not** followed John and Peter to the tomb; when they returned, **she**, was elsewhere; she **not at this occasion at the grave**, while Peter and John returned home, "remained". Remember (pp 29-30 above), Mrs White maintained Mary "hurried away to tell the disciples"; now she alleges "Mary when they (John and Peter) returned, she remained." Actual facts! Denial final! Mrs White errs!*

It is evident that Mary "remained behind" **not** 'after verses 1 to 10' – the visit recorded by John **as in the Present**, of "when being yet early darkness" or 'dusk' of Saturday evening. "*Comes Mary on the First Day of the week, when being yet early darkness, to the sepulchre, and sees the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Immediately therefore she runs and comes before Simon Peter and before the other disciple ... and says to them, They took away the Lord out of the tomb ...! Immediately therefore rushed forth Peter and the other disciple and went to the tomb. So ran the two together; the other disciple ran faster than Peter, and he arrived at the tomb, first. Not entering for haste, he, leaning over, sees the linen ... Catching up came Peter, and he, entered the sepulchre, and notices the sheets. ... Then therefore entered also the other disciple who got to the tomb first. ... For not yet understanding the Scriptures, they again returned to their own home."*

It was too soon to understand, and far too long before Jesus would appear to any. Understanding and Revelation went hand in hand. Each visit to the tomb shows the progression of both.

Mary therefore had remained standing at the grave's opening after **another** visit, that the **reader** should **suppose**— a visit of earlier the morning of that night. John expects of his reader to mark his

use of the word, "had had stood after" ('heistehkei'); John supposes the reader to have noticed the absence of Mary Magdalene in his story of Peter and John; John never fails to mention the involvement of Mary Magdalene. The reader who has not noticed, is doing John the historian an injustice. Mary must have stayed behind at the grave after another visit **of some women**, among whom she **earlier**, had found herself. Then after the other women had left from the tomb, Mary "had stayed behind standing" at the opening of the grave. That supposed visit must have been the one **Mark** recorded in 16:1-8, after which visit, the women "*went out quickly, and fled from the grave, for they trembled and were amazed: neither told they anything to anyone, because they were too afraid.*"

It is after this visit to the tomb recorded in **Mark** 16:1-8, and after the other women had left, that **John** picks up the story, "*But Mary stood without at the sepulchre. Weeping as she stooped down, looking inside the tomb, she sees two angels.*"

John has used the **Pluperfect** 'heistehkei' **because** it had been after the visit "*very early sun's rising*" (Mark), that Mary "*had had stood / stayed after*". The ordinary Past Tense word "stood", or, "remained", does not properly convey the idea of the Pluperfect, "had had remained after / had had stood after". The Pluperfect is **irreconcilable** with the idea that 'Mary remained standing' as if in the continuity of the Present, while Peter and John after their visit were leaving from the tomb. The Present or Imperfect would much better have expressed that feeling of present continuity; the Pluperfect cannot do it.

Something like where John used the Perfect to say the linen sheets were lying apart "having been wrapped up" ('entetylignemon') hours before, so does he here, using the Pluperfect an even stronger word and form than the Perfect, begin the final episode in the unfolding of the Gospel to human understanding— the episode of Jesus' first appearance.

Conclusive reason to believe that Mary wasn't staying behind after the visit of Peter and John, cannot be ignored for the fact John had stated in 20:1 the time of night that Mary received her first visit of the rolled away stone, which was soon after sunset the evening before "while it being early darkness still". After as much time as it took Mary to run from the grave to the disciples, they went to the grave. It scarcely could have been totally dark yet! But soon "after Mary had had stood" at the opening of the grave, Jesus encountered her. She thought He was the worker of the garden who then should have begun working there, which would have been with

sunrise. Virtually all night went by between after Peter and John had returned from the grave, and before Mary had seen Jesus.

During that time, Mary paid the grave her first visit (as told by Luke), as well as her second (as told by Mark). Mark supplies the time of morning of the womens's visit, "*sun's rising very early on the First Day (morning)*". "**Mary had had remained after**" after this visit— after the other women had had left from the grave. "Mary had had remained after" makes perfect chronological as well as circumstantial sense given the reasonable proximity between her last and relatively earlier visit, and her waiting at the sepulchre after it, and her experience in the garden when Jesus finally appeared to her. "Mary had had stood / remained after" (Pluperfect) makes no sense if immediate continuity is presupposed.

Therefore:

White: "Mary had followed John and Peter to the tomb: when they returned, she remained."

John: Mary never 'followed John and Peter to the tomb'. In fact, "John and Peter returned" from the tomb to their own home leaving **no one** behind.

Mary now (said I before), "*when being yet early darkness*"— John 20:1, must from the disciples' abode have made further contact with the other women, because soon after, **just after midnight**, "*Deepest morning hour, the women came unto the sepulchre bringing their spices they had prepared, with them.*" **Luke 24:1**. After having returned from the grave after this (second visit of Mary to the tomb), Mary once **again**, went to the tomb – as told by **Mark**. Mary (according to John 20:11) "*had had stood after at the opening*" after **this**, Mary's **third** visit to the tomb, where Jesus soon after, appeared to her, "*first, early, on the First Day of the week*", Mk16:9.

White: "As they lingered about the place, suddenly they saw that they were not alone. ... The women turned to flee, but the angel's words stayed their steps. ... Again they look into the tomb, and again they hear the wonderful news."

In absentia Mark, Matthew, Luke and John. Only Mrs White will know where she got this from. In total, one dished up mess.

White: "As they lingered about the place" John: "*But Mary Magdalene*", although like the other women "*affrighted*" at their visit to the tomb in the "*very early morning at sunrise*" (Mk16:6a), "*had had*

stood outside in front of the grave" (John 20:11a) – and did not with the other women "quickly fle(e) from the sepulchre. For they (all) trembled and were astounded; nor said they anything to anyone, because they were too afraid." (Mk16:8) So we find Mary still 'lingering' before the chamber, "weeping".

White: "As they..." – **John:** "But Mary";

White: "as they lingered about" – **John:** "went, quickly fled from";

White: "lingered about" – **John:** "had had stood";

White: "lingered about" – **John:** "outside in front";

White: "about the place" – **John:** "in front of the grave";

White: "suddenly they saw" – **John:** "as she wept she stooped";

White: "they not alone ... the angel ... again they look into"

John: "she seeth (into) two angels sitting"

A clause of six words and virtually double as many discrepancies! And so, we have seen ourselves, is the bulk of Mrs White's 'inspired writings'.

White: "Fear not ye," said he: "for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead. Another angel in human form is there, and he says, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but He is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again."" pp 96/97.

Matthew: Read above, " "Fear not ye," said **he** (the 'explaining' angel of **28:5**); "for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead."

White: "Another angel in human form is there, and he says,"

Luke: "Behold, **two** men stood by them in shining garments, and **they** said unto them ... Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but He is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again."

Again **White's** subtle subterfuge, blending into one, two **visits** and more; ignoring all time-differences, making of several, the only **time** and only moment of visits, of Resurrection, and of Appearances; making of several, the only **message**, of

Appearances and of Resurrection; making of several, the **event** of a single visit, of Resurrection as of Appearance; making of several, the only **place** and circumstance of direction, encounter, mode – every possible aspect crushed into one –, of visit, Appearance **and**, Resurrection! Tradition at its incomparable and inimitable best.

Does not my soul have reason to weep?!

Paul says what one accuse someone else of, one is guilty of oneself. I accept Paul's warning, and do not excuse or justify myself. But this I say, that if I just glossed over the hypocrisies of Mrs White, I would have acted hypocrite myself. My writing has been meant as a critique; not as just another zombian acclamation of her 'inspired' brilliance.

Fourth delivery

Save the Sabbath!

Ellen White and Sunday- 'Terror and Confusion'

"Priest and prophet have gone off the road ... they err in vision; they stumble in judgment ... To whom shall he teach knowledge, and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? ... The Word of the Lord to them was law upon law, law upon law, line upon line, here a little, there little, that they may go forward, but fall backwards, and be snared, and broken, and taken."

Is28: 7-13.

"All is terror and confusion"

"All is terror and confusion. The priest is about to slay the victim; but the knife drops from his nerveless hand, and the lamb escapes. Type has met antitype in the death of God's Son. The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens. It was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshippers: There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin. The Son of God is come according to His word, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God." "By His own blood" He entereth "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 10:7; 9:12." (72/4)

For perspective, to begin with, note two corruptions,

(1) "..."By His own blood""; "... He entereth ... "in once" ...". Mark the neat use of quotation marks.

(2) "... in once into the holy place ...". Mark the neat omission of quotation marks. No one should accuse Mrs White of abuse of the Scriptures! When she as much as changes "He entered in once" into "... He entereth ... "in once" ...", she has the honesty to not put the word "entereth" in quotation marks. (Who would bother, "By his own blood He **entered** in once", or, "By his own blood He **enters** in once"? What is the difference, anyway?)

Then, convinced of the author's purest of intentions, nobody would suspect anything sinister when reading on, ""By His own blood" He entereth "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 10:7; 9:1." Does she not supply the Texts she is using? Now who would have guessed, this very Text reads, "... into the holiest place ...", and not, "... into the holy place. ..."? (What is the difference? Who would bother, anyhow?) Honesty lasts the longest; this time it lasted not long. That is what one calls 'hidden agenda'. The agenda? Everything Mrs White says in this paragraph, she actually meant not for simultaneous with the death – or resurrection for that matter – of Christ, but for future, and after Jesus' death and resurrection; that's why she wrote, "He entereth / enters", and not "entered", and "into the holy place", and not "into the holiest place". And that is why one should carefully read, "... Type has met antitype in the death of God's Son ..." because "antitype" has not in the resurrection of Christ from the dead abolished "type" – 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... The great sacrifice has been made ..." because no atonement has been made— 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... The way into the holiest is laid open..." because this was the way into the holiest of the earthly temple laid open; not into the 'heavenly'— 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... A new and living way is prepared for all ..." because the new and living way for all has not been opened or entered upon— 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest ..." because he was the priest of the earthly temple; humanity need await the coming of the high priest Christ, into the 'heavenly sanctuary— 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens ..." because here a bit of White-truth reveals itself, that the Saviour officiated "as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens", not— 'as yet';

Carefully read, "... It was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshippers: There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin..." because that voice is Mrs White deceiving the worshippers that "there is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin" but no officiating of Christ as Priest and Advocate in the heaven of heavens and therefore no forgiveness of sins— 'as yet'.

Carefully read, "... The Son of God is come according to His word, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God." "By His own blood" He entereth "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 10:7; 9:12 ...", because one should read Mrs White here, as follows,

"The great sacrifice has been made. The – future – way into the holiest is laid open – not entered upon yet –. A new and living way is prepared – not finished and perfected yet – for all. No longer – will – sinful, sorrowing humanity (need) await the coming of the high priest. – Soon – (h)enceforth the Saviour was to officiate = would officiate – as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens – as soon as He would have ascended into the heaven of heavens –. It – now for the time being – was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshippers: There is now – that is, there will be – an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin. The Son of God – as soon as He will have entered into the first room of the heavenly sanctuary – is come according to His word, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God." "By His own blood" He –

as it were, now, after having ascended into the heavens – entereth “in once into the holy place – or first room of the sanctuary – having obtained – to be exact, to obtain – eternal redemption – to make final atonement – for us.” Heb. 10:7; 9:12.

A misrepresentation? You don't know anything yet!

“The time had come for Christ to ascend to His Father's throne. As a divine conqueror He was about to return with the trophies of victory to the heavenly courts. Before His death he had declared to His Father, “I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.” John 17:4. After His resurrection he tarried on earth for a season, that His disciples might become familiar with Him in His risen and glorified body. Now He was ready for the leave-taking. He had authenticated the fact that he was a living Saviour. His disciples need no longer associate Him with the tomb. They could think of Him as glorified before the heavenly universe. ...

... Jesus had now gone to share His Father's throne. ...

... All heaven was waiting to welcome the Saviour to the celestial courts. As he ascended, He led the way ... all are there to welcome the Redeemer. They are eager to celebrate His triumph and to glorify their King. But He waves them back. Not yet; He cannot now receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe. He enters into the presence of His Father (the first time since his death!). ... He presents to God the wave sheaf, those raised with Him as representatives of that great multitude who shall come forth from the grave at His second coming. He approaches the Father ... When upon the cross He cried out, “It is finished,” He addressed the Father. The compact had been fully carried out. Now He declares: Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. I have completed the work of redemption ... Satan is vanquished. Christ's ... are “accepted in the Beloved.” ... they are declared justified ... From that scene of heavenly joy, there comes back to us on earth the echo of Christ's own wonderful words, “I ascend unto My Father, and your Father, and to My God, and your God.” John 20:17.” (119/1, 121/4, 122/3, 123-124)

Absolute distance exhibits between what Christ had finished and what He was about to begin.

(1) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving the **Father's absence at all in Jesus' resurrection** from the dead, **from** the moment He had **died**, **until** the moment “He enters into the presence of His Father”. Not until “After His resurrection” and He had “tarried on earth for a season” “was (Jesus) ready for the

leave-taking”. Only after He “had authenticated the fact that He was a living Saviour” had “Jesus gone to share His Father's throne”. During all this time, Jesus was assisted by angels, at most, and whatever He had done in this period in between having died and having enter(ed) into the presence of His Father, He had done on His own without the Father's participation or presence.

(2) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving the mere intermediary and relatively **passing** value and merit of the **Resurrection**. The Resurrection is no more than a – be it necessary – stop on Christ's journey into the heavens and ‘heavenly sanctuary’ where at last He will accomplish continuous and real atonement or forgiveness of sins. “Continued pardon”, I once had an Adventist explaining to me what they have stamped “The Investigative Judgment”.

(3) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving Christ was **not High Priest** of the Most High God as He made sacrifice of Himself and as He rose from the dead, but only was made a Priest after He had ascended into the heavens. It meant – for Seventh Day Adventism –, that only **after** the Resurrection and after that Christ had ascended into the ‘first room of the heavenly sanctuary’, **that only “Now He declares: Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. I have completed the work of redemption”**. It means, for every common Christian, Jesus had not ‘completed the work of redemption’ in or through, during or with, by or **for having risen from the dead and grave!**

We therefore have for reason for saying Mrs White teaches a resurrection of Jesus wherein **the Father was absent**,

(1) This, her teaching of a **‘heavenly work of redemption’** instead of Jesus' **earthly** work of finished atonement for sin perfected in **resurrection** from the dead.

(2) Her teaching a Resurrection visible for **mortals** – a Resurrection the guard could look upon without dying as any mortal would, had he seen the Father raising the Son.

(3) Mrs White's arguing of Jn20:17a, “Touch Me not; for I am **not ascended yet** to my Father.”

(4) Her arguing of Lk23:43, “I say unto thee, **Today shalt thou be** with Me in paradise.”

(5) Her making the **angel the caller-forth** from the grave of Christ. Which resurrection could only have been the resurrection of **one who is not God**, for God who is not, or God who works not as being, and in being, the Father **and** the Son **and** the Holy Spirit, is not, nor can be, God. Cf. Ro6:4b and 1:23a.

(6) Her making “the wave sheaf” not Jesus Himself as and when the Father raised Him from the dead, but “those raised with Him”

(123/6), whom Christ "*after His resurrection*" —after He had "*tarried on earth for a season*" and after He "*had gone to share His Father's throne*" — as "*He **approache(d)** the Father*", "*present(ed) to God*".

(7) Her **avoiding** Scripture that might indicate or imply the **Father's** involvement in the Resurrection. White's omission of such Scripture is conspicuously intentional and conspicuously meaningful— the Father's absence must appear total. Therefore not a single reference to or from a vast number of most powerful Scriptures.

I consequently re-emphasise my allegation against her, that Mrs E.G. White no matter how nice it may appear at first reading, **corrupts the Word of God** where she wrote, "*... Type has met antitype in the death of God's Son. The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens. It was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshippers: There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin. The Son of God is come according to His word, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God." "By His own blood" He entereth "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 10:7; 9:12."* (72/4)

Mrs Whites excels in the art of the White lie, and the fact her statement at first reading appeared good, confirms my allegation Mrs White wrote every word with premeditated intention, so that she cannot be trusted the length of any of her sentences. She confuses in order to deceive. Her sinister and obscure aim is to bereave the believer his eternal security by destroying his assurance of a finished redemption in and through Christ in and through resurrection from the dead.

Bringing Sabbath and Salvation together

Whether one places atonement for sin in purgatory **after** Christ's resurrection, or in an investigative judgment **after** Christ's resurrection, one places it **outside** Christ, outside the actuality of its effectiveness and the effectiveness of its actuality— and thus outside the **reach** unto salvation of any. Salvation is **in Christ only**, in the **Full Fellowship** of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and, of man through Christ, which Full Fellowship is found only in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead in body of glorified resurrected flesh, nowhere else, no how else, never else. God the **Seventh Day** from all his works rested, nowhere else, no how else,

and never else, through Christ, in Christ, and because of Christ. The Sabbath was made for Man even this Man, Jesus Christ, and **in Him**, and through Him, and for or because of **Him**, in, through, and because of, yea, **for His Resurrection from the dead**. There is no other Sabbath rest than this Sabbath-Rest of God because there is no other Rest of God but this Rest of God— God's **Rest in the Son**.

Bringing the Glory of God and Christ together

"By the Glory of the Father raised ... and declared the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection from the dead ... according to the working of his mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set (and exalted) Him at his own right hand in heavenly realms." Ro1:4, 6:4, Eph1:19-20. From the heights of **triumph**, Christ's **Resurrection**-shout echoes, "*Glory to God in The Highest; and on earth, Peace; and goodwill toward men*". And from the depths, his Cry of **Victory** resounds, "*I ascend before My Father and your Father— indeed before My God, and your God.*"

Jesus says not, 'I must', or, 'I will ascend' – He says, "*I do ascend*"; and He says "before-'pros'", before his Father's face, which is, in his Father's Presence. Yes, Jesus had not yet gone up to His Father or where the Father is, which is 'in heaven'. **Yet exactly therefore** does Jesus say to Mary, "*Don't touch Me even because I have not yet ascended to My Father*" — which was saying, "*There is no time to stand there; go without delay; go straight on forward to my brethren, and tell them: Know, that I ascend before my Father's Presence who (now that I am risen) is your Father too, and before my God's Presence who (now that I am risen) is your God as well.*" Jesus not in the least meant to say He had been without His Father's presence! Jesus wanted to tell Mary one thing, the very opposite: That every step of the way He had been with His Father and His Father with Him, but the time has come for Him to leave His own on earth and must go to His and their Father, where He is 'in heaven'. So there is no time for you to waste, Mary: Do not delay, go on, tell my disciples so that they may be comforted and believe! But no, Mrs White wants, 'I have to go to My Father first before I can do anything for you or you can do anything for Me.'

Mrs White's, "*From that scene of heavenly joy* (long after Jesus' resurrection) *there comes back to us on earth the echo of Christ's own wonderful words, "I ascend unto My Father, and your Father, and to My God, and your God"*, is Christian Faith backwards, and in retreat.

Mrs White dedicates the climactic chapter of her book to the subject, "*To My Father, and Your Father*". But her praises are hollow and cacophonous because she is denying the Father's very own undividable and un-shareable power, prerogative, glory and honour of having raised Jesus from the dead, from death and from the grave when there and then He, the Father and none else or at his side, or in his stead, "*exalted*" Christ to his own Right Hand of heavenly Majesty "*When He raised (Him) from the dead*". The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead ought to have received Mrs White's dedication of the chapter, and she might have paid the Father due honour and glory and praises. Unfortunately as typically and consistently Seventh Day Adventist, the resurrection of Christ receives but insultingly little or no attention or respect. **The True Temple of God's Holiness—the very resurrection from the dead of the Son of God—** is trampled underfoot, and **in the void** from the Father's absence, and **in the stead** of God's innermost, most intimate and Private Presence of Almighty Power and Working, the abomination of desolation is found standing. Angels are being worshipped in an **emptied** Holy Place, and in the Sanctuary where should be the Full Fellowship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit the mere voice of a created being is heard — in its Ark of the Covenant of God's Faithfulness and Holiness. Whoso readeth, let him understand. (Mt24:15)

Mrs White serves her own purpose, to create and give substance and credibility to her dogma of an 'investigative judgment'. No sacrifice of principle is too great for reaching her objective. Like in the times of the temple it was used for the open worship of 'no-gods' – false 'gods' – so Seventh Day Adventism shows no fear of God, but serves and worships its own doctrines as were they God. They will rape all Truth to vindicate themselves.

Keeping the Glory of God and Christ apart

What more central and what more basic Truth is there to the Christian Faith than the Truth the Father raised the Son from the dead? than the Truth God **in having brought** the Son **into** the Most Holy and Intimate of the Full Fellowship of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, **raised Him from the dead— exalted** Him, far above all principality and power and might, and dominion, and every name? What more central or what more basic Christian

Truth is there than the Truth God **in having raised Christ from the dead**, brought the Son into the Most Holy and Intimate of the Sanctuary of God's innermost Being and Presence, of Father, Son and Holy Spirit? No temple can contain God but the Temple of His Own Self.

What more central or what more basic Christian Truth is there than the Truth **God in having raised Christ from the dead**, from all his works, **rested?** Christian Faith is nothing, and the Christian Sabbath Day, is nothing— yea, is an abomination —, were it not God **in having raised Christ** from the dead, from all his works on the Seventh Day, **rested!** But because Mrs White for her own agenda refuses the Father His Presence on His holy Sabbath Day, she must refuse the Sabbath Day the honour of God's Presence in having raised the Son "In the Sabbath". Then by having transferred what belonged to God's Sabbath Day to the First Day of the week, Mrs White heartily with antichrist raises her voice in lifting up Sunday instead of the Sabbath, "*He is risen, He is risen! ... what a day is this to the world!*" (97/2) But to God's true day of Triumphant Rest, Mrs White offers "*glorious ... promise of the future* (the very following Sunday) *.... with this scene* (in the grave) *the day* (the Sabbath) *upon which Jesus rested, is forever linked.*" (Chapter, '*In Joseph's Tomb*', second paragraph.) But she and the Adventists claim they are for, the Sabbath and against, Sunday?

God in having raised Christ from the dead brought the Son into the Most Holy and Intimate of the Full Fellowship of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit— which is, into the Rest of God, which is, into the Sanctuary of God— 'Sanctuary' means 'Place of Rest'. "*Therefore the Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God*".

Were it not **God**, in having raised Christ from the dead brought the Son **in into** the Most Holy and Intimate of the **Full Fellowship** of God, the **Father**, the **Son** and, the **Holy Spirit**, there would be no Gospel! no rest! no Sabbath! no salvation— but eternal **damnation**. Eternal damnation, because the Christian religion would have differed from the false religions of the world not in the least; would have differed in no respect, because God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in perfect co-operation of Full and in Unison Fellowship and Preference —their all exterior exclusive Synergy— would be denied, were it not **God**, in having raised Christ from the dead brought the Son **in into** the Most Holy and Intimate of the **Full Fellowship** of God, the **Father**, the **Son** and, the **Holy Spirit**.

Had not the **Father** – **in having raised** the Son **from** the dead and grave – "*declared Him to be the Son of God with Power according to the*

Spirit of Holiness, there would have been **no** salvation, no life, no Truth, no Faith, **possible**, but a nightmare for ever going on in the disillusionment, fright and despair of death's sweltering furnace. Why? Because "*All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth*"— not after I shall have ascended, but "*is given*", already and because of and through having, "*take(n) up my Life again*"! There would have been no "*working*" of God's "*exceeding greatness of power to us-ward*" reaching end and availing purpose; no "*hope of His calling*" ever come to fruit; no "*glory of His inheritance in the saints*" given or received, had not the **Father – in having raised** the Son **from** the dead and grave – "*declared Him to be the Son of God with Power according to the Spirit of Holiness*".

Away with the blasphemous, to death disappointing and fear-imprinting figment of their strange enthusiasm of a Christ who by degree, a bit here, a bit there, received power and glory and title and office; Away with their strange enthusiasm of a Christ who not at once and for all, as and when and where the Father instantaneously raised Him from-the-dead-and-grave-was-invested with all Divine Power and Authority, above all the Power to forgive sins!

O you holy Sunday-worshippers! What do you think your Sunday-dogma is different? Not a Truth standing up against Seventh Day Adventism, does not also stand up against your Sunday Dagonic Baal! In fact this very fundamental Truth of the Father having raised Christ from the dead against Seventh Day Adventism, which Truth you as much as they trample down and abuse for your Sunday-worshipping, is standing up against you in your idolisation of Sunday. Don't try to answer a word, for it must turn against you like a dog that bites the hand that feeds it. The Word of God is a two-edged sword!

But remember the Sabbath Day, for God the Seventh Day from all his works rested – in the Son, through the Son, and because of the Son— the Son in resurrection from the dead, the Son through resurrection from the dead, and the Son because of resurrection from the dead.

The time had come for Christ to ascend to His Father's throne. The time had come for the Father to raise Him from the dead. The divine conqueror Jesus, is about to return the trophy of victory to His heavenly Father. Before His death Jesus had declared to His Father, "*I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.*" John 17:4. Christ from the earth or hell for no moment waits, nor makes

His Father wait, **but in the time and season appointed Him** "*on the third day according to the Scriptures*", Christ **as He rises**, rises to the occasion— "*Thy will be done!*" Christ is glorified, "*on earth as it is in heaven*"— even in the flesh of the glorified body of His resurrection from the heart of the earth. **Now Jesus is ready** for the leave-taking **and enters in** "*into His own rest as God in His own*". Christ authenticates the fact He is the Living Saviour. He dissociates from the tomb. He is glorified before the heavenly universe. The Father enthrones the Son. All heaven awaiting is not disappointed: **Welcome to the Saviour in celestial court!** The Father descends and elevates and exalts the Son. The Father leads the way ascending Throne, and the Son at His Right Hand takes Royal Seat ... Not behind, but at His Right! All! Bow before the Redeemer! Celebrate His Triumph and glorify your King! And God was refreshed. And so they sang the Song of Moses –Exodus 15, and of the Lamb –Ephesians 1 and Revelation 14. But Mrs White, and Seventh Day Adventism, protest, "**Not yet!**" They also protest, Not this Song, this Sabbath's Song! He "**cannot now**" receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe. Not "on the Sabbath", stay! He is not gone into the presence of His Father, yet! Stay! say they.

Yet Christ presents to God the Wave Sheaf, **Himself**, raised from the dead the Representative of that great multitude who shall come forth from the grave at His second coming. Emmanuel, God with us, Salvation is with men. The Song of Nativity; the New Jerusalem Song. Christ here and now in being raised from the dead, approaches the Father as He is being approached by the Father. When upon the cross Christ cried out, "It is finished" and addressed the Father, so here, while from death's pains, calls He out, and addresses His Father and answers His cry, "Come forth!" The compact is being fully carried out. **Now** Christ declares: Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. I have completed the work of redemption ... And those Christ's Own are "accepted in the Beloved". Those Christ's Own by the glory of the Father are declared justified **from this very scene** of heavenly joy of most intimate Divine Fellowship **at the resurrection** of Jesus Christ ... "*from the dead*"! From the grave of Joseph and the garden in that earthly place, the Word of the Father as of His Christ goes forth, "Let us make men over again in our image!" From the grave of Joseph and the garden in that earthly place, the Word of the Father as of His Christ goes forth, Ascend unto Thy Father, and to Thy God! Sit Thee at my right hand in heavenly Majesty! (And so "*Your life is hid with Christ in God.*") "*Christ Jesus who having died— rather, who having been raised, is He at the right hand of God who also makes intercession for us.*" Ro8:34b.

Mrs White abuses Romans 8:34, trying to make it say that Christ **only after** He died and rose again, and **only after** He ascended to the right hand of God – only then – have begun making atonement for sin. "*After His resurrection he tarried on earth for a season ... Now He was ready for the leave-taking ...*" off to 'heaven' and the right hand of God 'up there', to start act High Priest and make '*reconciliation*' – even '*intercession*', according to Seventh Day Adventist definition of atonement. "*Jesus refused to receive the homage of His people until He had the assurance that His sacrifice was accepted by the Father. He ascended to the heavenly courts, and from God Himself heard the assurance that His atonement for the sins of men had been ample, that through His blood all might gain eternal life.*" 98/3. But had Jesus not the assurance that His sacrifice was accepted by the Father, the Father would not have raised Him from the dead in the first place! The bringing again from the dead his Son, was God's acceptance of and reward for Jesus' atonement made for sin by the sacrifice of Himself— **was God's recognition to the Waving of the First Sheaf before His Face.** Christ needed not to '*ascend to the heavenly courts*' to receive God's assurance – He availed nothing short when He rose from the dead. The Father's coming down and raising Him up from the dead was Christ's assurance, reward and glory. Had the Father not been well pleased, Christ would not Himself have taken up again the Life He Himself had laid down. The resurrection of Christ from the dead not only was proof of God's well pleasing; it was, God's well pleasing in the Son.

God because of Jesus' triumph over sin and death is justified in justifying the unjust. The resurrection of Christ from the dead was the only condition for God's accepting His chosen; and Jesus' intercession is the further benefit on their behalf from his obtainment of eternal salvation by resurrection from the dead. Christ's 'intercession' does not forgive sins— He by the Sacrifice of Himself had forgiven sins – that is, had made atonement for sin and **obliterated sin once for all** –, and by his resurrection had made righteous, many— in fact as many as are saved eternally, for by His Resurrection they are co-raised with Him, in Him and through Him. Christ by interceding does not forgive the sins of the ungodly, for He intercedes in behalf of those justified, the righteous, only. By interceding for them, Christ exercises his faithful in holiness. The sinner is forgiven his sins by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ and is justified in the resurrection of Him from the dead— once for all and for evermore. Christ's intercession in behalf of the saints is the assurance and guarantee of the Good News of their Salvation and Perseverance in the Faith.

These contemplations have drawn the main lines between and around the White-lie and the Stark Truth of Scripture. Now we can return again to some stark detail that – like when we began – in the light of this same Scriptures will confirm the overall picture of the manipulating deceit of Mrs White and Seventh Day Adventism.

I ended my third delivery with the consideration of Mary Magdalene's '**Last Stand Visit**' at the tomb when Jesus appeared to her, "Early on the First Day of the week", Jn20:11-17 and Mk16:9. I enumerated the visits to the tomb of the women, and counted four during the course of the Saturday night, Luke's, Mark's, John's in 20:11-17, and Matthew's in 28:5-10. These were four instances of recording though, rather than of incidence, come to mind Mary's '**Last Stand Visit**' actually was the elongation of her '**Mark** 16:2-8' visit together with the other women, when – we must understand by inference – the **other** women, "*fled from the sepulchre ... neither told they anyone anything*", "*But*" –according to John now– "*Mary had had stood after*".

We have seen Mrs White joined Mary's '**Last Stand Visit**' directly with the visit **Peter and John** brought the sepulchre. I have also showed how these two visits cannot so be linked in chronologically uninterrupted sequence. See my various arguments there. One argument I did not then raise, was John's **style** of writing— his making use of **parenthesis**. So that the Peter and John-visit must be seen for the interlude, or for John's interpolation, it is. John's telling about Mary Magdalene is the golden thread woven through his Resurrection-story. Peter and John's story is but incidental. Such parentheses are very characteristic of John, and the Peter and John-visit is no exception. Point is, **it is not allowed** for anyone to decide the Peter and John story **must stay linked** in unbroken time-sequence with Mary's 'staying-behind' story. To persist in such a view would require one must close one's eyes to the **valid reasons against** a continuous time-sequence here – to persist in, no honest man could once those reasons have been brought to his attention.

An uninformed person because of the way verses 10 and 11 are almost without exception translated and presented, admittedly scarcely **would be able to** notice the (implied as well as mentioned but in translations invisible) break in time in between verses 10 and 11. However, even accepting the standard translations at face value, the same uninformed though sincere person, when he will try to further consolidate and harmonise these two stories in John **in their broader context**, as well as in the context of all the other stories the **other Gospels** have to offer, must definitely come up against unanswerable questions. In other words, anyone reading

John 20:1 through to 20:17/18, also considering the other Gospel-stories, will be forced to conclude the two stories from several points of view **impossibly are of the same time-slot**. Only by **denying** the far-separated time-indication given by John in 24:1, "*While still being early darkness*", could the Peter and John visit and the Mary staying behind-visit be **projected** as **both** having taken place within the time-span of the sun's rising above the horizon. Yes, in fact, then also the Mark-visit should be reckoned in as of the same event, personae and time-equilibrium— tumbling everything into chaos and destroying time-equilibrium at once.

But admitting and accepting Peter and John immediately after Mary went to the tomb and again returned home from the tomb "*While still being early darkness*", then Mary's "*heistehkei*"-had had stood after"-visit as the sun appeared above the horizon and the gardener would have started work, could not have taken place **in immediate time-sequence**. Then **virtually all night** had passed in between Peter and John's visit and Mary's "had had stood after"-visit— **allowing the required and reasonable** time of the Mark-visit, after which "*Mary had had stood after*", from "*very early sun's rising*" until "*early on the First Day of the week*" (Mk16:9) as the sun appeared above the horizon and the '*gardener*' would have started work. **To deny or ignore** these intricacies of reality, would be such obvious hypocrisy no one could attempt. Nevertheless it is this very option of denial and ignoring Mrs White and many others as regularly as the clock strikes, take for granted and use as point of departure when they must explain the hour, the day, the place, the who, the how and everything else about the Resurrection.

Most obvious in and about this '*terror and confusion*' is the mix-up of Resurrection and Visit per se. The attempt invariably is to make the Resurrection happen at any one moment of time-description found wherever in the last episodes of the Gospels – no matter which. If it is "*The night of the first day of the week had worn slowly away. The darkest hour, just before daybreak, had come*", **OR**, "*On the first day of the week, very early, (the women) made their way to the tomb, taking with them, precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. ... Ignorant of what was even then taking place, they drew near the garden, saying as they went, "Who shall roll us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"*", **OR**, "*And lo, the heavens were suddenly alight with glory that came not from the rising sun. The earth trembled. They saw that the great stone was rolled away. The grave was empty ...*", **OR**, "*Mary Magdalene was the first to reach the place; and upon seeing that the stone was removed, she hurried away to tell the disciples. Meanwhile (blatant lie!), the other women came up. A light was shining about the*

tomb, but the body of Jesus was not there ...", **OR**, "*As they lingered about the place, suddenly they saw that they were not alone. It was the angel who had rolled away the stone. ... about him the light of the heavenly glory was still shining ... The women turned to flee, but the angel's words stayed their steps. "Fear not ye," said he; "for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said ..."*", **OR**, "*Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead. Again they look into the tomb, and again they hear the wonderful news. Another angel in human form is there, and he says ...*", **OR**, "*Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but He is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again ...*" ... in other words, **regardless which Gospel it is ... it's all the same: Resurrection-time!**

It is possible one way only: There is NO respect for **individual** stories, NO respect for **particular** events each in its own right or time! It's all Resurrection-time although the Resurrection is of little or no real consequence. All that counts is what could be misapplied to the one or to the other **dogmatic preclusion**— to either (pro-Adventist) support 'The Investigative Judgment', or (pro-Tradition), Sunday-sacredness. They all make the same horrid mess of the faultless historically true anecdotes of the Gospels. Of the Sunday protagonists it must be said nevertheless, to their credit (if it were possible), that they don't chase after the 'investigative judgment' phantasm which Seventh Day Adventism plotted, while the Seventh Day Adventists above and beyond their utmost, help strut and defend their Sabbath-opponents' Sunday-argumentations – mainly by their mix-up of the different Scriptures about the resurrection, the appearances and the visits to the tomb and the times and days of each. Seventh Day Adventism never in this regard helped clear up one mistiness of tradition; it only contributed and in fact introduced many more and foggier enigmas. Sunday-argumentations even came to rely on arguments before Seventh Day Adventism never dreamt of, most illustrative of which is Mrs White's infamous 'Sabbath-rest in the tomb'-dogma.

Disparity and Desperation

Now here is the strangest of contradictions of Mrs White's inspired visions. We have seen how Mrs White denies the Sabbath the glory invested in it by the resurrection of Christ. We have seen how she **emptied the Sabbath of God's Presence**, and as a result was forced to reach all her further conclusions of a 'Still Sabbath'

deprived of all honour and dignity and as still as the stillness of the grave. And then we have seen how Mrs White gave all the honour that she should have given to the Sabbath Day, to the First Day of the week. (A day, had to receive that honour because Jesus did rise from the dead, on a day— a day could not escape or refuse the dignity attributed it by the eventuality of Jesus' resurrection, just as a redeemed could not escape or refuse his salvation attributed him by the eventuality of Jesus' resurrection. Which day or which person, is the only question. And the only answer is, that which only God willed and appointed.)

Mrs White went therefore and bestowed on the Sunday the Sabbath's divinely given virtues and glory— divinely given virtues and glory due to and contained in and consisting of absolutely nothing but the eventuality of Jesus' resurrection from the dead; and which eventuality of Jesus' resurrection from the dead again, received divinely given virtues and glory due to and contained in and consisting of absolutely nothing but the Presence of the Father in raising Christ from the dead.

So Mrs White was stuck with the dilemma, I have given Sunday now that which belonged to the Sabbath Day, namely Christ' resurrection, and the glory and honour that go with his Resurrection. But I removed the Father's Presence from Jesus' resurrection, so I cannot allow Sunday that honour that in the last analysis, comes with the Presence of the Father. I'll make Christ sneak in into God's Presence on the First Day of the week! Nobody after all would notice! The passion of deceit knows no limits!

Do I commit defamation of character, and that to a person who cannot defend herself? I say, Mrs White is here to present her case herself. This is 'Mrs White' – here, between this cover. And she is granted every opportunity to speak in her own defence. Do you have anything to say, Mrs White?

Mrs White: I witness,

"Jesus refused to receive the homage of His people until He had the assurance that His sacrifice was accepted by the Father. He ascended to the heavenly courts, and from God Himself heard the assurance that His atonement for the sins of men had been ample. ... While the Saviour was in God's presence, receiving gifts for His Church, the disciples thought upon His empty tomb, and mourned and wept. The day that was a day of rejoicing to all heaven (Resurrection-day, Sunday) was to the disciples a day of uncertainty, confusion, and perplexity." (98/3,4) This was not after "forty days"; this was not Acts 1:3 or 9! This was Matthew 28:5-8,

Mark 16:2-8, Luke 24:1-12, John 20:11-18 time! This was First Day of the week time! And if any doubt still, the next page, page 99, paragraph 4,

"Tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see Him." (99/4) A reference to Mk16:7, "very early sun's rising".

"When Mary Magdalene told them she had seen the Lord, she repeated the call to the meeting in Galilee." A **false** reference to Jn20:17-18, because besides **nothing of the sort** is being stated in 17-18, anything of the sort was an **impossibility**, seeing the angel's command, "Tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see Him", was given to **several** women together, and not to **Mary** when Jesus "appeared to Mary ... first" (Mk16:9) and **alone**— "But Mary had had stood after" (Jn20:11) while the other women had fled (Mk16:8)!

"When Mary Magdalene told them she had seen the Lord, she repeated the call to the meeting in Galilee. And a **third time the message was sent to them**"— an **absolutely false** statement for the next, simple, fact Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene was his first appearance to any person! No one before Mary ever, mentioned as fact that Jesus was risen, except angels, who again, only told, the women that He was risen. No angel ever told any disciple anything! And in all cases but the very last that the women were told Jesus was raised from the dead, nobody – not even the women themselves, believed that He was raised.

But Mrs White must still prove where she got her "**third time the message was sent**" from! She of course did not explain, but we, could easily see; that she got it from three separate incidences of the 'message' being told which she completely confused. She put her foot in it.

On three different occasions,

- (1) Lk24:5-7, **Two angels** who **"stood ..."** and **"said unto them"**;
- (2) Mk16:5-7, The **angel** **"sitting on the right side"**, who **"saith unto them ..."**;
- (3) Mt28:5-7, The **angel** who **"Answered / explained and commanded the women"**.

Each event or visit has its own angel or angels; each event or visit has its own women; each event or visit has its own message, each message with its own main point of emphasis; each event or visit has its own observations and reactions on the part of the women.

Each event or visit has its own time-slot in night or day. There was a time-sequence, and because of it, a "third time the message was sent". But none of these visit-events was accompanied by an appearance of the Lord, and none of these visit-events was that of Mary Magdalene only.

So now, says Mrs White – her living, inspired, own witness self,

"Tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see Him. ... When Mary Magdalene told them she had seen the Lord, she repeated the call to the meeting in Galilee. And a third time the message was sent to them. After He had ascended to the Father, Jesus appeared to the other women, saying, "All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell My brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see Me."

Never forget what she immediately goes on to write: "Christ's first work on earth after His resurrection was to convince His disciples of His undiminished love and tender regard for them. To give them proof that He was their living Saviour, that He had broken the fetters of the tomb, and could no longer be held by the enemy death: to reveal that He had the same heart of love as when He was with them as their beloved Teacher. He appeared to them again and again." Throughout this review of Jesus' resurrection, Mrs White still hasn't mentioned the **Father's** Name once, or referred to Him in any way. And it is there for everyone to see, Mrs White ascribes no inherent power of ability to the Resurrection as such. She emphasises the power of the Appearances, "again and again".

But that's not what I'm actually busy on; We were explaining how Mrs White in order to invest Sunday with holy meaning, was **obliged** to bring into play the Presence of the **Father**. And here it is exposed, open and clear, how she takes Jesus up into the Father's Presence after having appeared to Mary Magdalene, but **brings Him down back again** before having appeared to the other women, so that Mary was prohibited to touch Jesus, but the other women were allowed to clutch him at his feet.

It is during this 'interlude' that this must have happened: "While the Saviour was in God's presence, receiving gifts ...", 98/4. I just wondered, for what then was this, "Christ's ascension to heaven (after forty days) was the signal that His followers were to receive the promised blessing. For this they were to wait before they entered upon their work. When Christ passed within the

heavenly gates, He was enthroned amidst the adoration of the angels. As soon as this ceremony was completed, the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples in rich currents, and Christ was indeed glorified, even with the glory which He had with the Father from all eternity. The Pentecostal outpouring was Heaven's communication that the Redeemer's inauguration was accomplished. According to His promise He had sent the Holy Spirit from heaven to His followers as a token that He had, as priest and king, received all authority in heaven and on earth, and was the Anointed One over His people." AA p 38/39"?

O, I see! 'gifts' only— any 'gift' except being exalted, or "inauguration", as "Redeemer", "priest", "king", or "Anointed". For no avail His Resurrection from the dead!

What further confirmation can any honest person ask for what I say Mrs White is teaching? That she teaches the **Father was uninterruptedly ABSENT from that Jesus died, until** that Jesus between his first two appearances, had – quickly – gone up into the Father's Presence and – quickly – had appeared back again. Now all this r-u-b-b-i-s-h **in spite of** Mrs White's other r-u-b-b-i-s-h talking, that Jesus only after He had entered into the 'heavenly sanctuary' and the Presence of the Father there, started pleading for the forgiveness of sins— the implications of which r-u-b-b-i-s-h are infinite and infinitely **blasphemous**. Hundred and sixty four years after, and Seventh Day Adventists still claiming and proclaiming for the Gospel of Jesus Christ?!

Just the Presence of the **Father** in the **resurrection** of Christ from the dead would have made all the difference— would have **prevented** the whole farrago and gigantic hoax of an 'investigative judgment'. Just the Presence of the **Father** in the **resurrection** of Christ from the dead would have made all the difference— would have 'given' the **Sabbath** of God's will (and not the Sunday of devilish design), Jesus' **resurrection** its very **reason for being Christian** Day of Worship-Rest.

SDA:

Quoting Gerhard Ebersöhn [GE]

The Sinister, 'John 20:17 and Hebrews 8:4', say the same devout Seventh Day Adventist, 'tell us why Mrs White declares it was the angel who 'called' Jesus to "come forth", that is, to 'come out' of the grave. 'Come out', your Father is not here; He is not in there with you, He calls you through me, his messenger, 'angel'. Mrs White is a word-artist;

Dear unsuspecting reader -- in the above - GE devotedly quotes himself -- and then drifts in and out of ranting about Ellen White -- whilst quoting himself repeatedly. Confusing indeed. Not sure if he intends it to be confusing or if this is just "normal" for GE.

John 20 tells us clearly that Christ had not yet ascended to the Father. Sadly - GE's objections that are all of the form 'but Mrs White said' does not change that fact.

John 14:28

Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.

Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised.

Jesus' prayer TO the Father, John 17

13 "But now I come to You; and these things I speak in the world so that they may have My joy made full in themselves.

14 "I have given them Your word; and the world has hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

So while it is also true that Jesus was in fellowship with God on earth (and yes I "could"

add an "as Ellen White said" if I was bent on ignoring the text as some are here) - at the same time HE CLAIMS that He is going TO the Father and HE claims that immediately after his resurrection He had not YET been TO the Father.

Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised.

Quoting GE listing his complaints -- in his own words no less - *"The Father wasn't present when Jesus was raised from the dead, is her whole point. Jesus made no atonement on earth, He was not Priest of God on earth, He first had to 'go to heaven'"*

I posted previously [See 'Lord's Day' Books 6/1, 2] about one part of GE's rant -- namely GE's denial of the writings of Paul in Hebrews where Paul tells us that When Christ ascended to heaven He began his work as our High Priest. Dear reader - read PAUL for yourself to see how GE opposes Paul's views. Between "quoting himself" ranting against E.G. White (as if THAT is where all his problems lie) and "denying Paul" it is no wonder GE "appears confused". But should one welcome a voice of clarity on this subject -- let it come from Paul...

Hebrews 8

1 Now the main point in what has been said is this: we have such a high priest, who has taken His seat at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens,

2 a minister in the sanctuary and in the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man.

3 For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; so it is necessary that this high priest also have something to offer.

4 Now if He were on earth, He would not be a

priest at all, since there are those who offer the gifts according to the Law;
 5 who serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, just as Moses was warned by God when he was about to erect the tabernacle; for, SEE, He says, THAT YOU MAKE all things ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN WHICH WAS SHOWN YOU ON THE MOUNTAIN.

Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised.

Heb 9

11 But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things to come, He entered through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation;
 12 and not through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.

Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised. Christ becomes our High Priest - NOT while on earth - but when He ascends to heaven.

Heb 7

22 so much the more also Jesus has become the guarantee of a better covenant.
 23 The former priests, on the one hand, existed in greater numbers because they were prevented by death from continuing,
 24 but Jesus, on the other hand, because He continues forever, holds His priesthood permanently.
 25 Therefore He is able also to save forever those who draw near to God through Him, since He always lives to make intercession for them.
 26 For it was fitting for us to have such a high priest, holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners and exalted above the heavens;

27 who does not need daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the sins of the people, because this He did once for all when He offered up Himself.

28 For the Law appoints men as high priests who are weak, but the word of the oath, which came after the Law, appoints a Son, made perfect forever.

Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised.

It is no wonder then GE struggles with this text -- but why in the world "blame that on Ellen White"?? Just simply study it and deal with the text until you can finally accept it -- a much more honourable solution if you ask me. Leave all the ranting and railing for someone with more time on their hands. Not that GE does not have enough time to dedicate to "ranting" -- I was just making a constructive suggestion.

GE:

Not that I didn't know that you will never admit deceit. Your response is exactly as I expected and what I wanted. Everybody reading can now see for himself. And there are some reading -

Your reference to John 14:28 is as irrelevant as referred you to Baruch 2:3. I challenge you again: Answer: Who raised Christ from the dead? You give me John 14:28. You now apply this text to my question, and you with it confirm what I accused you of, that you say the Father was not there to raise Christ from the dead. Thanks, It's what I wanted to hear. Therefore who may read: See for yourself.

Quoting SDA, "So while it is also true that Jesus was in fellowship with God on earth (and yes I "could" add an "as Ellen White said" if I was bent on ignoring the text as some are here) - at the same time HE CLAIMS that He is going TO the Father and HE claims that immediately after his resurrection He had not YET been TO the Father."

Again you evade the question. Can't you look me in the eye man? Read my lips, "Who raised Jesus from the dead – Who called Him from the grave? Don't give me y-o-u-r 'ranting' – give me your answer; give me Scripture!

First, It – what you wrote here – is not, what Jesus said to Mary. That – what you have written here – is a large, glaring, lie.

Next, Even had your lie been pardonable, what Jesus said to Mary was that He had not yet gone away to His Father — which was, He had not left them – his followers – behind yet; which is as obvious as can be. That is and that was the point then; not what you try to tell everybody here.

Three, I ask you again, who raised the Son? The Father? Who else? So where was the Father when and as and where He raised the Son? Was the fact the Father raised Jesus in his very Own Glory a hindrance to His being present on earth, in the grave, "working" to the exceeding greatness of His Power while raising, in raising, through raising Christ from the dead?

Like God formed the first Adam from the dust of the earth, God formed the Second Adam from the body of his grave, the Christ. Were I to write in Hebrew (which I cannot nevertheless might), I would have used God's Name, Elohim, the Plural Name, for **God in Three Persons** was **God who raised Christ** from that very earthly grave from that very earthly body, and on that "*Mortal, put on Immortality*".

I wish you applied your 'hints' to yourself! ("Hint: The answer to which is NOT of the form "but Mrs White said..." -- rather you need to "deal with scripture" and respond to the actual point raised.") And, hint, kindly deal with the actual Scripture under consideration?

The actual Scripture of John 20:17 from whichever point approached does not exclude that Mary in fact could have 'touched' Jesus. In fact, many who know say this word may mean, "Don't keep on holding fast to me", or, "Don't cling to me (so) but go now". So that, if that is correct – which there is no reason why it should not be correct – then by your way of thinking it is undeniable Jesus had have had contact with, and had have been, in the very Presence of His Father **all the while**, dismissing your silly notion Jesus and the Father had no contact for more than three days.

My personal viewpoint I have also given I cannot tell how many times already – which you of course would have reckoned too low your consideration – that this text has nothing to do with a clinging or touching or not for whatever reason, but that it has to do with the Gospel–Command: Go on straight, don't even turn back to look at Me again, and go tell my brethren. **Because:** This Good News is not by seeing, but by hearing and believing!

Your latest edition: "Christ becomes our High Priest – NOT while on earth – but when He ascends to heaven." It's no longer the older version, Christ becomes our High Priest – NOT while on earth – but only after He had ascended to heaven and had entered into the 'first room'.

Said you, "It is no wonder then GE struggles with this text -- but why in the world "blame that on Ellen White"??" Well, here's why:

(1) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving the Father's absence at all in Jesus' resurrection from the dead, from the moment He had died, until the moment "He enters into the presence of His Father". Not until "After His resurrection" and He had "tarried on earth for a season" "was (Jesus) ready for the leave-taking". Only after He "had authenticated the fact that He was a living Saviour" had "Jesus gone to share His Father's throne". During all this time, Jesus was assisted by angels, at most, and whatever He had done in this period in between having died and having enter(ed) into the presence of His Father, He had done on His own without the Father's participation or presence.

(2) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving the mere intermediate and relatively passing value and merit of the Resurrection. The Resurrection is no more than a – be it necessary – stop on Christ's journey into the heavens and 'heavenly sanctuary' where at last He will accomplish continuous and real atonement or forgiveness of sins. "*Continued pardon*", I once had an Adventist explaining to me what they have stamped "*The Investigative Judgment*".

(3) Mrs E.G. White's whole endeavour is aimed at proving Christ was not High Priest of the Most High God as He made sacrifice of Himself and as He rose from the dead, but only was made a Priest after He had ascended into the heavens. It meant – for Seventh Day Adventism –, that only after the Resurrection and after that

Christ had ascended into the *'first room of the heavenly sanctuary'*, that only "Now He declares: Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. I have completed the work of redemption". It means, for every common Christian, Jesus had not 'completed the work of redemption' in or through, during or with, by or for having risen from the dead and grave!

We therefore have for reason for saying Mrs White teaches a resurrection of Jesus wherein the Father was absent,

- (1) This, her teaching of a 'heavenly work of redemption' instead of Jesus' earthly work of finished atonement for sin perfected in resurrection from the dead.
- (2) Her teaching a Resurrection visible for mortals – a Resurrection the guard could look upon without dying as any mortal would, had they seen the Father raising the Son.
- (3) Mrs White's arguing of Jn20:17a, "Touch Me not; for I am not ascended yet to my Father."
- (4) Her arguing of Lk23:43, "I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with Me in paradise."
- (5) Her making the angel the caller–forth from the grave of Christ. Which resurrection could only have been the resurrection of one who is not God, for God who is not, or God who works not as being, and in being, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, is not, nor can be, God. (Cf. Ro6:4b and 1:23a.)
- (6) Her making "the wave sheaf" not Jesus Himself as and when the Father raised Him from the dead, but "those raised with Him" (123/6), whom Christ "after His resurrection" —after He had "tarried on earth for a season" and after He "had gone to share His Father's throne"— as "He approache(d) the Father", "present(ed) to God".
- (7) Her avoiding Scripture that might indicate or imply the Father's involvement in the Resurrection. White's omission of such Scripture is conspicuously intentional and conspicuously meaningful— the Father's absence must appear total. Therefore not a single reference to or from a vast number of most powerful Scriptures.

To which now must be added an **eighth** reason, Mrs White's taking Jesus up after He had appeared to Mary, in order to bring Him to the Father, in order to return Him down again in order to be touched by the other women – which surmising could not have been possible had the Father raised the Son from the dead and they since had been in the perfect Fellowship of the full Godhead. Which basic Truth of Christian Faith you keep on denying and blaspheming against for no reason but to find something for your 'investigative judgment'-fallacy to stand on. Of course this heresy goes hand in

hand with your other heresy the Father had been absent when Jesus died, blatantly ignoring the fact Jesus 'surrendered spirit' to the **Father**, when He died!

SDA:

B+ ranting -- (and of course you are improving in that area). But an f- substantive response to the quote from John 14. Can you be convinced or prompted in any way to "respond to the point" as raised from scripture? Today? Ever?

"The point" is that Christ claims "I GO to the Father" as in a level of "presence" anticipated that He did not enjoy BEFORE going. Even MORE so when He says "My God my God why hast thou forsaken Me?". And so When Christ is RAISED from the tomb He can rightly state that "I have not yet ascended to the Father". That much-anticipated event had not YET taken place.

Get it? (It is important in that case to stay focused on the point) Amazingly in all the GE "but Ellen White said.." smoke fury and sound we get NO response to the fact of Scripture raised regarding the high Priesthood of Christ taking place post cross.

GE:

Thank you, SDA, You supplied us with an answer as straight as an arrow. It was not my imagination, it was not my intelligence that noticed and understood exactly what you here state as your belief and confession of faith. For no moment think I did not 'get the point'. I got it long ago, even before I have read Mrs White. I learned it from you, and I am a good learner. I got the point! I believe everybody else had, too.

Now tell us, dear SDA, what poison have you smeared over that 'point'? "The point" is that Christ claims "I GO to the Father" as in a level of "presence" anticipated that He did not enjoy BEFORE going", which "level of "presence"" was the 'level' away from those He would **leave on earth** – never any 'level' where absent from His **Father** or His Father absent from **Him!**

"Even MORE so when He says "My God my God why hast thou forsaken Me?" --- which is totally another matter. We are here talking of the Son's Presence with the Father, and the Father's Presence with the Son **in the resurrection of Him from the dead** and forever inseparable ever after— **in**, and **while**, and **where** and **with** and **through** and **for**, Christ being raised from the dead, "*in (that) moment, in (that) twinkling of an eye*"— all eternity being contained in it, all forgiveness of sin and all justification and all righteousness of God being contained in it, and all the sanctification of men, contained in it and in it, perfected, finished, sealed, for evermore. This is the 'point', at present and of present relevancy, in your own words, "... When Christ is RAISED from the tomb ...". At this 'point' it may rightly be stated the Father had descended or in spatial terms just as well, had ascended, to the Son, and that the Son had taken in place "at the right hand" of the Almighty Father "in heavenly realms" of utter Divine Glory and Honour and Power and Authority of utter Unification and Unity of **Father, Son and Holy Spirit**. That much— anticipated event throughout history of the revelation of God had **not until then**, taken place. **Now** "*in the fullness of time*" it happened in Jesus in the flesh of His being resurrected body, in the grave, on earth, "from the dead"— "**from**", where just before, He had been **in** death. '*Get it? It is important to stay focused on the point!*'

While Jesus in the body of His flesh had not yet ascended to the Father, and He still had to ascend 'to heaven' in the body of his risen and glorified flesh, in order to "*be with you always*" (Mt28:20), was He in the Father's Presence? Was Jesus the First Sheaf Waved "**Before the LORD**", or was He the First Sheaf waved before the cry of an angel in the sight of mortals? In other words, was Jesus God, and no mere created being, in and through his resurrection from the dead? Are you a Neo-Docetist? Can you answer my question (which I have given you the answer for) Who, raised Christ from the dead? Can't you, not because you do not know, but because you do not **believe**? Is it because you are a Docetist you refuse to answer? Do you believe the Divinity and the Deity of Jesus Christ? Was Christ in having been raised from the dead **in** the Father's Presence, and **was** He in having been raised from the dead, **God's** Presence with men and **men's** presence with God? Like, and as Jesus in having become God **Incarnate**, **was**, God's Presence with men? In fact yes, **while** Jesus in resurrection from the dead was in the Father's Presence, He **was**, God's, presence— God's full and only, Presence **between** God and men.

No one has an issue with John 14:28 except SDAs. No one except

SDAs has an issue Jesus ascended before He ascended. So here with Christ's Priesthood no one except SDAs have an issue with Christ having been High Priest before and after He had been perfected High Priest through resurrection from the dead. Therefore you must ask yourself the question, Nobody else who has a problem with Jesus having been High Priest – in Truth, having been High Priest of the Most High God since eternity according to the Law of Indestructible LIFE? Nobody else than SDAs?

But herein in fact you, confirming, expose your very error, deceit and defeat, because If Jesus could not have been High Priest while on earth, He could not have been God on earth — and especially so according to your thinking, in his death and after his death while according to you not in the Presence of God the Father. For to be High Priest of Almighty God He had to become Man — this same Jesus, God, whom man crucified; this same Jesus, God, Whom God had raised; this same Jesus, God, Who from eternity was with God and was God, and always had been and has been, God, Mediator and Intercessor – God of the Substance of God as the Father is of the Substance of God. You divorce Christ' Priesthood from His Divinity as were His Priesthood a prize merely and no Condition for having made atonement of sin while not having been The Atonement for sin. You divide Christ and High Priesthood of Christ; you divide Christ and God. And of all things impossible for God, you place 'them' – Christ and God – in separate compartments of time and metrical space. What absurdity; nay what blasphemy! With this 'priesthood'—story of yours, you thought you had a sword in hand; while you had a snake that bit you, in hand.

We may thank SDA for this Quote, Hebrews 9,
 "11 *But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things to come, He entered through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation;*
 12 *and not through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.*"

When was this? "When Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things to come".

Who, was this? "Christ, appeared, as, a high priest." (Then He had to be High Priest from evermore to evermore.)

How "Entered He"? "Through His own blood."

Where was that? "The holy place."

Which 'Holy Place'? "the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation", which was Christ in resurrection from the dead by the hand of God the Father.

SDA:

GE saying, "Now tell us, dear SDA, what poison have you smeared over that 'point'?" That would be "me" quoting Scripture -- paying attention to what it says and accepting it. That would be "you", ranting. See? The point is that when Jesus is raised and says "I have NOT YET ascended to the Father" -- "he meant it". John 20:17, "Jesus said to her, "Stop clinging to Me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to My brethren and say to them, "I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God." As much as you may now prefer to resort once again to low-brow ranting and whining -- why not address the Bible point "instead"??

Amazingly in all the GE "but Ellen White said.." smoke fury and sound we get NO response to the fact of Scripture raised regarding the high Priesthood of Christ taking place post cross. Now as it turns out, this "only gets worse" when we observe that WHILE ON EARTH Christ is NOT High Priest -- but "when He Goes to the Father" (John 20) at that point He "appears as our High Priest". Amazingly GE quotes this devastating point against his own argument while ignoring the significance of it.

GE, quote, "... He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption. WHEN? When He ascended "to the Father"" (Notice John 20 yet again). That is WHEN He appeared as our High Priest. No amount of "whining about Ellen White instead" is going to change scripture in this case.

GE:

Yes, "That is WHEN He appeared as our High Priest". But let us change the emphasis to, "**That**", is when He appeared as

our High Priest", and we have changed the same words, from yours, to mine, and we have changed the meaning, from yours to the Word's. Describe, define, indicate, the concept, '**That!**' 'That', is as, where, when, and how, "*He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption*". Where, when and how, and as, was '**That!**? You, SDA, will die but admit it was the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead by the Father, in the Glory of the Father! You will die but admit it was, Where?— **at**; it was When?— **in and while**; it was, How?— **by and through**, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead by the Father, in the Glory of the Father, in the flesh of his glorified body **in the grave**, but, at the **same time** and in the **same place**, in the Most Holy of the Sanctuary of the **Presence** of the **Full Fellowship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit!** That's why I say your 'view', is blasphemy— **blasphemy** for keeping on denying the **Truth** of Jesus' resurrection from the dead that is the Full Gospel of God in Christ.

And, What, double, '*devastating point against your own argument – while ignoring the significance of it –*', is this?: "*Stop clinging to Me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father...*" while your 'point' was to show that Mary could not touch Jesus until such time as He would ascend to His Father? According to yourself, Mary touched Jesus; yet could not have had touched Him because He had not ascended to his Father yet. And once Jesus would have had ascended, what would be the point in saying 'Don't touch me now', for then He would not be present any more to touch?

SDA:

And as we continue to read in Heb 9 -- Paul argues this NEW role of Christ was STILL ongoing at the time of His writing - Hebrews 9:22 "And according to the Law, one may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness. 23 Therefore it was necessary for the copies of the things in the heavens to be cleansed with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. 24 For Christ did not enter a holy place made with hands, a mere copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us, 25 Nor was it that He would offer Himself often, as the high priest enters the holy place year by year with blood that is not his own. 26 Otherwise, He

would have needed to suffer often since the foundation of the world; but now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." And "yes" it is still true that -- No amount of "whining about Ellen White instead" is going to change that fact. Deal with scripture -- accept it and end the ranting and ad hominem "methods" that you have exchanged for "Bible study". (Recall that in the Gospel there is something called "the New Birth")

So in John 20 When Christ said "tell my Disciples I ASCEND to My Father and to your Father" -- he meant that he was indeed GOING to do that.

And then HAVING done it - He SAT DOWN at the right hand of God UNTIL His enemies should become His footstool.

GE

'New birth'? Thanks to God I am a believer - a 'Reformed', Protestant', believer. God is my Judge; not you. So that one will roll off my back like water from the proverbial duck's back.

"So in John 20 When Christ said "tell my Disciples I ASCEND to My Father and to your Father" -- he meant that he was indeed GOING to do that. ... And then HAVING done it - He SAT DOWN at the right hand of God UNTIL His enemies should become His footstool." What "it"? "Having done", what? "Then", "Having done", "it"? "Then", after what? After "Having done" "ASCEND(ing) to My Father"? Did Jesus "then", "S(I)T DOWN at the right hand of God"? No matter how long after, no matter "UNTIL His enemies should become His footstool"? "When", "SAT Christ DOWN at the right hand of God"? At the end after He would have come again? No? No!; At any point in time in between since He rose from the dead and will have come again? Your answer, "Yes"? 'Yes' when, 'in between'? "Not before after forty days after his resurrection"? I knew that! Everybody knows that's the SDA-'view'! That's the lie, which SDAs like you deny and maintain. You talk a lot about 'Scripture'; give us the Scripture! Not your 'rant', but Scripture!

I'll give you the Scripture that says when and where and how and at, "And then HAVING done it" - when and where and how and at, 'and then having sat down at the right hand of God', was-- "That ye may know ... what the riches of His Glory ... and what the exceeding greatness of his Power ... which He wrought in Christ, when He raised / raising Him from the dead and set Him at His Own Right Hand in heavenly Majesty, far above all ("His enemies at His footstool") principality and power and might and dominion and every name that is named ... and hath put all things under his feet ...". And there are many more!

SDA:

"Every priest stands daily ministering and offering time after time the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; 12 but He, having offered one sacrifice for sins for all time, SAT DOWN AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, 13 waiting from that time onward UNTIL HIS ENEMIES BE MADE A FOOTSTOOL FOR HIS FEET. 14 For by one offering He has perfected for all time those who are sanctified. 15 And the Holy Spirit also testifies to us; for after saying ..." Thus "ends" your gaming this point for all this time.

GE:

"SDA - Inspired writings", is the name of your game, SDA. I have one question that will settle the issue, one question directly as if asked from the pages of these very writings: Who, raised Christ from the dead? Now is it too difficult a question to answer? Then let me change my question and ask, Did the Father raise Jesus from the dead?

You see, the answer - from these writings and from nowhere else - will tell, are these writings inspired? And if inspired, inspired by whom? God or the devil? No SDA. You break my heart. Yours is a another gospel that is not the Gospel.

"WHEN?" Christ appeared our High Priest since God first "spoke to us through the prophets". Christ appeared our High Priest since when born a Child; He appeared our High Priest since every step of His earthly ministry; He appeared our High Priest since when He made Sacrifice of Himself; He appeared High Priest since when giving His Spirit into His Father's very own hands; but above all He

appeared our High Priest since when in resurrection from the dead He made offering of his Sacrifice "Before the LORD". And ever since He for no moment and at no stage of His 'Intermediary Office' (John Owen) has not been, Priest **and** High Priest of the Most High God. At no point in time **in or after** His resurrection has Jesus not been **both** Priest and High Priest. That is WHEN and HOW, and WHERE Christ appeared as our High Priest: Quote: "*When God raised Him from the dead*", 'Then', was He, quote: "*Perfected*", our High Priest. This is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. If anyone is offended by it, then must he be offended. But I, "*I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, because it is the Power — of God! unto salvation*" of this lost but saved soul, me!

Have I not said, Jesus by interceding on behalf of the saved, exercises them in sanctification? Well what are, "those who are sanctified"? Did I ever deny Jesus' Mediatory Office? I did not!

When and where and how – exactly – did Christ, "*having offered one sacrifice for sins for all time, sit down at the right hand of God*"?

These words are telling! You need not look anywhere else: "*having offered*", He "*sat down at the right hand of God*". "*When God raised Him from the dead and set Him at his own right hand in heavenly realms ... and hath put all things under his feet*". Not a second later; nowhere else; no other way! In no other Office than of High Priest of the Most High God.

Here's another of those speaking-for-itself-texts: "*But now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself*". "Manifested" – that's 'when' – 'manifested' to do what? "To put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" – that's 'when': Sin was put away the moment, "in the twinkling of an eye", when "the sting of death, sin" with death, were "swallowed up" when, where, how? In Victory! That was, in and with, at, the moment of Jesus' resurrection from the dead! Nowhere else; no other time, no other occasion! **Where is the Triumph of Jesus' resurrection if not in his resurrection?**

SDA:

At Jesus' resurrection -- but as Jesus said even then "I have not YET ascended to my Father" John 20.

GE:

I asked my questions: Did the Father raise Christ from the dead? Did Jesus give His Spirit to God the Father when He died on the cross? I shall – I honestly mean it from the bottom of my heart – be very thankful to receive your answers. Anyone who might have read this, Are any of you prepared to answer?

John 20:17 "Do not 'touch' me"?

Bob Ryan SDA

Christ's argument at the moment of resurrection, John 20:17, is that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied. ... God the Father and God the Son have conducted the execution of the plan of salvation in a way that is public and formal as we see in Daniel 7 "the courts at the books were opened.... myriads and myriads were in attendance".

The "Court of heaven" is something God uses to proclaim both his love and His justice. As we see even in the case of Job 1 and 2 God allows for objections to be raised and official verifiable evidence to be presented in those "Court of heaven" contexts. What's the point of creating intelligent beings like the Angels if He is going to continually revert to a "trust me and don't think this one through" solution? In fact what is the point of 6000 years of sin and suffering on earth if there is nothing here being "demonstrated" or "proved"? Why not simply "snip Lucifer out of existence" prior to his tempting one single loyal angel? Better yet - why not "redirect Lucifer's cycle of thought" before he even knows he is thinking about questioning God and save God the death of His son? It shows an "extreme degree of integrity and accounting" with God that he takes NONE of those shortcuts.

Ed Sutton

The "presentation" of the Son to the Father was physical, as well. One could get sidetracked here, I guess, by relying on a translation or

translations that render Jesus' words to Mary as "Do not 'touch' me...", I guess, but that is a less than ideal rendering here, IMO. I suggest that the NASB is much clearer, here, in this rendering of John 20:17: 17, Jesus said to her, "Stop clinging to Me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to My brethren and say to them, 'I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God.'" Jn.20:17. A short time after the encounter with Mary, Jesus was "held by his feet" (Mt. 28:9), and he specifically said to the disciples to "Handle Me and see..." (Lk. 24:39), less than 24 hrs, by any reckoning, of the encounter with Mary, and later, 'commanded' Thomas to place his hands into Jesus' side. (Jn.20:27)

The point was not "to avoid any 'physical contact'", at all, in His words to Mary, but rather to announce that His work was of a greater scope, than Mary was realizing. He was no longer going to be here, 'physically' in the presence of Mary, in the manner in which she had known, and He was telling her this, in so many words.

By no stretch, am I ever presenting what can even be remotely constrained as "another 'gospel'", in any manner, whatsoever, for I have no intention of having any such near me, just as you say, as well.

Gerhard Ebersöhn

Thank you, Ed Sutton. This is how I too, feel; especially where you say, 'His work was of a greater scope and Jesus was telling her this'.

Bob Ryan SDA

You have exactly nailed the reason that Christ does not focus on "The work he was doing while dead" [insinuating GE] -- His argument at the moment of resurrection is that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied.

And as you note - this must have been done by the time He meets with Thomas but had not been done when Mary met him. The point is not that "Christ is not God or does not know something" the point is that God the Father and God the Son have conducted the execution of the plan of salvation in a way that is public and formal.

GE

Ed Sutton's and the NASB's 'Stop clinging to Me' is far better than "Do not 'touch' me". However, what about the most **obvious** 'interpretation' or 'observation' possible? Even according to just the **English** of the KJV, Mary never as much as touched Jesus! From where then the idea she 'clung' to Him, but Jesus said, No? From where too, Bob Ryan's idea Jesus **needed still to obtain presence with the Father**? That's the crux of the matter! Rather the text and context create **no** impression Jesus tried to prevent Mary to touch Him, but that He **commissioned** her to go straight on and **proclaim** the Gospel to his disciples that Christ in being raised had **obtained** that by which God was now God and Father of both Himself and them! A **finished salvation** that would **rule out** a future and still ongoing atonement— here's the 'point' or 'argument', as Bob Ryan has called it, Jesus wanted to make with saying, "*Do not stay here with me (don't hesitate, don't linger), for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren and tell them (when I ascend), I ascend to my Father (who through my resurrection has become) your Father too, and to my God, (who by my resurrection has been made) your God as well.*" Prophecy has been fulfilled in Christ in resurrection from the dead, having made peace: It says, "*He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.*" Mal4:6 -- the very last words of the Old Testament!

This **New Relationship** had been accomplished **by** the resurrection and **in** the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; it meant **Completed Redemption, Perfected Salvation, full and final**, made and established **once for all!** Now the Seventh Day Adventists claim it is **not even begun** with "... at the moment of resurrection", but that Christ "... does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned

approval" **before** He could begin with making 'final atonement'!

According to the literal Greek, one may visualise the following: Mary leans over (*parékypsen*) in order to look into the tomb, sees two angels, converses with them, then all in one movement "*she these things saying turned around / back / away from*" the opening, "*tauta eipousa estrafēh opisoh*", "*and saw Jesus standing not knowing that it was Jesus. Said Jesus to her, 'Woman, why do you cry? Whom are you looking for? That one (Mary) thinking He was the gardener, asked Him ... Answered Jesus her, Mary!'*"

Then the interesting part: As Jesus spoke to her, Mary, while she recognised Him, apparently shocked, "**turning**" – "*strafeihsa*", "*called out, Master!*" --- her back to Jesus her head bent low in awe and amazement, her hands covering her eyes? **While Mary stands in this posture**, Jesus commands, "*Don't stay with Me, for not yet am I gone to My Father, so go to my brethren and tell them (while I'm still with you), that I shall go to the Father who (now that I am risen) is my Father and your Father, my God and your God!*" *'I have availed; I have created the New Brotherhood; my work is finished. This is your message to tell them; go now! I have obtained entrance into the innermost sanctity of the Presence of the Father – where I was raised by the Glory of the Father and **obtained your sonship and Mine own**, and from Him got his official sanctioned approval that the Law is fully satisfied.*

"*Stop clinging to Me*" is therefore a **figurative** command that should not be understood for literal nor by the nature of its case could be misunderstood for literal, but is a command that should be understood for its implying and requiring the accomplishment and completion of God's **ultimate** Purpose in Christ **in having raised** Him from the dead ("*The exceeding greatness of His Power which He worked when God raised Christ from the dead*"). Christ had to "go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied" – humanly speaking – before the Father would have quickened Him from the dead in the first place!

That approval Jesus **had had obtained, the moment he died**, "*After this, Jesus knowing that all things now were accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled (and the Law (be) fully*

satisfied and vindicated), *saieth, I thirst.*" The 'separation' **here**, was complete, completed and, therein and therewith, was **ended!** "*When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar*" of the 'second death' in all its bitterness, and have emptied the cup He had to drain to the dregs, "*He said, **Finished!**: and He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.*" Jn19:28-30. Now this was **how** Jesus "*gave up the ghost*" with His very last Word of Life, **spoken, there and then:** "*When Jesus cried with a loud voice, He spoke: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, He gave up the ghost*" to Him his Father. Lk23:46. **Now** is His Life hidden in God; **until** "*The God of Peace*" the Father "*through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant*" of Peace, "*brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus*" and "*Prince of Peace*", "*For He hath said, I will never leave Thee*", and Christ believed Him, and said, "*I will not fear what man shall do unto Me*". Hb13:20, 5-6.

Instead of the *separation* the Seventh Day Adventists contend for, the Word presents Divine Union and Re-Union even **in the dying moment** of Jesus on the cross. This Re-Union all through the death of Christ in the grave **worked from and worked towards**, springs into vibrant Life like a buried seed bursting through the ground into the sunlight, "*When suddenly in Sabbath's fullness midst of daylight ... there was a great earthquake for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled back the stone from the door*". That was the angel from heaven's part. It needs not be said when suddenly in Sabbath's fullness midst of daylight ... the **Father, descended, from** heaven, and **came**, and "*awakened*" and "*quickened*" His Son "*from the dead*", and "resurrected" Him "*Christ and Lord*", "*in the Glory of the Father*". It needs be believed! The Father, "*from heaven*"; his Son, "*from the dead*". It needs be believed!

But, here is the Abomination of Desolation standing in The-Holy-Temple-of-God's-Immediate-Presence-in-and-of-the-resurrection-of-Jesus-Christ-from-the-dead: one concept!— here is the Abomination of Desolation standing: "His argument at the moment of resurrection is that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied. And as you note - this must have been done by the time He meets with Thomas but had not been done when Mary met him."

Jesus had no "argument at the moment of resurrection ... that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied." Besides it **not now was** "the moment of resurrection", besides it **now** for all purposes or needs being too late 'to go before the Father to get the official sanctioned approval', Jesus 'at the moment of His resurrection', "*In the Sabbath's fullness*",

already had had gone before the Father and **already had had made** that official presentation whereby He **already had had got** "the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied". That 'official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied' **was**, yea, **already had had been**, Jesus' very **resurrection** from the dead.

To deny this absoluteness is to deny and blaspheme against Jesus' resurrection from the dead and instead place the abomination of desolation standing in the Most Holy Temple in heavenly places of Almighty God's Presence and Glory. Because denying it, also denies and blasphemes against Christ's **finished** work of atonement and reconciliation, the bringing together again of God and sinners in Christ, the heart of the Father and the heart of the sons, **where and when** having died He also **rose** from the dead again, **having wrought** "official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied".

The 'ascending' ('anabainoh') of Jesus is not his

- 1) **'Exaltation'**: 'epairoh / hyperairomai'; 'hypsos / hypso-oh / hyperypso-oh'; **or**, his
- 2) **'Seating'**: 'kathisas < 'kathehmai / 'kathidzoh': Rv4:2; Eph1:20b; Hb1:3, 8:1, 10:12, 12:2; **or**, his
- 3) **'Glorification'**, 'docsa / docsadzoh / endocsas / endocsadzomai / kauchehma / kauchaomai / katakauchaomai / kleos /'.

'Seating of Him': to the right hand of the throne of God "*in heavenly places*" of glory, **already attained** "*When God raised Christ from the dead and set Him at His Own Right Hand*", **Eph1:20**.

The SDAs confuse these different things for one and the same, Jesus' 'ascending'-'anabainoh'. Had Jesus not already through

resurrection from the dead been glorified "*far above every name that is named*" (21), He would not have been able or allowed after, to ascend, to his Father. "*For if He were on earth, He should not be Priest at all!*" Hb8:4a. "*Even as I overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne*", **Rv3:21b**. Read 1Jn5:20-21. "*He would raise up Christ to sit on his throne*", being an Infinitive of Noun force, says, Christ's resurrection **was that of** His 'sitting down' or 'being set' upon God's throne at once, **Acts 2:30**; "*He (David) seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ*", **31a**. Jesus assures the vain disciples when they asked to "*sit on thy right hand*" "*in thy glory*", that they by the baptism or death He would die and be raised from again, in fact would, Mk10:37-39. Paul says, "*Buried with Him in his baptism wherein ye are also co-raised with Him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised Him from the dead.*" **Col2:12**. "*But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together with Him, and made us sit together in Christ Jesus in heavenly places.*" **Eph2:4-6**.

His **resurrection** was where and when Christ "**sat**" down in His **Glory**. Christ "**sat**" down in His Glory where and "**when God raised (Him) from the dead ... by / in the Glory of the Father**", **Eph1:20**, **Ro.6:4**. "*In that He liveth, He liveth unto / equal with God ... death hath no more dominion over Him*"; "*Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more*"— and no more maketh atonement— He hath dominion over death, **Ro.6:9-10**. Therefore **before** He ascended to the Father, Jesus confirmed that **already**, "*All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth*". **Mt28:18b**— "**is given**" since the moment of his having been **resurrected**. "*Christ who dying, rather who rising— rather who is at the right hand of God, (is Christ) who indeed maketh intercession for us.*" **Ro.6:8:34**. Christ's '*making intercession*' became possible by virtue of and followed upon his having been **exalted** "*at the right hand of God ... having died – rather, in having been raised*"— not a few hours or forty days after having died and having been raised, but once and for all, simultaneously "**when God raised (Him) from the dead ... by / in the Glory of the Father**". "*For as the Father has life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself, and hath given Him all authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man*". Glorious Being since through resurrection having triumphed over death and grave (Jn5:26-27),

this is the **exaltation** of Jesus Christ His '**gift**', **awarded in Victory by Victory**; not later or afterwards. "*The hour is now!*"— the moment of Christ's **resurrection** from the dead (25a).

Putting it one twinkling of an eye after, puts Christ's exaltation, perfection and anointment outside of Christ's resurrection, and "*after the Sabbath on the First Day of the week*" according to the antichrist corruption of the Times and Laws of God— Seventh Day Adventist-style and Seventh Day Adventists eagerly under bondage in collaboration with antichrist, illustrated amply by Bob Ryan's affirmations of vanity.

The lame man healed of Acts 3 is a figure of **Christ in his exaltation**. God took Christ by the right hand and lifted Him up: "*and immediately*" He entered into the Temple of the Glory of God, and received strength and all power in heaven and in earth. **Like as** to us God "... *saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light*", Eph5:14, **so** God said to Christ, 'Awake Thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and I shall give Thee light.' God waited not, but **as soon as** "*He raised his Son from the dead, even Jesus who delivered us from the wrath to come*", 1Thes1:10, **so He set** Him in the light of His Presence. "*God that raised (Christ) up from the dead and gave Him glory that your faith and hope might be in God.*" **1Pt1:21**.

Only for his disciples' sake and so that the Scriptures should be fulfilled did Jesus **after his exaltation** at and in and because of his **resurrection** from the dead, remain on earth another forty days. It never meant that Jesus **first** had to 'ascend' **in order to be** 'exalted', honoured and glorified, or that His '**ascension**' was his 'exaltation'. It never meant "... that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied"! That '*presentation / offering*', Christ had had made while having been raised from the dead "*First Sheaf Wave Offering before the LORD*", and that dignity He had **already** earned **and** received, in recompense **for** having **finished** atonement for sin in dying, **through** and in and by and with, **resurrection** from the dead, from death, and from the grave. Postponing Jesus' '*presentation*' or exaltation one minute or eighteen hundred and fourteen years, cannot better the lie in itself; it keeps on robbing Christ of His glory and 'official sanctioned approval from the Father' that He received through and in resurrection

from the dead and nowhere and no how else. "*But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of God should (have) taste(d) death for every man. For it became Him (God), for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make (have made) the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.*" "*It became Him*"— it was God's **Glory**— "*in bringing unto glory*" of 'perfection' "*many sons*", in "*Jesus* (whom) *we see ... crowned with glory and honour*". We see **Jesus** here in the rising of His from the death of His partaking in— not in his ascension to his Father forty days later or whenever after. We see Jesus here **in the rising of His from the death** of His partaking in— not in his ascension to his Father forty days later or whenever after— 'now enter(ing) into the presence of the Father ... receiving the coronet of glory and the royal robe.' Herein is Christ's and the Glory of God: "*But now Christ become the Firstfruits of them that slept is risen from the dead.*" **1Cor15:20**. The risen Christ and He "*in bringing many sons unto glory*" in and with Himself is all the Glory and the whole Glory of the Father, in whose Glory Christ was raised from the dead. "*So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption (sufferings); it is raised in incorruption (glory).*" 1Cor15:42. There is no division, no separation, of resurrection and glorification and exaltation of Jesus Christ at God's "*own right hand in heavenly places*". If, no matter how fractionally divorced from or postponed to after Jesus' resurrection, God's works are not perfected or finished; atonement for sins, is not wrought; denial of the resurrection of Christ in fact follows. It is blasphemy against God to maintain. "*If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins*" (1Cor15:17). It is blasphemy against God if Christ be raised, to maintain ye are in your sins yet because Christ's "argument at the moment of resurrection is that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied." All that Faith receive from Christ through resurrection from the dead— all abundance of Grace— forfeited unless afterwards and later - maybe even hundreds of years after and later - to officially get sanctioned approval from the Father! Blasphemy! because, "*If Jesus had given them rest, God would not after these things speak of another day*", Hb4:7-8, of mercy or obtainment of forgiveness of sins.

Blasphemy against God, "*seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame*", Hb6:6.

The Glory of God is the Rest of God, even Christ having made reconciliation for sins through resurrection from the dead. "*God thus concerning the Seventh Day spake: And God the Seventh Day from all His Works, rested.*" In that Christ was raised "*In Sabbath's fullness*", God in having ended making atonement, rested in the Son. God postponed not his rest or glory a single day or forty days or eighteen hundred and fourteen years. Mary touching Jesus on the First Day of the week, could have had no influence; was not able to deter; the works of God were perfected in Christ, through Christ, and His glorification and exaltation and 'official sanctioned approval' **gained and granted**, in the resurrection of Him from the dead and the grave.

The Father had had been **present** and **working** in all His Glory in Christ and through Christ the while He finished all the works of his Father in Victory over death and sin through the **resurrection** of Him from the dead. "*But now Christ risen from the dead become the Firstfruits of them that slept*", **is Christ in Glory of Exaltation the Glory of the Father**. "*Yea, and we are found false witnesses (of the Glory) of God because we have testified (of the Glory) of God that he raised up Christ whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not*" with Him and in Him where and when and as He rose from the dead. (1Cor15:15) The glory of the Father by which He raised up Christ from the dead is Christ who rose from the dead, incorruptible, exalted and glorified with and in and as that official presentation and official sanctioned approval from the Father at the right hand of the Almighty in His Holy Temple in its utter Holiest, "*immediately*"— that is, **in being raised up from the dead**: in the acme of His Power and glory whereby God raised up Christ from the dead— no one moment in time or of time later or after, but for eternity after, once and for all.

Thus "Christ came in the flesh". He who deny, denies that Jesus is the Christ; he who deny, is, antichrist. The Church that deny, is antichrist. Not even the Roman Catholics deny! Who that deny remain, but the Seventh Day Adventist Church?

Here to be continued the determination of the time and circumstance of Jesus' being come in His Glory, to the above key-words.

SDA, "Christ does not focus on "The work he was doing while dead". . ." ... But you SDAs are! You say He '*rested in the tomb*'. You say, Jesus by '*resting in the tomb*', "*obeyed the Commandment*"; you say Jesus by '*resting in the tomb*', sanctified the Sabbath. Now are these the **works** of God, yes or no?! Is God's rest, an act of His, or are these acts of Jesus, God 'doing nothing'? God 'doing nothing' not even is a logically possible concept; what being the thing God in Christ was **resting** in the grave thereby sanctifying the Sabbath!

Bob Ryan's words, "Christ does not focus on "The work he was doing while dead" . . ." ... are the words never of GE: but the precise words of the very Bob Ryan himself: "The work he was doing while dead". Ja, indeed the precise act and responsibility of the very Bob Ryan, who put these words and this FALSITY between the teeth of GE. But, as sometimes – almost always truth can be found in and from the mouth of satan himself – the precise words, "The work he was doing while dead" **do** in fact contain truth! For again, Christ, even in the tomb and interred and "while dead", like His Father no moment is found indulgent, passive, doing nothing! "*Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*", Acts 2:27— that was, 'while dead'! Even while, in and through being dead and interred, the Christ with the Father, **work victory over grave, death and destruction**. He – They – **work** on still, not having reached the utmost height yet; 'They' – Father, Son and Holy Spirit – '*energise*' still in Almighty Achievement ... **until from** the dead, **until from** the grave, God **raised** Christ, Triumphator and Victor, **until** Christ— "*as God*" Hb4:10c – "*enter into His Own Rest*", '*incorruptible*', because not only is God's Victory over death, grave and sin 'spiritual', it also is bodily and temporary— in space and time, 'three-dimensional': **reality** that also includes **time**, and therefore, is Christ's "*resurrection from the dead*", "*according to the Scriptures*". So did the Son of God, "*finish the works of (His) Father*"— not "The work he was doing while dead",

but **while and in being resurrected from** the dead and **from** death and **from** grave; to put what I have said in proper perspective, and rescue it from Seventh Day Adventist distortion.

Further absurdities and blasphemies of the SDA position

Bob Ryan SDA

You have exactly nailed the reason that Christ does not focus on "The work he was doing while dead" [insinuating GE] -- His argument at the moment of resurrection is that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied.

And as you note - this must have been done by the time He meets with Thomas but had not been done when Mary met him. The point is not that "Christ is not God or does not know something" the point is that God the Father and God the Son have conducted the execution of the plan of salvation in a way that is public and formal.

GE

Bob Ryan is insinuating that I claim Jesus' resurrection as such was "The work he was doing while dead". This is Bob Ryan's words and method of avoiding the issue, which in this case was, and still is, that I said **God** raised Christ from the dead, and that **Christ**, in rising from the dead "*by the glory of the Father*", "*entered into the full fellowship of the Trinity*" (the words of Klaas Schilder). This is what Bob Ryan says I say, is "The work he (Christ) was doing while dead". Fine; I said it and I maintain.

Instead ... if **that**, would not be 'the work He was doing while dead'? ... then **instead**, Bob Ryan has Jesus' 'argument' - "His argument at the moment of resurrection...". Now consider Jesus' 'argument' (according to Bob Ryan the Seventh Day Adventist) "at the moment of resurrection"

— consider and ask, **Was** this the 'moment-of-resurrection'? No, it was **after** it.

But for argument's sake, **say**, it was "his argument at the moment of resurrection", **then**, Jesus' "argument at the moment of resurrection is ...", the following: "... that he does need to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied"! **Then** this "need to go" and this "mak(ing) that official presentation" and this "to get the official sanctioned approval", belong to "the moment of resurrection" **as much as** Jesus' "argument is ... at the moment of resurrection" — **so that** everything 'is at the moment of resurrection', and nothing of it is after 'the moment of resurrection', **so that Bob Ryan is plainly contradicting and destroying his own 'argument'**. So that Bob Ryan unwittingly and unwillingly is saying just what I am saying, that Jesus, **in rising** from the dead, *entered into the full fellowship of the Trinity*. Because it would be only *in the full fellowship of the Trinity that Christ could go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied!* Exactly **what** actually happened and exactly **when** actually it happened— when, as, and in that Jesus was 'resurrected' and by the **Father**, and in the **Glory** of the Father was 'resurrected'!

Bob Ryan's fallacy might seem callow, but is callous as hard as rock (if one knew him and the Adventists). Their 'argument' comes from, and goes to 'proving' their presumptuous claim the Father was absent at the resurrection of Christ. If there had been one period of time God was God without the Second Person of the Godhead, it would be from Jesus died until He rose from the dead and grave again. In fact, this is exactly what they teach!

(Questioner) "If divinity cannot die, does this suggest that Jesus' nature at death split, and that his humanity died but not His divinity?"

(Bille Burdick) "Yes... essentially this is exactly what it says. ... If we apply that to one member of the Godhead, then it becomes clear that the only thing that can happen to one of the Trinity ... is that there would be a *separation* between the members.... such that they are **no longer ONE in their being.**" (Bold, GE)

The Adventists teach, very authoritatively (Ellen G. White), that Jesus died "as man" – not as God, "for that cannot be".

Despite, one of their opinion makers, Bille Burdick of above, desperately tried this one, God's, for them, 'only option', "But by becoming a human... God could, by the dual nature of His incarnation, die as a man, but survive as God... and give life back **to the man he was**... finally demonstrate in a way all the watching universe could understand, the very basic difference between the created order and the Creator"! SDANet 19 May 2008. (Bold and underline, GE. Notice "all the watching universe"-stuff, just like Bob Ryan's 'Lucifer'-stuff. Burdick's reasoning is obviously based on 'manifestation-deism' where the Godhead is single with three projections of 'Father', 'Son' and 'Spirit'— an excuse for an altogether human 'Jesus', their protests despite.) When faced with the same dilemma, another of their great thinkers, Leroy Moore, reminds the questioner who asked, "Who resurrected Jesus?", that Mrs E. G. White said He was called from the grave by 'the angel', but he is careful enough to add: 'After all Jesus was God' (— from which the questioner should draw his own conclusion — only Leroy Moore won't say it out loud or he might be heard). Now if not Jesus **died** being God, how could He **take up** his life again, **while being not God?** So their — theirs, I say — '*only alternative*' would be that God the Father 'resurrected Jesus'. But ask them, Was Jesus resurrected by the Father? And they evade the answer and innovate thousands of reason why the Father could not have resurrected Jesus.

Because "there would be a *separation* between the members", the Father could not be present to raise Jesus up again. See, *When He died, the Father left Jesus in the state of 'the second death' of complete separation from God*. The Seventh Day Adventists place that *separation* **after** Jesus' '*physical*' death. They place it in the state and within the confines of Jesus' '*physical*' death, so that at the end of '*physical*' death, they're stuck with their dilemma of Who raised Christ from the dead? I must have asked them that question at least a thousand times; to this day they could not give answer. Because they will not succumb to truth, that the Father raised the Son in His very immediate and intimate Glory! Because if they did consent, it's tickets with their 'investigative judgment' phantasm and they stand ashamed in the eyes of all religious hoi polloi.

That is why Bob Ryan's pathetic explanations hide much more than it seems.

It is not simply a matter of an hour or so taken opportunity of for Jesus to quickly "go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied. And (that) this must have been

done by the time He meets with Thomas but had not been done when Mary met him." It is Bob Ryan's deceitful foolery to make his questioners fail to see the deeper and greater scope of Seventh Day Adventist error in it. It is Seventh Day Adventism's deceitful foolery to make honest seekers for truth fail to see 'His work was of a greater scope and Jesus was telling (Mary) this', Ed Sutton.

Even casually glanced at, Bob Ryan's presentation here shows reckless negligence. "...this must have been done by the time He meets with Thomas but had not been done when Mary met him" ... What about the **other women** to whom Jesus before He met with Thomas, appeared? Mt28:9, by whom actually He was "held by the feet"? that created the shorter space of time within which Mrs White squeezes her '*gift-reception*' session 'in heaven' into? Bob Ryan knew better than '*the servant of the Lord*' to give Jesus a little more elbow room in time; he extended his 'gift'-interval to the appearance to Thomas.

Then again a little more time is gracefully granted the Lord, and He is allowed by the Seventh Day Adventists under auspices of Mrs White a full thirty nine days more before He could "go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied", Acts 1:9-12.

This idolon contradicts and vanquishes itself in that Jesus thus entered **twice** into the presence of the Father: Why a second time if not the first availed; and why if successful and 'gifted' (DA chpt.9,§10,14) the first time, a next? Where do we find in Prophecy the Christ had to enter in, twice? Mrs White has this wonderful explanation ready: After He appeared to Mary and "After He had ascended to the Father", and before "Jesus appeared to the other women", she says, "While the Saviour was in God's presence receiving gifts for His Church". Jesus with his first attendance in the Father's presence, "receiv(ed) gifts for His Church"— not for Himself! "The same Jesus had now — "based on Luke 24:50-53; Acts 1:9-12" — gone to share His Father's throne... There is the throne... cherubim and seraphim... are eager to... glorify their King. But He waves them back. Not yet; He cannot now receive the coronet of glory and the royal robe. He enters into the presence of the Father..." (DA chpt.13,§8) Only here and only now Christ received 'gifts', "the

coronet of glory and the royal robe", for **Himself**.
Clever! Too clever! Too blasphemously clever!

So no sooner had the Seventh Day Adventists decided, Halt! He is not even High Priest yet, and only serves as Divine though ordinary Priest in the 'First Room'; He must wait until such time as we shall have determined for Him, 1844, to enter into the Holiest, and only then can He begin office of High Priest "to go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied."
Wait! Wait! We have forgotten! He had to have come again first, before we give Him thousand literal earthly years in heaven to **show the universe** God after all is just - for Him to "go before the Father and make that official presentation - to get the official sanctioned approval from the Father that the law is fully satisfied". *The point is this must be done after the thousand years, but had not been done when He was resurrected.*

These are not my blasphemies; if they are blasphemy they are the blasphemies of their creators, who are not I, but the Seventh Day Adventists. And blasphemies they are of the coarsest kind.

What have I, **benefited** from this dialectic?

That Christ cannot to his **Church** give of which **He**, not from His Father received— **His** Father— who now through Christ Jesus whom He resurrected from the dead— is become **our** Farther too;

That Christ **first** had to have entered in into his own rest as God in his own— that He first had to have entered in into the presence and glory of the Father, and to have received from Him **for Himself** "the coronet of glory and the royal robe";

That **then** Christ could give to his 'Church' as well, 'gifts' of which of all are supreme and comprehensive, the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life;

That Christ through the **offering of his Life** won and exhibited the redemption towards which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in Oneness in the Temple of the Father's Glory **worked**— the Holiest of God resurrected in the flesh of the body of Jesus Christ from the dead incorruptible and glorious.

Where do I find that which I have so benefited, in the Scriptures? Where **John 20:17** is become the fulfilment of Jesus' Prayer of Consecration to the Father, **John 17**, and the fulfilment of His prophetic Baptism, "*Upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the Same, is He Who baptises with the Holy Spirit!*" Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the faith in Whom through Jesus Christ, is what, from this conversation, I have benefited.

ISBN 978-0-620-41731-0; 978-0-620-41747-1

Gerhard Ebersöhn
Suite 324
Private Bag X43
Sunninghill 2157
Johannesburg
biblestudents@imagnet.co.za
<http://www.biblestudents.co.za>

ISBN 978-0-620-41731-0; 978-0-620-41747-1